United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2008 No. 24

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

Rev. Chad Eaton, Biltmore Baptist Church, Arden, North Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Gracious Heavenly Father, we ask for Your presence today in this great Chamber. Please bestow upon each Representative today divine wisdom and discernment.

We stand at a difficult time in the history, not only of our great Nation, but of the world. May the decisions made here today not only honor the districts they represent, but first honor You.

Father, it is because of Your great blessing and provision that this Nation has prospered in the past. I pray that this body recognize its need and continued dependence upon You to maintain that blessing.

May these Members seek to be servants today instead of being served, and find favor with You because of their desire to know, honor and serve only God the Father, with humility, character, and courage.

May God once again bless America.

I ask this in the strong name of my Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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 with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3773. An act to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, and for other purposes.

WELCOMING REV. CHAD EATON

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. SHULER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHULER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend and my brother in Christ, Chad Eaton, for opening the House of Representatives in prayer today.

Chad Eaton is the pastor of Sports Outreach at Biltmore Baptist Church in Asheville, North Carolina.

Chad is married to Kim Eaton, and they have one son, Cole.

Chad has been a great friend to my family and to me, and to the members of our church. I appreciate the dedication he has shown to reaching the youth in our community for Christ.

I ask my colleagues to welcome Chad as he has led us in prayer this morning.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to fifteen 1-minutes on each side.

ARMY CHOOSES TO KEEP CRITICAL REPORT SECRET

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

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, this week we learned that the Army refused to release a report it commissioned from the RAND Corporation on the mistakes made in the planning and the implementation of the Iraq war.

We all know that mistakes were made. However, it's important that the Bush administration hear from independent voices exactly why the war in Iraq did not go as the administration planned.

The RAND report, uncovered by the New York Times earlier this week, chided both President Bush and then-National Security Adviser, Condoleezza Rice, for not resolving differences between the State Department and the Pentagon. It also highlighted the administration's failure to develop a single national plan that integrated ''humanitarian assistance, reconstruction governance, infrastructure development and postwar security.''

Madam Speaker, the Bush administration has a lot of lessons to learn but refuses to listen to any independent critiques. I would hope the administration would take this report seriously and would also conclude that the status quo in Iraq cannot continue.

It's time that we bring our troops home.

FIX FISA NOW

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we need a permanent fix to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and we need it now.

Our enemies will not take a vacation if the Protect America Act is left to expire. Therefore, it is dangerous for American families to let our intelligence-gathering capabilities be limited because of a failure by Congress.

We face an enemy well equipped to exploit the technologies of the 21st century for their evil purposes. Our intelligence community knows what it

Printed on recycled paper.

needs to combat that enemy and has told us on countless occasions. Yet the efforts by some to water down a fix to FISA or punish American businesses for cooperating with the government has brought us to another deadline. We face the choice of acting to defend this country or further delaying a fair solution.

I hope we take the bipartisan Senate bill and pass this fix immediately. Let's get this done to protect American families.

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

PENTAGON TO KEEP 130,000 TROOPS IN IRAQ

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, Defense Secretary Gates confirmed what many of us in Congress have long suspected: the Bush administration plans to leave nearly 130,000 troops in Iraq until the day he leaves office next January.

The war in Iraq has been misguided from the start and mismanaged in its prosecution. It has led to a significant military readiness crisis, deteriorating conditions in Afghanistan, a readiness crisis for National Guard forces here at home, and a record low standing for us abroad.

This month, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau said that 88 percent of our stateside Guard units are ''very poorly equipped'' with less than half of what they needed to respond to a domestic crisis. Five years of war in Iraq is indeed straining our troop force and their equipment. Yet the Bush administration wants more of the same.

Mr. Speaker, this Democratic-led Congress will continue to fight to change direction in Iraq and responsibly redeploy our troops home.

CONGRESS WORKS FAST TO ADDRESS ECONOMIC DOWNTURN, BUT MORE WORK NEEDS TO BE DONE

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, economists said if Washington wanted to help jump-start our Nation's economy, it needed to act fast. That's exactly what we did. Congress acted in a strong bipartisan fashion to pass an economic stimulus plan that will be signed into law by President Bush today.

The new law will put hundreds of dollars into the hands of more than 130 million American families, including seniors and disabled veterans, who will then spend it to reinvigorate our economy.

The law also expands financing opportunities for Americans who are in danger of losing their homes because of the mortgage crisis and promotes small business investment in plants and equipment.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats are proud that we have been able to work so quickly to produce an economic stimulus plan that is timely, targeted and temporary. We are also proud of the fact that this package provides immediate relief to low- and middle-income families and small businesses that need the help the most.

We will continue to rebuild and strengthen our economy, create good jobs, and give relief to families that are struggling to make ends meet.

COMMEMORATING THE DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the Day of Remembrance. This marks the 66th anniversary of the executive order which authorized the incarceration of over 120,000 Americans, primarily of Japanese descent, but also Italian and German Americans.

I stand today to remember those that were taken from their home and their communities, citizens and residents of our country that were victims of an unwarranted and unjust political paranoia.

In 1988, Congress apologized for that internment and took steps not to allow this black mark in our history to happen again.

Mr. Speaker, in rising today, it is also important to remind ourselves in these times where scapegoating and fear-mongering against a certain people is becoming more and more prevalent, this day reminds us not to allow this to happen again and to, above all, protect everybody's rights, protect everybody's inherent rights in this country, and not to allow this to happen again.

NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate February 19, the National Day of Remembrance for Japanese American internment.

During World War II, fear and mistrust clouded judgment and allowed brazen racism to take hold. Sixty-six years ago next week, President Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, which sent 120,000 American citizens and legal residents of Japanese descent into internment camps, forcing them to lose their homes, jobs and possessions. Some of these families were held in internment even while their sons showed great patriotism by serving in the Army. In my home State of Hawaii, 10,000 individuals were investigated and an estimated 1,250 Japanese Americans were detained in our islands.

During trying times such as our Nation once again faces, we must not allow prejudice against people based on race, creed or national origin to shape public policy. Fear tests our moral fortitude, and this National Day of Remembrance reminds us to reflect on our past actions in order to make just decisions which uphold our Constitution.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor of the House today to address the issue of gun-related violence and deaths in America. Last Thursday, the first day I began this series of statements on the plague of gun violence that's sweeping our country, two more gun-related incidents captured the Nation's attention.

In Portsmouth, Ohio, an estranged husband shot and then stabbed his wife to death on the schoolhouse steps. She was a fifth grade teacher, and she died in front of her students.

The second incident that grabbed headlines that day occurred during a city council meeting in Kirkwood, Missouri. In that suburban town, the assailant took the lives of five innocent people. A sixth victim, Kirkwood Mayor Michael Swoboda, is still clinging to life. And so in a sign of respect for the victims, Kenneth Yost, police officers Tom Ballman and William Biggs, and council members Michael Lynch and Connie Carr of Kirkwood as well as teacher Christi Layne of Portsmouth, I enter these six names in the RECORD.

When will America join me in saying, Enough is enough? Stop the killings.

□ 1015

CONGRESS WORKS FAST TO ADDRESS ECONOMIC DOWNTURN, BUT MORE WORK NEEDS TO BE DONE

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today President Bush will sign our bipartisan economic stimulus legislation into law. Getting this bill done quickly is a victory for the American people that will inject confidence and consumer demands, promote economic growth and create jobs.

130 million low- and middle-income Americans will receive tax rebates in the coming months. These rebates are welcome relief to many families who are struggling in this economy. Family incomes and home prices are down as health care and energy, food and education costs and mortgage foreclosures have climbed. Economists estimate that every dollar included in these rebate checks will lead to $1.26 in economic growth. The new law should also

help create 500,000 new jobs by year's end.

Mr. Speaker, this economic stimulus package is a good first start, but this Congress will take additional action to help American workers and help our economy recover. We will also develop a plan for additional assistance, which could include extension of unemployment benefits, food stamps, State and local assistance, and Medicaid.

RENEWABLE ENERGY TAX PACKAGE

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, ExxonMobil recently announced that they have earned over $40 billion in 2007, the highest profits ever for a U.S. company. Of course, we want our U.S. companies to succeed in the global marketplace, but hugely profitable oil companies certainly don't need taxpayer subsidies, especially as the price of oil continues to hover at $100 a barrel.

I want to urge my colleagues, it was none other than President Bush who said that with oil at $50 a barrel, he saw no need for the kind of subsidies put in the 2005 energy bill by the Republican Congress. My constituents are fed up that oil companies are reaping billions in profits while hardworking Americans are suffering from a slowing economy.

Now is the time to level the playing field by removing Big Oil tax breaks and advancing clean technologies that will create green collar jobs and help grow our economy, drive down high energy prices, reduce our dependence on dirty and dangerous fossil fuels, and curb global warming pollution.

If we are going to give American consumers more efficient and cheaper energy options, we need to expand the incentives to invest in renewable and alternative energy sources.

The House will soon take up legislation to repeal these giveaways and to put our tax dollars to work to create a new policy for the 21st century. This legislation will significantly move us toward the goal of energy independence.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

CONGRESS WORKS FAST TO ADDRESS ECONOMIC DOWNTURN, BUT MORE WORK NEEDS TO BE DONE

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, the economic stimulus package that President Bush will sign into law today is a bipartisan victory for the American people. This broad-based stimulus package will provide tax relief of up to $600 per individual and $1,200 per married couple, plus an additional $300 per child. Recovery rebate checks could be sent out to 130 million Americans as early as May.

The stimulus package includes unprecedented tax relief for working families. The measure provides $32 billion in tax relief for 35 million families who work but make too little to pay income taxes, families who otherwise would not have been included in the recovery package. This is a critically important provision in the stimulus package because economists say that the tax rebates that include low- and moderate-income families are 24 percent more effective as stimulus than rebates that leave these families out.

Mr. Speaker, it is our hope that this stimulus package will help jump-start our economy so more Americans can live the American Dream.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN TOM LANTOS

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this Nation lost a great American this week. United States Congressman Tom Lantos passed at the age of 80. Last night on this floor, there was an hour of bipartisan agreement of what this man meant to this country and how much we've lost. There will be a memorial service tomorrow under the Capitol rotunda.

Tom Lantos was a Holocaust survivor who escaped from the Nazis twice and survived. He helped Jewish people survive the Holocaust through the good deeds of Raul Wallenberg, and he remembered that. He was a leader in this Congress and this Nation on human rights and civil rights, animal welfare rights, all living creatures.

Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of Congress, I was befriended by Tom Lantos, who told me to call him ''Tom,'' which was difficult to do. He was such a giant of a man.

There are great opportunities to speak out on policy in this body and to serve in the greatest deliberative body in the world, but there are human stories, too.

In my opinion, there are two saints that are Members or have been Members during this term that I have served. One is Congressman Lantos, and one is Congressman LEWIS. They have overcome great adversity to go to great heights. I think this country owes a debt of gratitude to the Lantos family for his work. He will be sorely missed. I was fortunate to serve with him and to be able to call him a friend.

SHORT-TERM EXTENSION ON ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE LEGISLATION

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, we are back on the floor today deliberating another short-term extension on electronic surveillance legislation, and I would understand a stopgap measure if we were at an impasse. But yesterday the other body passed a bipartisan permanent rewrite of this essential national security legislation. They did it with 68 votes. They did it overwhelmingly on what some here have called a contentious issue. Well, 21 Members of the majority here have written the Democratic leadership supporting the Senate's version. The President has said he will sign it.

Mr. Speaker, let's bring that bill to the floor and pass it today. If the current authority is allowed to lapse 3 days from now, most experts agree that the administration would have to go back to the original FISA statute for new warrants in cases where foreign-to-foreign communications are routed through the U.S. telecom infrastructure, causing us to miss important information on terrorists that are trying to attack Europe, trying to attack us here, trying to attack in the Middle East. That's a situation we cannot go back to.

ENDING SUBSIDIES FOR BIG OIL AND SUPPORTING RENEWABLE ENERGY

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, you've heard previous speakers this morning talk about the incredible profits of oil companies. The number is $40 billion last year. That is the largest corporate profit in the history of this Nation. And meanwhile, as these profits are flowing and high energy prices continue to squeeze working-class Americans since President Bush took office, gas prices are up 109 percent, and home heating prices are up 222 percent. And over that same period of time, profits at the oil companies are up 313 percent.

Now, to add insult to injury, in addition to these profits, the oil companies are currently receiving tax subsidies from the taxpayers of America. House Democrats do not believe that's right.

In the coming weeks, we are going to consider legislation that will end those subsidies and transfer it to renewable energy sources. Renewable energy jobs and investment across America depend on Washington to act on this.

Mr. Speaker, by passing this energy bill, congressional Democrats will lower energy costs, improve national security by making us more energy independent, and end taxpayer finance subsidies to the oil companies.

RECOGNIZING THE COURAGE AND CHARACTER OF PEOPLE IN THE SOUTH AFTER NATURAL DISASTERS

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today, a deadly series of storms rolled across the South bringing destruction and heartache to many of my constituents in Tennessee, and I rise today to recognize the people affected by these storms in Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, and Kentucky, and to commend them for the character and determination that they displayed and to encourage my colleagues to support H. Res. 971 to recognize that courage and character.

In visiting the communities that were hurt by the storms, I drew true inspiration from the people that I met. In the midst of destruction on an unimaginable scale, shaken and grieving individuals were pulling together with the spirit of determination and cooperation. Neighbors are helping one another, churches and schools are functioning as headquarters for emergency aid, serving hot meals and giving out supplies. Emergency responders have proven their mettle, and local and State officials are focused on how they can best move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing the spirit of the people in the community. Support H. Res. 971, and I wish each family well as they rebuild.

ON FISA, PRESIDENT AND REPUBLICANS PLAY POLITICS WITH NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, President Bush and congressional Republicans are playing politics with our national security.

After slowing down the process of withholding key documents in the Senate, President Bush and congressional Republicans are demanding the House take immediate action on a Senate FISA bill that just passed the Senate yesterday.

The Protect America Act is a law that was pushed by the President, and yet today he says that he will oppose any attempts by Congress to extend that law for 3 additional weeks.

The House has passed its own bill, the RESTORE Act, that will modernize FISA by giving the intelligence community the tools it needs to track terrorists while protecting the constitutional rights of innocent Americans.

If Congress does not extend the Protect America Act, the intelligence community will still have all the tools it needs to continue current surveillance and begin new surveillance on any terrorist threat.

Mr. Speaker, if the President was serious about our national security, he would stop playing politics over a very serious issue.

PEPFAR REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I don't need to tell you the HIV/AIDS pandemic has infected more than 60 million people worldwide, killed more than 25 million people, orphaned 14 million in its wake, and today, nearly 70 percent of the people in the world who are afflicted with HIV/AIDS reside in Africa.

In 2003, President Bush called on Congress to create a program to address the worldwide HIV/AIDS pandemic. The President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, known as PEPFAR, was an extraordinary bipartisan achievement of compassion, and unfortunately, the majority in Congress has put forth a reauthorization drafted to this bill that will be considered tomorrow that puts at risk America's commitment to HIV/AIDS efforts.

The Democrat proposal will take a successful bipartisan achievement, do away with funding requirements for abstinence, and also mandate the integration of family planning services into PEPFAR, which would transform the program potentially into a mega funding pool for organizations with an abortion promotion agenda.

PEPFAR must not be hijacked in partisanship or domestic public policy issues. We owe the world a bipartisan remedy to meet the global AIDS pandemic that meets the crisis with American resources and values, and I urge my colleagues to work on this legislation in a bipartisan and compassionate manner.

WE MUST PASS THE SENATE VERSION OF THE FISA BILL

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

Mr. McCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we will be engaging today in an important debate, perhaps the most important debate certainly since I've been in the United States Congress, and that is how to protect the American people, how can we capture intelligence overseas to better protect the United States.

I bring to this debate a unique experience. I worked in the Justice Department under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act on FISA's national security wiretaps. This statute was never designed to prohibit us from capturing overseas intelligence from foreign targets. If Osama bin Laden is calling in to the United States, we, as Americans, have a right to know what he is saying.

This is, again, one of the most important debates, and the Senate passed yesterday a version of this which I urge the House to pass today, and also one that protects companies, patriotic companies, who help out the United States Government when the United States Government asks and gives the call to duty to help the United States in capturing this overseas intelligence.

The time to act is now, and extension in terms of intelligence is unacceptable. We cannot allow our intelligence to go dark in many parts of the world. We must pass the Senate version of the FISA bill.

□ 1030

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois). The question is on the motion to adjourn.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 3, nays 366, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—3

Johnson (IL) Tancredo Tiahrt

NAYS—366

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick

Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kucinich
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Welch (VT)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—59

Ackerman
Baird
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Braley (IA)
Cole (OK)
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
Dicks
Doolittle
Doyle
Engel
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gohmert
Goode
Higgins
Hinojosa
Honda
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lowey
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
McCrery
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Musgrave
Ortiz
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Smith (NJ)
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Sullivan
Taylor
Tierney
Towns
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Whitfield (KY)
Wynn
Young (AK)

(1056)

Mrs. BLACKBURN, Messrs. ISRAEL, SHULER, TURNER, McNERNEY, SAM JOHNSON of Texas, HASTINGS of Washington, PUTNAM, CHABOT, SMITH of Washington, SESTAK, BACHUS, SMITH of Texas, SCOTT of Georgia, CARDOZA, FATTAH, BRADY of Pennsylvania, KINGSTON, INGLIS of South Carolina, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mrs. MYRICK changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No. 46. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the motion to adjourn.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5349, PROTECT AMERICA ACT OF 2007 EXTENSION

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 976 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 976

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5349) to extend the Protect America Act of 2007 for 21 days. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 5349 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 976 provides for further consideration of H.R. 5349, which extends the Protect America Act of 2007 for 21 days under a closed rule.

□ 1100

The rule provides 1 hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

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

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 7, nays 364, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—7

Dicks
Doolittle
Hastings (WA)
Johnson (IL)
King (IA)
Shimkus
Tiahrt

NAYS—364

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)

Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Welch (VT)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—57

Andrews
Bachus
Berman
Brown, Corrine
Cannon
Carnahan
Costa
Cubin
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
Delahunt
DeLauro
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Farr
Frank (MA)
Gilchrest
Gohmert
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Honda
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Lewis (KY)
Lowey
Marchant
McCrery
Miller (NC)
Moran (VA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pickering
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Rogers (AL)
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sali
Simpson
Skelton
Souder
Taylor
Tierney
Towns
Walsh (NY)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Wynn
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1123

Mrs. BIGGERT and Messrs. RUSH and VAN HOLLEN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5349, PROTECT AMERICA ACT OF 2007 EXTENSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the intent of the original 1978 FISA law was to enhance Americans' security while at the same time protecting Americans' privacy. Recognizing that no responsibility of the Federal Government is more important than providing for the defense and security of the American people, Congress should be doing all it can to ensure that FISA continues to reflect the intent of the original law.

In the nearly 30 years since FISA became law, we have seen tremendous advances in communications technology, such as the Internet, cell phones, and e-mail. However, under the original FISA law, our intelligence officials are not free to monitor foreign terrorists, Mr. Speaker, in foreign countries, without a court order, because of advances, as I mentioned, in communications technology.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat again: Because of advances in technology, our intelligence officials are not free to monitor foreign terrorists in foreign countries. It is clear that the law is outdated and must be modernized to reflect changes in communications technology over the past three decades.

In August, Congress, in a bipartisan manner, took an important step to close our Nation's intelligence gap. The Protect America Act passed only after repeated attempts by Republicans to give our Nation's intelligence professionals the tools and authority they need to protect our homeland. This action was long overdue, and this law marked a significant step forward in improving our national security. But, unfortunately, Democrats forced these needed technology tools to expire in 6 months.

In November, the House Democrat leaders brought legislation to the floor that does not go far enough to reform outdated FISA laws. It weakens Americans' privacy protection and fails to permanently close our Nation's intelligence gap. A bipartisan, permanent solution is needed that shows all Americans and our enemies that the United States is truly committed to closing our Nation's intelligence gap.

Yesterday, the Senate acted in a bipartisan manner by a vote of 68–29 to permanently close the terrorist loophole and ensure that intelligence officials are able to monitor communications of suspected terrorists overseas such as Osama bin Laden and other al Qaeda leaders. This commonsense solution would help keep our country safe from attack and should be acted on immediately and sent to the President to be signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, House Democrat leaders need to stop dragging their feet. They need to end their delaying tactics, indeed, to let the House vote on the Senate-approved measure. Today, I am going to give Members of the House an opportunity to support the bipartisan measure that the Senate passed just yesterday. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule to allow the House an opportunity to concur with the Senate amendments. By approving the Senate amendments, the bill can become law before the current extension expires in just a few days.

We don't need to close the terrorist loophole just temporarily, Mr. Speaker. We need to close it permanently and update our Nation's surveillance laws in order to protect our Nation from another terrorist attack.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can permanently close the loophole.

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

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

I thank my colleague from Washington for his insightful history on the FISA bill. I would submit that I agree with him that the FISA bill is necessary for the security of America. No one questions that. No one on our side of the aisle questions that. The question that we do have is does the Senate bill actually take away some of the liberty that is so necessary to the American people.

All we are asking for is an extension of 21 days. When you think about it in the grand scheme of things, 21 days to make a determination whether or not this bill continues to give the American people the liberty that they have had for over 200 years, that is not a lot to ask for. I would much rather have 21 days, keep the bill in effect but extend it for 21 days, knowing full well that the end product is something that not only ensures our security but guarantees our liberty.

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

□ 1130

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), ranking member of the House Intelligence Committee.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague for yielding.

I think they are absolutely right, we need to take a look at this in the bigger context. We have to set the stage for how we got to this point.

It's September 12, 2001. The President is meeting with his advisers. They're trying to identify exactly what this threat is from al Qaeda, how serious is this threat, what other activities or attacks might they be planning against the United States. And the President says: I need my intelligence and military folks to get the answers to these kinds of questions. Tell me what the threat is and tell me what the tools are that I need to implement to keep America safe.

They come back with a series of recommendations, saying here's what we know, here's what we don't know about the threat. They come back and say, here are the different options that are available to us to get the information that might be able to answer some of these questions.

The President and his leadership team consider the various options. They say, you know, we need to bring Congress into this to take a look at exactly what tools we're going to implement and make sure that we do this in a bipartisan basis and we do it in a basis that is consistent with American values and American law.

On October 25, the President and Vice President convene a meeting. The President's national security team comes up and they say, here's the tool that perhaps can be used. The chairman of the House Intelligence Committee is there. The Chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee is there. The ranking minority member of HPSCI is at the meeting. She's accompanied by the vice chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee. That's right. Back in October of 2001, the Speaker of the House was briefed on the various tools that could be used to keep America safe.

November 14, 2½ weeks later, the chairman of HPSCI, the ranking member, yeah, that's right, the current Speaker of the House, was briefed on the tools that were available and could be used, the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, the vice chairman.

March of 2002, the chairman of HPSCI, the ranking minority member of HPSCI, that's right, the current Speaker of the House, was in the meeting.

June of 2002, the chairman of HPSCI, the ranking minority member of HPSCI, that's right, again, the current Speaker of the House is brought in, is briefed on this program, and said this is the tool that we want to use, this is the tool that we need to use to keep America safe.

Four times in about 9 months, the current Speaker of the House was briefed on this program, about what the tool was, the kind of information that we were expecting to get and, after a period of time, the information that we were collecting that would keep America safe.

I was not in those meetings. I was not one of the select group of people that was informed. You would think that they would say, what are the civil liberty implications of this? You know, how are we using these tools? Where does it fit within the legal framework of America to keep us safe? And who's going to be working on this program? Who do we need to partner with? And there might have been certain companies or individuals that were identified as saying, these folks are going to partner with us and have partnered with us because they can help provide us with the information that will keep us safe and do it in a legal way.

Since that time, and since this program became public, there has been all kinds of accusations out there. But the bottom line is, there may have been people, there may have been companies and corporations that, when the President and Congress went to them and said, we need your help to keep America safe, they may have stepped up to the plate and provided us with the assistance that we knew that on a bipartisan basis the executive branch and Congress said, we need to do this, and we need to do it in a way that protects civil liberties, and we need to do it in a way that is legal and consistent within the law.

And the bottom line is, this is dealt with in the Senate bill. They recognized the help. They don't throw these people under the bus after we asked them to help.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's passion on this issue. Certainly it is the type of issue that elicits real passion from people. But I think we as a body need to be sure that the steps that we take are deliberative and thoughtful. Certainly reacting to an issue such as this in a passionate way may deprive us of taking the necessary steps that we need to ensure that the liberty of our citizens is kept intact.

Again, I would just point out that this bill is asking for an additional 21 days within which Congress can continue to review the documents that we have asked for that we have only recently received to make a determination, again, a deliberative determination based upon facts and reasons and not on passion.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), also a member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important laws that is preventing another terrorist attack in this country will expire on Friday. It expires on Friday.

My colleague from New York says, well, we just need to take enough time and be deliberative and so on. My colleague from New York didn't vote for the temporary fix that we passed in August. In fact, in an exchange with him that I remember so well, he questioned whether we should extend the constitutional protections of the fourth amendment to people who are foreigners in a foreign country talking to each other.

The temporary fix that we made in August needs to be made permanent, and we need to move forward with a permanent law that allows our intelligence agencies to listen to foreigners in foreign countries without a warrant while protecting the civil liberties of Americans. That's what we passed in August. That's what the Rockefeller-Bond bill does from the Senate, and they passed it last night. We passed a 6-month bill in August. We had 6 months to review this. And then when that deadline passed on the 1st of February, they said, well, just give us another 15 days. We gave them another 15 days and they said, well, we really haven't had the time to look at this paper.

You've had almost 7 months. The time is now to get serious about our national security and giving our intelligence agencies the tools they need to prevent the next terrorist attack.

The Senate passed the Rockefeller-Bond bill last night by a vote of 68–29. It makes permanent the authorities that we passed in August of last year to listen to foreigners in foreign countries without a warrant. We spy on our enemies. We try to find out what their plans are so that we can stop them from killing Americans.

That Rockefeller-Bond bill also provides protection from lawsuits for the American companies that stepped up to the plate when this country was in crisis. In good faith, those American companies partnered with the U.S. Government, under instructions from that government, from our own government, to move forward and to help us to prevent another terrorist attack. And, ironically, they cannot defend themselves against lawsuits because the government says to do so would violate state secrets. It would give away secrets to our enemies. So they're stuck in court not even being able to defend themselves.

The cooperation that is being protected here in the Rockefeller-Bond bill is long established in criminal law and should certainly extend to the national security realm.

Today, I circulated a letter from 21 bipartisan attorneys general supporting these lawsuit protection provisions. Our intelligence agencies and their partners in private industry need certainty, the telecommunications companies whom we depend upon to cooperate need certainty, and our intelligence agents need certainty that we're not going to keep operating our intelligence community on a month-to-month basis.

In August we closed an intelligence gap, a vital gap that has been now closed, and the changes that we made have already provided intelligence that the Director of National Intelligence, Admiral Mike McConnell, has said

have helped us to disrupt terrorist attacks.

Intelligence is the first line of defense in protecting this country against terrorism. I would urge my colleagues to allow a vote today on the Rockefeller-Bond legislation, do not allow this bill to expire, and stand up and protect this country.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, my colleague seems to be asking us to rely upon assurances given to us by this administration, this same administration that has told us about weapons of mass destruction, the same administration that told us that Iran was building a nuclear bomb. And then she asks why we are skeptical about taking the word of the administration.

As my colleague knows, the House passed the RESTORE Act last November. It was not until last night that the Senate passed a bill reauthorizing and reforming the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. The bill is significantly different than the one we passed in November.

As is the case when the House and the Senate have differing bills, it is appropriate for the two to meet and reconcile their differences. That is exactly what we intend to do in a bipartisan and bicameral way.

However, as my colleagues also know, the President's preferred surveillance law is set to expire on Saturday. The underlying bill will extend that law for 3 weeks and give the House and Senate Judiciary and Intelligence Committees time to work toward a conference agreement. Additionally, it will also give our Members, Republican and Democrat, time to review reams of highly classified materials which were only provided to us by the White House in recent days, despite requests dating back all the way to May, 8 months ago. These materials are absolutely critical as the House considers the request which has been made by the White House to grant what amounts to a blanket transactional immunity to telecommunications companies who participated in the Bush administration's warrantless surveillance plan without any explanation of what that immunity is for. While the President has been quick to call on Congress to act, it is he who has continued to ignore countless congressional requests for information about the actions of his administration.

As a former State attorney, I know firsthand that not even a first-year prosecutor would even entertain the idea of granting immunity without knowing what that immunity is for and who that immunity is being granted to.

From his seat, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee noted last night in Rules that he cannot recall a time in his 45 years in the House when an administration has asked Congress to provide immunity to anyone or anything without telling us why. The House is not opposed to granting such immunity, but if we are going to act, then we need to know why.

Mr. Speaker, we are on the verge of passing long-term FISA reform, but it will take time because there are very real differences between the positions of the majority Members of this body and the Senate and the White House. Those who come to the floor today to delay this extension and engage in a manufactured obstructionism, which has become so symbolic of the congressional Republicans, are doing a great disservice to this Nation.

□ 1145

We will overcome this obstructionism, and we will use the next 3 weeks to reconcile our differences and come to the American people with a bill that protects our homeland without sacrificing our civil liberties.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the former attorney general of the State of California, Mr. LUNGREN.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule. Let's think about what we are talking about. The majority is asking us to extend for 21 days a bill that they don't support, a bill that they overwhelmingly voted against, a bill that they said harmed the American people, a bill that they said somehow doesn't protect civil liberties. Now, why do they want to extend it for 21 days if it is terrible? Perhaps there is some mischief in the air. Perhaps what they really want to do is to continue to kick this can down the road so that finally in the war of attrition we will give up and say, you know, those people who helped us, those companies referred to by Mr. HOEKSTRA that responded to a request by the United States Government to help us in our time of need, that is immediately after 9/11, we are not going to help them.

Remember what the greatest criticism of the 9/11 Commission was of government in all of its aspects, it was that we fail to connect the dots. What does that mean? We failed to put together intelligence information or to gather that intelligence information and put it together in a way that made sense that would give us a forewarning of what was about to take place. And they said it is not good enough to rely on the criminal justice system to gather evidence after the fact to prosecute somebody. No, in a war on terror what you want to do is to prevent the terrorist act in the first place.

So what we have here is a difference on that side of the aisle and this side of the aisle in which we believe a Good Samaritan law makes sense, a Good Samaritan law much like what we do to allow people to respond to an accident without having to fear that they will be sued for medical malpractice. And in some circumstances, does that mean that maybe one out of 1,000 times there might be medical malpractice for which you can't be sued? Yes. But we do it because the overall good of the country is enhanced by giving incentives to people to help their neighbor.

That is what happened here. We have either an incentive or a disincentive for companies and individuals to respond to their country and act in good faith. That is what is at stake here, whether or not we are going to be safer or whether or not we are going to play these political games to support a bill that you all voted against.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today Congress is engaged in an important debate, perhaps the most important debate certainly in recent years. Our most solemn obligation to this country is to protect the American citizenry.

In my view our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are playing a dangerous political game, and the American people are the pawns in this game. I bring to the Congress a unique experience. I worked in the Justice Department under the FISA statute. I have worked on national security wiretaps, and I can tell you that the statute was never intended to cover foreign targets in a foreign country. And if Osama bin Laden is on the phone calling into the United States, I think the American people want us to pay attention to that and to listen to that conversation.

Intelligence, good intelligence has stopped every threat to this country since 9/11. Intelligence is the first line of defense in the war on terror. Without that, we cannot prevail in this war on terror, and we need to protect the American companies who we ask to protect the United States and the American people.

They stood up to the plate, and it is our time to stand up to the plate and now protect them. They were doing their patriotic duty in a time of war when America asked them.

If we do not protect them, then what company, American or otherwise, will dare help the United States of America in its greatest time of need, in a time of peril, in a time of war.

Yesterday, the Senate passed the FISA bill, which included this immunity and also protects Americans. I say we put that bill on the floor, let's pass that bill and let's make the Protect America Act permanent. Now is the time, not 21 days from now, not several months from now. For the American people, let's pass and protect the American people now.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I would submit to my colleague that the only dangerous political game that is being played here is the attempt to cast this as a political game. There is no such attempt being made by anyone in the Democratic Party. The only attempt we are making is to give us time to go through the material that has only recently been given to us with the simple objective of ensuring that we get a bill which keeps our country safe and guarantees the liberty of our people.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a Member who for 6 years was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutions of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to the underlying bill before us. Last August, Congress passed and the President signed into law a bill that provides our law enforcement and intelligence community with the tools needed to protect this country, to protect the United States.

The events of September 11, 2001, exposed gaps in our intelligence-gathering activities, particularly those occurring outside the United States. Since that tragic day, the administration has worked with Congress to ensure that every tool in our arsenal is available to those who are charged with keeping our country safe, including working with telecommunications companies and allowing officials to gather intelligence from potential foreign terrorists outside this country.

These two aspects of the PAA have been critical in protecting the United States from actual or potential terrorist attacks or sabotage. Oversight by the FISA Court and minimization procedures approved by the courts ensure that such activities do not go beyond their scope.

Last night, the Senate passed bipartisan legislation that would maintain these critical features enabling the intelligence and law enforcement communities to continue with its critical work.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and immediately take up and pass the Senate bill so that law enforcement and the intelligence communities continue to have the necessary tools to keep the American people safe.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS), a member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is really almost going beyond the pale of irresponsible and getting into dangerous.

I used to be an FBI agent, and every day in this country there is an FBI agent who goes up to somebody, an average citizen, it may be a coworker, it may be a neighbor, it may be somebody who owns a small business, it might be somebody who owns a big business, and says, We need your cooperation to catch child pornographers, and here is the evidence. Will you cooperate with your Nation? And we do it every single day, and great Americans stand up every single day and say, Yes, I will. I will go after child pornographers with you. I will go after crack dealers selling the drugs to our kids with you. I will go after murderers who murder our children in the streets of America, and I will stand with you and cooperate so we can eliminate the dangers from our communities.

And you know what the government did? It went and said, Hey, to whatever business it was, small, big, large, we had people kill 3,000 people, murdered, on one day. And you know what, they are coming back. Will you cooperate with your government to stop the next round of murders?

But we play a very dangerous game. It is about civil liberties. Then why did we pass the bill before, and before that? Because there is civil liberty protection in this bill. It is a farce.

What is at risk here is the future certainty by our intelligence agencies and every single American who wonders: If I cooperate against a criminal of any sort, a terrorist, are they coming to get me next?

We need to refocus on who the bad guys are. It is not the companies who cooperated with their government. If you are a small business selling insurance or you are washing windows, it is the terrorists who threaten the lives of Americans.

We ought to be proud of every American who has the courage in a dangerous world to stand up and say: I will stand with you, United States of America, to get the true enemy, the bad guys, al Qaeda, terrorists, crack dealers, child pornographers, and everybody in between.

I urge the strong rejection of this rule, and let's get back to business and give them the tools to keep us safe.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague, you know, obviously raises a good point. As a former FBI agent, he was very concerned, he is very concerned, and he continues to be very concerned with doing the right thing, getting the people who are breaking the laws, hurting our children and who are putting our citizens in jeopardy. But no one in this Chamber has the market cornered on that. That is something that I think universally throughout this Chamber there is a strong desire to fulfill. That is why we are here. We are here to protect and defend our citizens and to protect and defend our Constitution, and that is all we are asking for today: 21 days to ensure that we are able to look over the recommendations, to look over the material that has recently been forwarded to us by this administration to ensure that we are not only protecting and securing this country, but rather that we are also doing it in a way that protects our liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), a member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LUNGREN and others who have spoken are right in one respect, yes, most of the House of Representatives voted not for the Protect America Act but rather for a substitute that we passed, a very good piece of legislation, that would indeed protect Americans, known as the RESTORE Act. That passed the House. It should be the law.

We do not need the Protect America Act to protect Americans, the so-called Protect America Act. We do not need it to keep from going dark. But what we do need is the time and the attention to get this right. This is a serious, serious matter about protecting the safety of Americans but also about the definition, the relationship between the people of this country and their government.

There has been a fundamental shift under the Protect America Act in the relationship between the people of this country and their government. It is whether or not the government regards the ordinary American with suspicion first. Think about it.

The reason this country and our liberty has survived so well is because the government understands they are subservient to the people. The government has understood that they treat the people with respect, their bosses, and do not regard them with suspicion first.

To be able to seize, search, intercept without having to demonstrate to an independent judge that you know what you are doing is a sign of disrespect. It is a sign of suspicion. It is, in fact, a redefinition of the makeup of this country.

So if we need time to get this right, let's take the time. We don't need the Protect America Act to keep us from going dark, and I would argue we certainly don't need it, as they argue, to protect Americans from those who would do us harm. We have offered that protection in the RESTORE Act. Let's get this right.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to another member of the Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the comments from the last speaker are very enlightening on this debate because we have heard for month after month the same arguments made time and time again, and the bottom line is there are a number of Members who are not for these authorities that allow our national security professionals to listen to terrorist communications. And there are a number of people who would just as soon let the Protect America Act expire and let it go out of effect. As the gentleman who just spoke said, we don't need it to protect the country.

□ 1200

But there are others of us who believe that we do need such authorities to protect the country, and a very large number of Members of the other body have just voted on a proposal that would do that.

And so my position, Mr. Speaker, is give us a chance to vote on it. We hear

excuse after excuse. We need more documents, we need more information, we need more legal opinions, we need 14 days, we need 21 days. But we have been debating the same issues month after month. Nothing has changed. No more information, no document is going to change the basic position the country stands in today and, that is, a law expires on Friday, and if the people for whom we have given the responsibility to protect the country are to do their job, that law is going to have to be made permanent so they can count on it, not dribbling it out a few weeks at a time, not treating them the way we treat soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan by giving them funding just a few months at a time, but giving them the authority they need to do their job.

I suggest the best way to do that is to bring up the bill that has already passed the Senate by an overwhelming bipartisan majority and give us a chance to vote on it. There will be some Members who vote ''no.'' They think we don't need that authority. They think the Protect America Act is not needed. But I suggest a majority will vote ''yes'' and it will pass and the country will be safer.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

You know, kicking the can may be a fun game when there's nothing to do and there are no consequences at stake. But when it comes to national security and protecting the American people, providing the right tools to those on the front lines in the war against terrorism, kicking the can could be a fatal bargain.

Congress continues to kick the can down the road on a key tool that has kept this country safe since September 11. The other body closed a loophole in FISA that will ensure intelligence services have all the tools necessary to track terrorists overseas, terrorists who want to do us harm. Our Nation has not been attacked since September 11, in large part because of our ability to detect and disrupt terrorist plots before they've had a chance to carry out their evil acts. FISA is essential to those efforts.

Why do some ignore history? Why do some ignore the mindset of the likes of al Qaeda and others? Why do some want to weaken our ability to disrupt a terrorist attack before it occurs? Why do some put our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines in harm's way or at risk?

Last year we modernized the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act only after the National Intelligence Director told Congress that we were ''missing a significant amount of foreign intelligence that we should be protecting to protect our country.'' What about those consequences?

Preventing the destruction of the Brooklyn Bridge is but one example. More tragically is the case of Specialist Alex Jiminez of Queens, New York. Last May, Specialist Jiminez was taken hostage by al Qaeda in Iraq. Information had been secured on one of the possible kidnappers, but intelligence experts were hamstrung by the outdated version of FISA. It prevented them from conducting surveillance on terrorists in a foreign nation without first obtaining a warrant. As the kidnappers acted, lawyers sat around a conference table here in Washington for 10 hours debating and drafting legal briefs to establish probable cause to conduct the surveillance. While the lawyers debated, losing precious time, Specialist Jiminez most likely was killed. They've yet to find the body and that of his colleague.

Let's stop kicking the can down the road. This is not a game we can afford to lose.

Mr. ARCURI. I thank my friend and colleague from New York for his statements.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the speakers on the other side continue to try to couch this argument in a way and frame it in such a way that makes it appear that people on our side, the Democrats, don't care about the security of this country in the way that they do. And it's obvious that nothing could be further from the truth.

Simply by extending the FISA bill for 21 days to ensure that we have all the information that is out there and all the information that is available and that we have an opportunity to go through it in a thoughtful way doesn't mean that we have less concern for security but, rather, an equal amount of concern for security and also for the liberty of the American people.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend from New York if he has any more speakers.

Mr. ARCURI. I have no further speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. And so the gentleman is prepared to close after I close?

Mr. ARCURI. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. Speaker, the tragic events of September 11, 2001 taught us many lessons. One of the lessons we learned that day was that our Nation must remain aggressive in our fight against international terrorism. We must always stay one step ahead of those who wish to harm our fellow Americans. Now is not the time to tie the hands of our intelligence community. The modernization of foreign intelligence surveillance into the 21st century is a critical national security priority.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree with that assessment. On January 28, 2008, less than 3 weeks ago, 21 members of the Blue Dog Coalition sent a letter to Speaker PELOSI in support of the Rockefeller-Bond FISA legislation. The letter states, and I quote, ''The Rockefeller-Bond FISA legislation contains satisfactory language addressing all these issues and we would fully support that measure should it reach the House floor without substantial change. We believe these components will ensure a strong national security apparatus that can thwart terrorism across the globe and save American lives here in our country.''

Mr. Speaker, that was a letter sent to Speaker PELOSI less than 2 weeks ago by the members of the Democrat Blue Dog Coalition.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, January 28, 2008.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Legislation reforming the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) is currently being considered by the Senate. Following the Senate's passage of a FISA bill, it will be necessary for the House to quickly consider FISA legislation to get a bill to the President before the Protect America Act expires in February.

It is our belief that such legislation should include the following provisions: Require individualized warrants for surveillance of U.S. citizens living or traveling abroad; Clarify that no court order is required to conduct surveillance of foreign-to-foreign communications that are routed through the United States; Provide enhanced oversight by Congress of surveillance laws and procedures; Compel compliance by private sector partners; Review by FISA Court of minimization procedures; Targeted immunity for carriers that participated in anti-terrorism surveillance programs.

The Rockefeller-Bond FISA legislation contains satisfactory language addressing all these issues and we would fully support that measure should it reach the House floor without substantial change. We believe these components will ensure a strong national security apparatus that can thwart terrorism across the globe and save American lives here in our country.

It is also critical that we update the FISA laws in a timely manner. To pass a long-term extension of the Protect America Act, as some may suggest, would leave in place a limited, stopgap measure that does not fully address critical surveillance issues. We have it within our ability to replace the expiring Protect America Act by passing strong, bipartisan FISA modernization legislation that can be signed into law and we should do so—the consequences of not passing such a measure could place our national security at undue risk.

Sincerely,

Leonard L. Boswell, ———, Mike Ross, Bud Cramer, Heath Shuler, Allen Boyd, Dan Boren, Jim Matheson, Lincoln Davis, Tim Holden, Dennis Moore, Earl Pomeroy, Melissa L. Bean, John Barrow, Joe Baca, John Tanner, Jim Cooper, Zachary T. Space, Brad Ellsworth, Charlie Melancon, Christopher P. Carney.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that House Democrat leaders chose to bring a 21-day extension bill to the floor instead of the bipartisan measure that passed the Senate by a vote of 68–29. I

might add, Mr. Speaker, those Senators had the information that has been alluded to several times on the floor today.

To make our country safer, Congress needs to act. The House should vote on the Senate measure, but the Democrat leaders have chosen instead to use delay tactics. The only reason I can see, Mr. Speaker, that we are not voting on the Senate measure is the fear of the leaders on the other side of the aisle that this bipartisan bill will pass.

But today, I will attempt to give all Members of the House an opportunity to vote on this bipartisan, long-term modernization of FISA. I call on all my colleagues, including members of the aforementioned Blue Dog Coalition that signed the letter to Speaker PELOSI on January 28, to join with me in defeating the previous question so that we can immediately move to concur in the Senate amendment and send the bill to the President to be signed into law. We need to do that before the current law expires, making our Nation at greater risk.

Mr. 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 (Mr. HOLDEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question and give us an opportunity to vote on a bipartisan, permanent solution that closes this terrorist loophole in the FISA Act.

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

Mr. ARCURI. I thank my colleague from Washington for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, if we have learned anything since the terrorist attacks of September 11, it is that the balance between security and civil liberties is not only difficult, it's absolutely critical. Providing this 3-week extension will do nothing to block or hinder the efforts of our intelligence community. Quite the contrary, it enhances their ability to do their jobs effectively and ensures the integrity of their efforts because it gives us time to get these reforms right.

I want to remind my colleagues that voting to defeat the previous question is a vote to deny the administration the ability to utilize its existing authority under law to assess threats, gather intelligence and protect the freedom and security of every American.

Twenty-one days isn't a long time. And based on the sensitivity and public interest in this issue, we owe that to the American people and the framers of the Constitution to strike a fair balance that allows us to protect the civil liberties of Americans and to provide the administration the tools and resources to protect our Nation from another terrorist attack. Twenty-one days is a fair request.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this 21-day extension to FISA. If Congress does not act this week, critical tools that allow our intelligence officials to monitor terrorist communications overseas will expire. We not let that happen!

As we all know, yesterday, the Senate approved a comprehensive, long term, bipartisan bill by a vote of 68–29 to close the terrorist loophole in our intelligence laws. Their bill represents a strong compromise between Congress and the Administration. It is a responsible plan for protecting our nation against the threats of terrorism.

The intelligence community needs a long-term fix to gaps in our intelligence laws—not a 21-day delay. After 7 months of stalling and a 15-day extension, passage of another short-term extension is irresponsible, when we have a long-term solution ready to be voted on.

The Senate has passed a strong, bipartisan bill. The House must now act quickly to pass the Senate's bill and send it to the President. Failing to do so is effectively failing to protect our country.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this extension, and instead immediately pass the Senate's version of the bill so we can send this important bill to the President.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 976 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

(1) Strike ''That upon the adoption of this resolution it'' and insert the following:

''That upon adoption of this resolution, before consideration of any order of business other than one motion that the House adjourn, the bill (H.R. 3773) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table. A motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment shall be considered as pending in the House without intervention of any point of order. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

''Sec. 2. It''.

(2) Redesignate section 2 as section 3.

(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.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adopting the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 195, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—210

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

NAYS—195

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
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
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Bishop (GA)
Clay
Doolittle
Doyle
Engel
Gilchrest
Herger
Hinojosa
Honda
Jones (OH)
Lowey
Marchant
Mitchell
Ortiz
Pickering
Pryce (OH)
Renzi
Reyes
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Towns
Waxman
Wynn

□ 1237

Messrs. SULLIVAN and DONNELLY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. ARCURI

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 206, noes 194, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

AYES—206

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

NOES—194

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam

Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
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
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—28

Berkley
Bishop (GA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Emanuel
Engel
Gilchrest
Herger
Hinojosa
Honda
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Loebsack
Lowey
Marchant
McDermott
Meek (FL)
Neugebauer
Ortiz
Pickering
Pryce (OH)
Renzi
Reyes
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Towns
Walsh (NY)
Waxman
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1244

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the Chamber for rollcall vote 49. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 206, noes 199, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

AYES—206

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (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 (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
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)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—199

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
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
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Bachus
Bishop (GA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Engel
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Hinojosa
Honda
Hooley
Lowey
McIntyre
Ortiz
Pickering
Pryce (OH)
Renzi
Reyes
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Towns
Waxman
Welch (VT)
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1254

Mr. SHULER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CUMMINGS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote on the resolution.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. ARCURI

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the motion to reconsider.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 210, noes 195, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

AYES—210

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (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 (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—195

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
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
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Bishop (GA)
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Engel
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Hinojosa
Honda
Lowey
Ortiz
Pascrell
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Pryce (OH)
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Towns
Waxman
Wynn

□ 1303

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 3, noes 395, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

AYES—3

Hastings (WA)
Johnson (IL)
Young (AK)

NOES—395

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

Walberg	Watt	Wilson (OH)
Walden (OR)	Weiner	Wilson (SC)
Walsh (NY)	Welch (VT)	Wittman (VA)
Walz (MN)	Weldon (FL)	Wolf
Wamp	Weller	Woolsey
Wasserman Schultz	Westmoreland	Wu
Waters	Wexler	Yarmuth
Watson	Whitfield (KY)	Young (FL)
	Wilson (NM)	

NOT VOTING—30

Allen	Honda	Renzi
Bachus	Lowey	Reyes
Bishop (GA)	McCrery	Ruppersberger
Doolittle	Musgrave	Rush
Doyle	Napolitano	Ryan (OH)
Engel	Ortiz	Towns
Gilchrest	Pascrell	Turner
Gutierrez	Pickering	Udall (CO)
Higgins	Pryce (OH)	Waxman
Hinojosa	Rangel	Wynn

□ 1321

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

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROTECT AMERICA ACT OF 2007 EXTENSION

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 976, I call up the bill (H.R. 5349) to extend the Protect America Act of 2007 for 21 days, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5349

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

SECTION 1. 21-DAY EXTENSION OF THE PROTECT AMERICA ACT OF 2007.

Section 6(c) of the Protect America Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-55; 121 Stat. 557; 50 U.S.C. 1803 note) is amended by striking ''195 days'' and inserting ''216 days''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 976, debate shall not exceed 1 hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5349.

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

There was no objection.

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

Members of the House, the temporary FISA law we enacted in haste as a stopgap last August expires Saturday. We want to replace that law with a well-considered one which appropriately addresses both our security needs and our constitutional values.

The House passed a version of that well-considered law in my view in November, the RESTORE Act. We have been waiting for the Senate to pass its version so that we could compare it with ours and decide together on the best course of action. We have also been waiting on access to classified documents regarding what telecom companies may have done in recent years to assist our government with surveillance on United States citizens outside the bounds of law at that time.

The 15-day extension we passed 2 weeks ago was intended to give us time to consider the Senate bill, thought to be on the verge of passing, and to review the classified documents. Unfortunately, it has turned out not to be enough time.

The Judiciary Committee members, 38 in number, have not all seen the documents. We have only had clearance for 19 of those members to gain that access to the classified documents that we have been asking for for over 1 year. The review process is unavoidably somewhat cumbersome and inefficient. Even today, as I stated in my letter to the White House, we still do not have access to numerous critical legal documents. In addition, those documents that we have reviewed have left many of our questions unanswered and, as a matter of fact, raised a number of new ones.

Moreover, the Senate has just passed its version of a long-term surveillance law. It differs from the House version in ways that may have major ramifications on the freedoms that we cherish.

So we need a bit more time. The measure before us will give us 3 weeks, 21 days, not much time in the view of some, but enough, I believe, to permit us to reach an appropriate resolution on this matter of utmost importance. Therefore, your Committee on the Judiciary comes before you to urge support for this short-term extension.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose H.R. 5349, which extends the Protect America Act for 21 days. Another extension is unacceptable and unnecessary.

Last August, Congress enacted the Protect America Act to close a dangerous loophole in our ability to collect foreign intelligence. The Democratic majority insisted on an arbitrary 6-month sunset. But instead of using that time wisely, they ignored the needs of our intelligence community and passed a partisan, unworkable bill, the RESTORE Act. Then, 2 weeks ago, the House Democratic majority insisted on another extension. Again they squandered the last 2 weeks. Now House Democrats want more time. But their time is up.

We know from Admiral McConnell, Director of National Intelligence, that before Congress enacted the Protect America Act, the intelligence community was missing two-thirds of all overseas terrorist communications, endangering American lives.

Some in Congress are willing to let the Protect America Act expire because ongoing surveillance under the act can continue for up to a year. This might be acceptable if the terrorist threat also expired this weekend, but it doesn't. If the act expires, we will return to the status quo, unable to begin any new foreign intelligence surveillance without a court order, again threatening America's counterterrorism efforts.

Another extension represents a failure by the House Democratic majority to protect the American people. The Senate understands this. The intelligence community needs a long-term bill to fix gaps in our intelligence laws, not a 21-day extension.

The Senate bill addresses the concerns of our intelligence community and has strong bipartisan support. But House Democrats are at war with themselves and at odds with the American people. House Democrats disagree with the Senate Democrats and House Democrats disagree among themselves. One group wants to approve the bipartisan Senate bill and another opposes it.

Americans are tired of this kind of partisanship in Washington. Now we have partisanship within partisanship within the Democratic Party. House Democrats disagree among themselves, disagree with Democrats in the Senate, and oppose a bipartisan bill that passed yesterday with overwhelming support by a vote of 68–29.

The House Democratic leadership is like a clock that runs backwards. They keep going in counterclockwise circles to the left. Unfortunately, we can't turn the clock back on terrorists. We must act to gather intelligence on terrorists and prevent another attack.

Why do we keep delaying our ability to protect American lives? Another extension represents a failure to act, a failure to lead, and a failure to protect our country. It doesn't take long to do what is right. Let's stop the stalling and pass the bipartisan Senate bill.

I urge my colleagues to reject this extension and urge the Democratic leadership to allow the House to consider the bipartisan Senate bill.

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

□ 1330

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentlewoman from California, JANE HARMAN, a long-time member of the Intelligence Committee who now on Homeland Security chairs the subcommittee that handles that same subject, for 4 minutes.

Ms. HARMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we discuss a short extension of the Protect America Act in order to hammer out a bicameral agreement with the Senate which just passed its bill last night, thousands of intelligence agents are working hard around the world in undisclosed locations, unaccompanied by their families, to prevent and disrupt dangerous threats against our country. Once again, let me say ''thank you'' to them, and let me say that every Member of this Chamber thanks them for their service and prays for their safe return.

This debate is not, as some on the other side want to characterize it, about Democrats wanting to coddle terrorists. We emphatically do not. We want to capture or kill them. It is beyond cynical to suggest otherwise. This debate is not about whether we want court orders for foreign-to-foreign communications between terrorists. We do not. Or whether we are opposed to responsible changes to FISA. We all support responsible changes to FISA.

This debate is about whether the careful framework in FISA, which has lasted three decades while letting us pursue terrorists while protecting constitutional freedoms, will survive.

The bill the Senate passed late yesterday, in my view, is unacceptable. I am mindful that there was a substantial bipartisan majority for it, but some in my party and some in the other party who voted for it tried mightily to improve it and lost. If we have 21 more days, we can consider some of their amendments here and, I would hope, pass them. If we cannot fix the Senate bill, I will oppose it if it comes up for a vote in the House.

Yes, I was one of a small group of Members briefed on the terrorist surveillance program between 2003 and 2006. But those briefings, until the program was publicly disclosed in late 2005, were about operational details only. I never learned that the administration was not following FISA, and I think that was wrong. And that is why for 3 years I have worked my heart out to fashion responsible bipartisan agreement on the need for the terrorist surveillance program to comply fully with FISA. This fall, I urged repeatedly for bipartisan negotiations which, sadly, never happened. It may now be too late, but I am ''go'' for one more try.

I say to the intelligence officers mentioned at the outset of my remarks, to my colleagues, and to the American people, we need to conduct surveillance of foreign terrorists, but we must do it within the rule of law. With a clear legal framework, they are empowered to do their job better and from that we will all benefit.

In August, the House was jammed by the Senate into passing ill-advised legislation. I opposed it, and said we did not want to watch the same movie again in 6 months. Well, here we are for the sequel. But this time we must object, and I do object. We can and must do better.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. At this time I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), a member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill, and I am extremely concerned about our national security and deeply troubled that our intelligence community has been prevented from doing the job they need to do to protect Americans.

We do not need another delay of much needed FISA improvements. The Senate passed a bipartisan comprehensive FISA bill 68–29. That is the bill that we should be voting on today, and not this temporary extension. It is not the bill that I would have written, but it does give our intelligence community many important tools they need to protect our Nation. Instead of taking up a perfectly good, well-thought-out bill, we have another delay tactic by the House Democratic leadership that insists on catering to special interest groups like the trial lawyers and the hard left of the Democrat Party.

Mr. Speaker, we have had leaks in the way we collect information on individuals through electronic conversation; we have had leaks about how we collect e-mails on terrorist Web sites; we have had leaks that have caused our allies in Europe to no longer cooperate when it comes to tracking terrorist financing. Instead of prioritizing arguably the most important security issue, the majority party has delayed and failed to focus on how we can help the community in the 21st century against enemies who utilize the latest technology against our country.

As a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I have been very disturbed this past year to see the anger against our President cloud the judgments of its members. In an effort to embarrass the President, they have weakened our intelligence gathering capabilities and caused long-term damage to the security of this Nation. We do not monitor phone conversations like we should, we do not monitor e-mails like we should, or finances like we should. And the enemy knows it. It is time for us to strengthen and not weaken the terrorist surveillance program. Enough is enough.

We all know that if we simply pass an extension for 21 days, it doesn't solve the problem. It is time for us to stand up and force the Democrat leadership of this House to do their job and bring the FISA modernization bill before this body, the one that was passed by the Senate by a wide margin, so that the intelligence community can have every tool at its disposal to protect the United States.

The Director of National Intelligence Mike McConnell, the man in charge of overseeing the intelligence community, has repeatedly told us of the urgency to modernize the FISA law. He said, ''We must urgently close the gap in our current ability to effectively collect foreign intelligence. The current FISA law does not allow us to be effective. Modernizing this law is essential for the intelligence community to be able to provide warning of threats to this country.''

Mr. Speaker, what the Senate passed does exactly what Mr. MCCONNELL talked about. We should bring that vote to the floor and vote it up or down.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. I am pleased now, Mr. Speaker, to recognize the chairman of the Constitution Committee on the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. JERRY NADLER, for 4 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5349, a 21-day extension of the existing FISA Act to provide Congress the time to work out the differences between the two Houses on this very important matter. It is a question of our Nation's security and it is a question of our Nation's values. We should not be stampeded into action when there is no need. This administration has the ability to monitor terrorists, and extending current law for 21 days will not remove that ability.

What this debate is really about is whether national security wiretapping should be subject to judicial and congressional oversight, as the bill that we passed last November, the RESTORE Act, provides and as traditional American values insist on, or whether the administration, any administration, can be trusted to police itself, whether American citizens' liberty should be subject to the unreviewable discretion of the Executive as the Protect America Act and the Senate-passed bill provide.

Also at stake is the question of so-called telecom immunity. We know what they are asking. They are asking that the lawsuits against the telecommunications companies for participating in the warrantless surveillance program, allegedly in violation of the FISA law, be foreclosed.

Now there are only two possibilities. There are two narratives: Either the telecom companies nobly and patriotically assisted the administration against terrorism. That is one narrative. Or the telecom companies knowingly and criminally participated in a criminal conspiracy in violation of the law, aiding and abetting a lawless administration to violate Americans' liberties and privacy rights against the Constitution and against the FISA Act. I believe it is the second. But it's not up to me or up to anybody else here to

decide that. That's why we have courts. Courts determine questions of law and fact. People are out there who believe their rights were violated. They've brought a lawsuit. Let the lawsuits continue. Let the courts decide whether the telecom companies acted properly or acted in violation of the law. It is not the job of Congress to foreclose that judgment.

We have been told: If we pass telecom immunity and if we fail to control abuse of the state secrets privilege that has been abused by the administration to prevent the courts or the Congress from reviewing what they have done, there will be no mechanism in the courts or in the Congress to know, let alone to control, what the Executive is doing. The separation of powers established by the Constitution to protect our liberties will have been destroyed. That way lies the slow death of liberty. It must not be permitted.

We have been told by this administration, Trust us. I'm not in a very trusting mood these days, nor should we ever trust any administration without judicial and congressional oversight.

I remind everyone here that there is a bill that passed this House, the RESTORE Act, last November. The Senate finally got around to passing a bill yesterday. Now we are being told we should have no time to work out the differences as we normally try to do, we must take the Senate bill sight unseen. Frankly, that's an insult to every Member of this House and to the prerogatives of this House. We passed a bill. They passed a bill. We should have 21 days to work out the differences. American liberty is depending on this, and the integrity of this House depends on this. I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), former chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I thank the gentleman from Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

Yesterday, the other body passed the FISA bill by a vote of 68–29. I don't understand why House Democrats refuse to bring this bill to the floor, sponsored by Senator ROCKEFELLER. It makes no sense to block its consideration for another 21 days. Why do we keep extending the terrorist loophole? It's imperative that the House pass the Senate bill today.

The Rules Committee last night rejected a Republican amendment to vote on the Senate-passed bill, and then the committee refused to allow the Senate-passed bill as a motion to recommit this afternoon. The majority knows that the American people support long-term legislation to keep our country safe. And I guarantee that the Senate bill would pass the House by a wide margin if the Democratic majority would let the House vote on it.

Instead of passing the Senate bill, we continue to waste time on legislation of little consequence. The FISA bill expires on Friday. There is no more time to waste. We passed a temporary fix last summer and another extension earlier this year. There has been plenty of time to review this and to come up with a permanent fix. If we keep on passing these extensions, we're never going to get a permanent bill, and Americans are in jeopardy.

This majority's charade of passing short-term extensions has gone on long enough. President Bush will veto another extension, and the Democrats will have no one to blame but themselves. It's time for the majority to stop playing political games. We have had plenty of time to debate this issue. The Senate finally got it right, and it's time that the House does the same.

Our intelligence community needs the certainty of a long-term bill to protect the Nation. The Senate bill will continue to give our intelligence agencies the tools they need to keep us safe. I urge my colleagues to reject the 21-day extension up now and to pass the Senate's bipartisan FISA bill today.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to recognize the gentlewoman from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee and a subcommittee chairman on Homeland Security, for 3 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and I want to personally thank him for the extensive work we have done to secure America and as well to protect the civil liberties of all Americans.

I hold in my hand the Constitution of the United States embedded in this book. When you think of the term ''embedded,'' you think of the concerns regarding the Iraq war. You think of the concerns of terrorism. You might even think of the concerns of embedded press who have been able to travel with our soldiers. But in this instance, I am saying that deeply embedded in the hearts of Americans is a concept of the Constitution that protects their civil liberties.

□ 1345

I think it is important to note that in fact a bill has been passed so many months ago. And I will not argue about the integrity of this place, for many have raised that question, that we should have the privilege of reviewing the legislation of the Senate, and that privilege is necessary.

But I think there is a larger argument, more expanded argument, and it must be clarified that we have not dillydallied. We have not delayed. We have, in fact, been meticulous in making sure that we have balanced a new FISA law, updating it, and also providing that protection, that firewall for Americans.

How many of you would have known that initially the administration came to us and suggested that while they are surveilling someone on foreign soil, if it kicks back to an American, your grandmother, your aunt, your uncle, yourself, because it kicks back in a sense that we are talking to someone on foreign soil but you happen to be on the other side of the phone, that that was okay?

But I offered an amendment, and that amendment is in the bill that the House passed, that we cannot tolerate reverse targeting; you must get a warrant. There must be an intervention, and I am glad to say it is in the Senate bill.

Yet there is a major question that the Senate bill has not addressed, and it is the fact that many, many people's rights were violated in the course of the old law when the government went straight to the private sector and told them you have to do this and so many persons who were innocent were violated by surveillance. Now these companies, of which I have great respect, I believe they are part of the economic engine of this Nation, want us to interfere in the legal system, for many of these companies are now being sued retroactively, if you will, or being addressed for the grievance they did against an American citizen.

Who are we to stop the normal legal process? If one of these corporations has a defensible defense, the judges will rule for them. If they were following the law or they have a defense or were relying upon representations made by officials of the Federal Government, I can assure you that a court of law will give them their relief. Why are we interfering where citizens of the American society believe that this Constitution and their rights have been violated?

So to my friends who want to provide a scare tactic, let me say to you all this legislation does today is to ensure you will be safe by extending the existing law. Hopefully we put notice on corporations that they should not be violating the civil liberties of Americans, and clearly I will tell you, as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, that none of us stand in this well to jeopardize the safety and security of the American people. Let us dispense with that myth altogether.

What is important is that when we finally design a bill that is going to be entrenched in law, it must be in compliance with the Constitution that is embedded in this bill. It is not today. I ask my colleagues to enthusiastically vote for the extension because I believe in security and the rights of all Americans.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to Mr. SAXTON.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago as I was working to have a subcommittee on the Armed Services Committee established on terrorism, I was making the rounds among my party's leadership. I

made the case about why I thought we needed, and of course this was before 9/11, a subcommittee on terrorism. And I will never forget, one of my good friends told me that he thought, he said, JIM, he said, I think you and your friends see a terrorist behind every bush.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Democratic majority leadership has adopted that same frame of reference. There is not a terrorist behind every bush, but they present a clear and present danger. We were told so as late as today by representatives of the Intelligence Committee.

Passing a 21-day extension simply continues the uncertainty in the intelligence community, the uncertainty in the telecommunications community, and uncertainty among the American public itself.

Just yesterday, as it has been said here several times, the Senate approved a comprehensive, long-term, bipartisan bill by a vote of 68–29 to close the terrorist loophole in our intelligence laws. Their bill represents a compromise between Congress and the administration. It rightly restores the original intent of the FISA by ensuring that intelligence officials can conduct surveillance on foreign targets without a court order while still protecting the civil liberties of the American people. It also grants liability protection to telecommunications companies that helped the government after September 11. Allowing these companies to be subjected to frivolous lawsuits threatens their future cooperation, which could cripple America's counterterrorism efforts.

The Senate bill is a responsible plan for protecting our Nation against terrorist threats. Many times the Senate sends bills over here and they are very shortly passed by the House. The House must act quickly on the Senate's bill, as well, and send it to the President so he can sign it. Failing to do so is effectively failing to protect our country and American citizens.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 5349 and instead immediately pass the Senate's version of the bill so we can send this important bill to the President.

There may not be, Mr. Speaker, a terrorist behind every bush, but they, today, present a clear and present danger.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise disappointed that the President of the United States is attempting to short-circuit the legislative process and force Congress into an impulsive decision by vowing to veto this short-term extension before us now that would permit us to legislate responsibly.

It is beyond me how the Chief Executive of this country who truly wants an effective FISA reform, who truly cares about enacting sound legislation to protect Americans' lives and liberty, who truly respects the prerogatives of Congress in shaping that legislation, could seriously threaten us with the prospect of vetoing this legislation.

It is especially disturbing to think that he might refuse to accept a brief extension of his own surveillance program in order to ramrod a decision his way on telecom immunity before we can know what it is we are giving immunity to.

I am also disappointed that some of my friends, Members of the minority, whom I have always considered to be responsible legislators, have spoken today in support of the President's attempt to once again bludgeon us to enact sweeping new wiretapping powers for the executive branch without giving the legislative branch the time to ensure that the way it is done holds true to our most cherished American values.

I hope that these few observations do not reflect widely shared sentiments in the minority, and I would hope that we would not lend credence to the President's veto threat. I don't think we should have to legislate under that kind of intimidation. It amounts to a demand that we abandon and abdicate our sworn constitutional duty.

I hope that we would all agree that we need to consider FISA reform responsibly with the care it deserves, with the importance that every American attaches to it, and to preserve the prerogatives of the House to have our voice heard.

This demand that we act irresponsibly reflects no credit upon the process. We should instead remind him that we are the legislative branch and remind him that he must show some patience and allow the Congress to responsibly work its will.

If the President were to veto this brief extension of his own surveillance program and if that in any way compromises our national security, no amount of political blustering would change the fact that it would be him who has put our Nation at risk by refusing to participate responsibly in the legislative process.

Now, I can't truly imagine that happening. I hope that with a strong bipartisan vote for this commonsense, temporary measure, we can convince our President to help us take this responsible step to ensure that Americans are appropriately protected against threats to their liberty as well as threats to their security. I hope that the result of this discussion will turn into a sound bipartisan vote in support of this measure.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California, Mr. LUNGREN, a member of both the Judiciary Committee and the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of our committee, for clarifying what this is all about. In his statement he just said that the President is trying to force us to accept this bill from the Senate so that there can be immunity granted to those communications companies that responded in the affirmative when asked to help this country. So that is what it is. That's what this vote is all about.

You can talk about a 21-day extension. You can talk about wanting to work a little harder. You can talk about this and that, but essentially that is what this vote is. It is the question of whether or not we believe that we ought to grant to those who responded in the affirmative when requested by their country to assist in the aftermath of 9/11, to allow us to collect that kind of intelligence which would prohibit or prevent another 9/11, whether or not we are going to slap them in the face and say because you answered yes, you have to, in the words of the chairman of the Constitutional Law Subcommittee when this was brought up in the committee, let them do it themselves, they have millions of dollars of high-priced attorneys. Now, that's the response we are to tell the American people if asked in the future: Will you help in gathering information so that we can prevent another attack? And, oh, by the way, make sure that you have millions of dollars worth of high-priced attorneys to respond to whatever lawsuit might be out there.

Now, the question here is whether or not the majority is going to allow the majority to do its will. Why do I say that? Twenty-one Members of the Democratic side have sent a letter on January 28 to the Speaker saying they support the Rockefeller-Bond bill. Twenty-one Members. Now, I was never great in math, but I do know that 21 Members on that side of the aisle, added to our Members on this side of the aisle, are a majority in the House of Representatives.

So the question is: Will you allow the House to work its will? Will you allow the bill from the Senate, which 21 Members on your side of the aisle have signed a letter in support of, come to the floor so we can find out whether or not the majority of this House will support it?

We were denied that in the Rules Committee. We were denied that on two specific votes in the Rules Committee, and now the only way we can allow that vote to come up is if we defeat this bill and force those on the majority side and the leadership to allow the majority to work its will.

□ 1400

Interestingly enough, the gentlelady from Texas who just spoke talked about how we ought to support this bill. I remember in August when she stood in that very well and tore up a piece of paper and said this is what we're doing; we're shredding the Constitution by voting for the bill that was then on the floor. And now we're

supposed to understand that the other side wants us to have 3 weeks more of a bill which shredded the Constitution.

Let's understand what we're really doing here. Let's vote this down so we can vote on the bill that the majority of the people in this House and the majority of Americans support.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would grant myself as much time as I may consume.

I appreciate the discussion that we're engaging in, but at this point I rise to make the case that this is not a debate exclusively about immunity. There are other key differences that we should and, I think, want to consider.

For example, the Senate bill, which we've just examined, does not contain sufficient provisions to guard against reverse targeting of United States citizens. I think that's an important matter that needs our continued consideration.

The Senate bill permits surveillance to commence without judicial approval of the essential procedures that will be used to ensure that there's no surveillance of United States persons without appropriate individualized warrants. I think that's pretty important.

The Senate bill further does not require the Inspector General or the Justice Department to investigate the President's warrantless surveillance program. The House bill requires this investigation.

And so I don't think we need to be stampeded into a vote by threats from the executive or from the mathematical perfection of the other side in suggesting where the majorities ally in this body. The 21 signers of the letter are entitled to get some answers to these questions just as everyone else that didn't sign the letter are.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD at this point from cnn.com, ''Phone companies cut FBI wiretaps due to unpaid bills.''

[From CNN.com, Feb. 13, 2008]

PHONE COMPANIES CUT FBI, WIRETAPS DUE TO UNPAID BILLS

WASHINGTON.—Telephone companies have cut off FBI wiretaps used to eavesdrop on suspected criminals because of the bureau's repeated failures to pay phone bills on time.

A Justice Department audit released Thursday blamed the lost connections on the FBI's lax oversight of money used in undercover investigations. Poor supervision of the program also allowed one agent to steal $25,000, the audit said.

In at least one case, a wiretap used in a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act investigation ''was halted due to untimely payment,'' the audit found. FISA wiretaps are used in the government's most sensitive and secretive criminal investigations, and allow eavesdropping on suspected terrorists or spies.

''We also found that late payments have resulted in telecommunications carriers actually disconnecting phone lines established to deliver surveillance results to the FBI, resulting in lost evidence,'' according to the audit by Inspector General Glenn A. Fine.

More than half of 990 bills to pay for telecommunication surveillance in five unidentified FBI field offices were not paid on time, the report shows. In one office alone, unpaid costs for wiretaps from one phone company totaled $66,000.

The FBI did not have an immediate comment.

The report released Thursday was a highly edited version of Fine's 87–page audit that the FBI deemed too sensitive to be viewed publicly. It focused on what the FBI admitted was an ''antiquated'' system to track money sent to its 56 field offices nationwide for undercover work. Generally, the money pays for rental cars, leases and surveillance, the audit noted.

It also found that some field offices paid for expenses on undercover cases that should have been financed by FBI headquarters. Out of 130 undercover payments examined, auditors found 14 cases of at least $6,000 each where field offices dipped into their own budgets to pay for work that should have been picked up by headquarters.

The faulty bookkeeping was blamed, in large part, in the case of an FBI agent who pleaded guilty in June 2006 to stealing $25,000 for her own use, the audit noted.

''As demonstrated by the FBI employee who stole funds intended to support undercover activities, procedural controls by themselves have not ensured proper tracking and use of confidential case funds,'' it concluded.

Fine's report offered 16 recommendations to improve the FBI's tracking and management of the funding system, including its telecommunication costs. The FBI has agreed to follow 11 of the suggestions but said that four ''would be either unfeasible or too cost prohibitive.'' The recommendations were not specifically outlined in the edited version of the report.

A lot has been said about what some call patriotic phone companies. Are these the same companies that cut off the FBI FISA wiretaps because the FBI hadn't paid its phone bill? This is breaking news.

I ask that we examine this issue, and that we include it in the ones in the 21-day period. After all, we already have a FISA bill that will continue during the 21 days. Someone may have accidentally mischaracterized the fact that we will be without FISA protection if we don't act immediately. I don't think that's the case, and I think many of our colleagues on the floor at this time know that as well as I do.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from the State of Michigan (Mr. ROGERS), a member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have such great respect for my fellow colleague and Michigander, Mr. CONYERS, for his work and passionate belief and where he stands.

I do worry about where we're at. And I hear the gentleman talk about the fact that we just don't have time, and we need more time. You know, today we're going to spend hours and hours grilling a professional baseball player about he said/she said activities in professional baseball. We spent an entire day on this floor this year trying to figure out how we're going to designate scenic trails in New England; 162 bills commemorating someone or something, 162 on the floor this year; 62 bills naming post offices.

I think, if we put this in perspective, this isn't about needing more time. This isn't about that. We've obviously wasted a lot of time.

Our Constitution, as so many people point to, says some pretty clear things to me. It makes sure that you stand tall and you take an oath to defend against all enemies, foreign and domestic. It's one of the most important things that we do in this body.

If we can find time to put Roger Clemens in a chair and grill him for hours and make a media circus about professional baseball, you'd think we could spend a few minutes protecting the United States of America. Instead what we do is we kind of fool around and wring our hands and say, I'm for national security but kind of, not really. But, hey, did you see these jangly keys? Professional baseball could be in trouble. It maybe works for my kids when they were 3 and in trouble, but it doesn't work for the American people, and it certainly doesn't work to keep us safe.

This isn't about the Constitution. Many of your Members came down here and said, we think this is unconstitutional, but give us 3 more weeks of unconstitutionality in the United States. If I believed that, as a former FBI agent, I wouldn't vote for it. It's wrong.

This is about white hats and black hats. It's about good guys and bad guys. It's about Good Samaritans. You know, there are ads on TV today where they go into high crime neighborhoods and say, It's okay for you to tell on criminal behavior. Please call the police. Please call the FBI. Please make a difference in your community.

Think of the confusing message we are sending today because we're hooked up on the size of the company. So if I go in as an FBI agent to find the address that a pizza delivery company has for a fugitive, should we go after them, too? Should we go after that pizza delivery guy for, out of the goodness of his heart, telling us where there is a fugitive who may have committed murder or have committed child pornography or been selling drugs and is in violation of the safety and security of his neighborhood, his community? No, of course not. And we shouldn't punish people who say, listen, I want to help the United States catch terrorists and murderers, and if you ask me and I'm in lawful possession of it, I'll share it with you. We do it in banks. We do it in small businesses. We knock on neighbors' doors every day in this country and say, Help us help protect your neighborhood, your kids and your family. Will you tell us what you saw? Will you tell us what you know? Will you tell us where this information leads us to? It happens every day.

This is about black hats and white hats, good guys and bad guys. Let's make sure we stand up today for every courageous American who stands up for the safety of the community of this United States. I don't care how big or

how small they are, we ought to stand with them and not make them the enemy.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time at this point.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we've heard a number of things, what this is or isn't about. We're told it's not about the protections for the country, but it is about that. And I have great respect and admiration for our chairman, Mr. CONYERS.

But we were told, also, well, gee, the reason we need more time is the White House has delayed giving us documents. But if you really want to get to the bottom of this, you go back to August 4 when we took a vote on FISA being extended for a number of months. There was no immunity in there. There was no issue about is the President going to turn over documents. Forty-one Democrats voted for it, nine didn't vote, and all the rest voted against it. They were against the protections for this country and FISA.

Now, we need to try to eliminate risk to the country, not political risk to a party. And I understand sometimes you have Members that see the dangers to America, gee, that exposes the country to great risk and if we don't do something and something terrible happens, then we've exposed our party to terrible political risk. This shouldn't be about political risk. We need to do what's right for the country.

The chairman had said there are other key differences and there are. But those are important to note as well.

Our friends across the aisle somehow think it shreds the Constitution if we tap a terrorist in a foreign country and he calls an American. I've said it before and I'll say it again. The solution to that is not that we not tap into that known terrorist in a foreign country; it's that the friends of those concerned about this in America, tell your friends to have their terrorist buddies not call them at home. That's real easy. Then they don't have to worry about this bill.

But if terrorists that are known terrorists in foreign countries call them in this country, then they ought to be at risk for having them tapped. Once we know that there's somebody here, then they go get the warrant and that addresses it. But you cannot restrict it otherwise without doing great harm to our protection in America.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I continue the reservation of time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5349, a bill to extend the Protect America Act of 2007 for 21 days.

Now it's hard for me to come to this floor and oppose an extension of a bill that I support, and supported in a bipartisan manner, Mr. Speaker.

It was this summer, I believe last August, that Republicans and Democrats came together on the Judiciary Committee and worked out a solution for an extension that came to be known as the Protect America Act. And we've heard in the course of this debate, eloquently stated on both sides, what the issues are here. We have antiquated foreign intelligence surveillance laws. The technology that has exploded across the globe in the last 25 years has occurred without a significant updating of those laws that govern the means and the manner and the technology whereby we can collect intelligence. And so we find ourselves, essentially, as the hub of communications in the world in the United States of America. You've heard the percentages, the enormous amount of communications that pass through the United States of America. And yet we have this massive loophole in our intelligence surveillance laws that does not permit us to listen to a terrorist in one foreign country talking to a terrorist in another foreign country.

When we worked out the compromise this summer, it was built, Mr. Speaker, I believe, on an understanding between Republicans and Democrats that that ought not to be, we ought to solve that problem in an equitable and bipartisan way. And I was pleased to support that extension and legislation for a period of 6 months.

But what I struggle with today is now, in the aftermath of that, the contrast between the work in the House and the Senate is rather startling. Yesterday, the Senate approved a bipartisan bill supported by nearly 70 percent of the Senate to close the terrorist loophole in our intelligence laws. It represented a strong bipartisan compromise between Congress and the administration. And yet here in the House of Representatives we passed a 6-month extension. A few weeks ago we passed a 15-day extension. Now I believe we're passing a 21-day extension. And yet the American people, I believe, know in their heart of hearts our enemy does not think in the short term and, therefore, our solutions must occur in the long term. And when it comes to the ability of our intelligence community during this administration or whomever will be the next administration charged with protecting this country, I believe it is imperative that we call the question.

□ 1415

I believe it is imperative that we rise today, respectfully to my colleagues on the other side, most especially the chairman whom I esteem, and say enough is enough. We need to modernize our foreign intelligence surveillance laws today. We need to find a bipartisan compromise as we did last summer. We need to find a bipartisan compromise as the United States Senate did yesterday.

And I say again with a heavy heart, our enemy does not conspire to harm us in the short term. Our enemy conspires to harm us in the long term: to harm our people, to harm our families, to harm our children and our interests around the globe. We must, in this Congress, find a way beyond politics, as we did last summer, as the Senate did yesterday, to repair those holes in our foreign intelligence surveillance laws and give our intelligence community the legal authority and tools that they will need to protect us in the long term.

I urge my colleagues to reject the bill to extend the Protect America Act for 21 days and call the question on this floor. We need a long-term solution to what ails our intelligence laws.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) has 4½ minutes. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has 7 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) has 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 976, further proceedings on the bill are postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

HONORING AFRICAN AMERICAN INVENTORS

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 966) honoring African American inventors, past and present, for their leadership, courage, and significant contributions to our national competitiveness.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 966

Whereas African-American and other minority scientists, technologists, engineers, and mathematicians have made significant achievements in our national research enterprise and inspired future generations;

Whereas the National Society of Black Engineers (''NSBE'') lifts up African-American

researchers of the past and present, including special contributors named in this Resolution;

Whereas Garrett Augustus Morgan made outstanding contributions to public safety;

Whereas firefighters in the early 1900s wore the safety helmets and gas masks that he invented, and for which he was awarded a gold medal at the Second International Exposition of Safety and Sanitation in New York in 1914;

Whereas 2 years later, he himself used the mask to rescue men trapped by a gas explosion in a tunnel being constructed under Lake Erie;

Whereas following the disaster which took 21 lives, the City of Cleveland honored him with a gold medal for his heroic efforts;

Whereas in 1923, he received a patent for a traffic signal to regulate vehicle movement in city areas, and this device was a direct precursor to the modern traffic light in use today;

Whereas Ernest Everett Just was a trailblazer in the fields of cell biology and zoology;

Whereas his research and papers on marine biology were so well received in 1915 that Ernest Everett Just was awarded the first Spingarn Medal by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People at age 32;

Whereas Ernest Everett Just dedicated years of research toward the study of cells and cell structures in order to understand and find cures for cellular irregularities and diseases such as sickle cell anemia and cancer and became one of the most respected scientists in his field;

Whereas racial bigotry in the United States caused much of his work and his achievements to go unrewarded;

Whereas in other countries, he was treated as a pioneer and was recruited to work with Russian scientists and invited to be a guest researcher at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Biology, the world's greatest scientific research laboratory at the time;

Whereas he was welcomed at the Naples Zoological Station in Italy and the Sorbonne in France, where he conducted research and was regarded as one of the most outstanding zoologists of his time;

Whereas Archibald Alphonso Alexander excelled in design and construction engineering;

Whereas, employed by the Marsh Engineering Company, he designed the Tidal Basin bridge in Washington, DC;

Whereas after studying bridge design in London, Archibald Alphonso Alexander and George Higbee formed a general contracting business that focused on bridge design;

Whereas his designs include Washington, DC's Whitehurst Freeway, the heating plant and power station at the University of Iowa, and an airfield in Tuskegee, Alabama;

Whereas he went on to become the first Republican territorial governor of the U.S. Virgin Islands;

Whereas David Nelson Crosthwait Jr. made significant and practical contributions to the engineering of heating and cooling systems;

Whereas he held numerous patents relating to heat transfer, ventilation, and air conditioning, the areas in which he was considered an expert;

Whereas David Nelson Crosthwait Jr. served as director of research laboratories for C. A. Dunham Company in Marshalltown, Iowa, where he served as technical advisor from 1930 to 1970;

Whereas he designed the heating systems for Radio City Music Hall and Rockefeller Center in New York City and authored texts and guides on heating and cooling with water;

Whereas during the 1920s and 1930s, he invented an improved boiler, a new thermostat control, and a new differential vacuum pump to improve the heating systems in larger buildings; and

Whereas African-American innovators continue to improve the daily lives of Americans through their inventions and stir the creative spirit of future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes and appreciates the significant achievements to our national research enterprise made by African-American and other minority scientists, technologists, engineers, and mathematicians;

(2) honors and extends its appreciation and gratitude toward all African-American inventors, for the significant and honorable research and educational contributions that improve the lives of all citizens and that have gone unacknowledged too long; and

(3) looks for opportunities to make sure that the creativity and contribution of minority scientists, technologists, engineers, and mathematicians can be expressed through research, development, standardization, and innovation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H. Res. 966.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in celebration of February as Black History Month, I offer this resolution to celebrate the accomplishments of four outstanding inventors.

The first, Garrett Augustus Morgan, lived from 1877 to 1963 and was a son of former slaves. He grew up in Kentucky on the family farm, but as an adolescent, he worked as a handyman for a wealthy Cincinnati landowner. Surely that early experience, as well as his education, influenced and shaped his interest as an inventor.

Among his inventions, Garrett Morgan designed a traffic signal that greatly improved public safety. In the early 1900s, bicycles, animal-powered carts, and motor vehicles shared the roads with pedestrians. Accidents frequently occurred between the vehicles. After witnessing a collision between an automobile and a horse-driven carriage, Morgan was convinced that something should be done to improve traffic safety. He was the first to be granted a patent for a traffic signal containing the caution provision.

Prior to Morgan's invention, most of the traffic signals in use featured only two positions: stop and go. Because the manually operated traffic signals of the day allowed no interval between the ''stop'' and ''go'' commands, collisions at busy intersections were common during the transition moving from one street to another. Morgan's traffic signal, as well as others, such as a safety hood and smoke protector, contributed greatly to public safety. Such a simple innovation, yet a major impact.

The second innovator mentioned in this resolution is Ernest Everett Just, who lived from 1883 to 1941. He grew up in Charleston, South Carolina, and was the son of a dock builder. He dedicated his life to cell biology research and earned a Ph.D at the University of Chicago. He studied the fundamental role of the cell surface in the development of organisms. He performed his research in the District of Columbia, Chicago, and Massachusetts, as well as in Italy, Germany, and France.

Ernest Just was truly a trailblazer during the time when African American researchers were rare and underappreciated.

The third individual to be honored is Archibald Alphonso Alexander, who lived from 1888 to 1958. Born in Iowa, the son of a janitor, Alexander was the first African American to graduate from the University of Iowa. He studied bridge design in London, England, and founded his own business in the 1920s. He and his partners designed and constructed many roads and bridges, including the Whitehurst Freeway, the Tidal Basin Bridge and an extension to the Baltimore-Washington Parkway.

He designed the Tuskegee Airfield and the Iowa State University heating and cooling system. He was truly a Renaissance man. He excelled in football, designed highway infrastructure, and served as Governor of the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Finally, my resolution honors David Nelson Crosthwait, Jr., who lived from 1898 to 1976. He was born in Nashville, Tennessee, and grew up in Kansas City, Missouri. After graduating from Purdue University in 1913 where he studied mechanical engineering, he took a job with the C.A. Dunham Company.

During his 40 years with the company, he became an expert on heat transfer, air ventilation, and central air-conditioning. He authored a manual on heating and cooling with water. He also wrote guides and standards as well as codes that dealt with heating, ventilation, refrigeration, and air-conditioning systems.

During the 1920s and 1930s, he invented an improved boiler, a new thermostat control, and a new differential vacuum pump, which were all more effective for the heating systems in larger buildings. He also held numerous patents and designed the heating systems for Radio City Music Hall and Rockefeller Center.

These four individuals and so many others overcame the tremendous personal challenges to excel in their careers and benefit society.

The National Society of Black Engineers has chosen to lift up these

innovators, and I thank the society for its helpful input in designing this resolution to honor these exceptional men.

Let their light shine as an example to the thousands of African American young students across the Nation. The message of their lives, that of Black History Month, and that of this resolution: with challenge comes perseverance, with perseverance comes endurance, with endurance comes strength, and with strength comes success.

It is my goal to wish success to all students of color who aspire to future careers in science, technology, engineering, and math.

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

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 966. It's fitting that this Congress is also considering the gentlelady from Texas', Mrs. JOHNSON's, resolution on the same day that we're celebrating National Engineers Week.

H. Res. 966 honors African American inventors, past and present, for their leadership, courage, and significant contributions to our national competitiveness. Three of the men we honor today were engineers; the fourth, a renowned biologist. Their contributions to our Nation are many; their drive to achieve success, often in the face of adversity, admirable; and their recognition today, highly deserved.

We owe a debt of gratitude to Garrett Augustus Morgan for the contributions he made to public safety with safety helmet, gas mask, and traffic signal inventions.

Ernest Everett Just's cellular work to help find a cure for sickle cell anemia and cancer helped him become one of the most well-respected scientists in his field.

Many of the roads we travel on in the D.C. area, including the Tidal Basin Bridge, the Whitehurst Freeway and much of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, were designed by Archibald Alphonso Alexander.

Considered an expert in heat transfer, ventilation, and air conditioning, David Nelson Crosthwait, Jr., invented numerous practical heating devices. These include an improved boiler, thermostat control, and differential vacuum pump for larger buildings, such as Radio City Music Hall and Rockefeller Center.

These men are role models for our next generation of scientists and engineers. This Congress, through America COMPETES, has made great strides to ensure that our Nation continues to attract the best and the brightest to these admirable and important careers.

I support H. Res. 966 and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for speaking, and I reserve.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would simply ask for support of H. Res. 966 and thank the Speaker, as well as the gentleman on the other side and all the staff for assisting.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 966.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1430

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL ENGINEERS WEEK

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 917) supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 917

Whereas National Engineers Week has grown into a formal coalition of more than 75 professional societies, major corporations, and government agencies, dedicated to ensuring a diverse and well-educated future engineering workforce by increasing understanding of and interest in engineering and technology careers among all young students, by promoting pre-college literacy in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), and raising public understanding and appreciation of engineers' contributions to society;

Whereas February 17–23, 2008, has been designated by the President as National Engineers Week and the theme is ''Engineers Make a World of Difference'';

Whereas National Engineers Week, which was founded in 1951 by the National Society of Professional Engineers, is among the oldest of America's professional outreach efforts;

Whereas National Engineers Week is celebrated during the week of George Washington's birthday to honor the contributions that our first President, a military engineer and land surveyor, made to engineering;

Whereas for one outreach program alone, the National Engineers Week Future City Competition, more than 1,100 schools and 32,000 middle school students participate annually and 7,500 volunteers donate more than 225,000 hours;

Whereas during National Engineers Week, more than 45,000 engineers connect with some 5,500,000 students and teachers in kindergarten through high school as they help students and teachers determine practical applications of their academics and help students discover that STEM subjects can be fun;

Whereas National Engineers Week activities at engineering schools and in other forums are encouraging all our young math and science students to see themselves as possible future engineers and to realize the practical picture of knowledge;

Whereas National Engineers Week sponsors are working together to transform the engineering workforce through the better inclusion of women and underrepresented minorities;

Whereas engineers from all disciplines send a new message to today's youth: engineers change the world, save lives, protect the Earth, and make a world of difference;

Whereas engineers are working together to mesh diversity and collaboration worldwide, whether reaching for the stars, building global networks, or helping today's young students prepare for their futures;

Whereas engineers use their professional, scientific, and technical knowledge and skills in creative and innovative ways to fulfill society's needs;

Whereas engineers have helped meet the major technological challenges of our time—from rebuilding towns devastated by natural disasters to designing an information superhighway that will speed our country into the future;

Whereas engineers are a crucial link in research, development, and demonstration in transforming scientific discoveries into useful products, and we will look more than ever to engineers and their knowledge and skills to meet the challenges of the future;

Whereas engineers play a crucial role in developing the consensus engineering standards that permit modern economies and societies to exist; and

Whereas the 2006 National Academy of Sciences report entitled ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm'' highlighted the worrisome trend that fewer students are now focusing on engineering in college at a time when increasing numbers of today's 2,000,000 United States engineers are nearing retirement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week and its aim to increase understanding of and interest in engineering and technology careers and to promote literacy in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics; and

(2) will work with the engineering community to make sure that the creativity and contribution of that community can be expressed through research, development, standardization, and innovation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SOLIS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 917, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 917, supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week.

Founded by the National Society of Professional Engineers and including more than 100 society, government and business sponsors and affiliates, including Boeing and the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, National Engineers Week draws upon local and regional experts to recognize the contributions of engineers and to promote careers in engineering.

From national and regional engineering competitions, such as the Future City Competition, to events such as Introduce a Girl to Engineering Day, this week is intended to inspire the next generation of American engineers and scientists.

National Engineers Week takes place next week, just as it does every year, to commemorate the birthday of George Washington, one of our Nation's greatest engineers. Engineers have helped make our country great, from the American Revolution to the development of key modern industries, such as the aerospace industry, as well as various alternative industries. Engineers are at the forefront of human advances because engineers combine creativity with math and science training to solve problems. Engineers are not just builders, as they are sometimes envisioned, they are problem solvers. This is one of the first things I was taught when I was a graduate student at Stanford University in the Department of Engineering-Economic Systems. Engineering is problem solving.

I have a unique perspective in Congress as one of fewer than 10 engineers currently serving. Besides my master's degree from Stanford, I earned a bachelor's degree from Northwestern University in mechanical engineering. It is of great concern that America has fallen behind other countries in producing engineers. When I have toured engineering schools, whether it's been at Northwestern University, Stanford University, Northern Illinois University or the Illinois Institute of Technology, I have heard again and again how few Americans are getting engineering degrees, especially graduate degrees in engineering. It is great that America has such top universities that we are attracting some of the brightest minds from around the world to study here, but we are losing more and more of those students when they graduate and go back home.

Engineers in the past helped us build boats across the seas, railroads to take us west, and the Internet to communicate across the world. Today, we need the innovative capability of engineers more than ever to confront the new challenges before us.

A few years ago, the National Academy of Sciences report entitled ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm'' raised serious questions about America's future technological competitiveness. This report called for the Federal Government to take a number of actions, including addressing the potential for a shortage of good engineers. I am proud that Chairman GORDON and the Science and Technology Committee on which I serve as vice chairman answered the report's call and took action to bolster America's competitiveness. Last summer, Congress passed and the President signed into law the America COMPETES Act. This groundbreaking law invests more in education, especially in the STEM fields of science, technology, engineering and math, and increases investment in critical research and development.

America COMPETES has created new awards for outstanding early-career researchers and new graduate research assistantships in technological areas of national need. These investments will greatly benefit our Nation's engineers, helping America stay at the forefront of innovation and increasing our national, economic and environmental security. Indeed, America's engineers are a critical component in developing and employing the innovative technologies necessary to carry out many of the provisions of the Energy Independence and Security Act, the landmark energy law passed at the end of last year.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) for his work on this resolution, as well as the 45 other cosponsors. And I would especially like to thank the engineers who have contributed so much to America, especially the 2 million engineers in America today.

I ask my colleagues to support H. Res. 917.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 917. House Resolution 917 supports the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week, which will be celebrated this year in just a few days, starting February 17.

The National Society of Professional Engineers established the first National Engineers Week in 1951. Through all of the next week, a wide range of activities are planned around the theme of ''Engineers Make a World of Difference'' in order to increase the understanding of and interest in engineering and technology careers and to promote K–12 literacy in math and science. These activities will also highlight the contributions that engineers have made to our society.

Historically, Engineers Week is celebrated during the week of George Washington's actual birthday to honor his contributions to engineering as a military engineer and a land surveyor. As our Nation's first President, he put our Nation on the path toward technological advancements, invention and education.

We continue down that path today, which has grown exponentially into multiple and complex highways of innovation. It is our engineers, literally and figuratively, who build those highways and help keep us ahead of the innovation curve. From landing a man on the Moon to designing bags to carry our groceries, engineers play a role in nearly every facet of our lives.

Just a few weeks ago, the National Science Foundation released the 2008 Science and Engineering Indicators loaded with statistics on our Nation's engineering future. It's essential that we capitalize on opportunities such as National Engineers Week to raise awareness of the valuable work and contribution of engineers to society to attract young people of all ages to this rewarding profession.

I support the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week, and I urge my colleagues to join me with their support.

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, I think it may be appropriate for me to add here a little interesting perspective that was not in the script today. It's an incident that occurred about 19-plus years ago. It seems like just the other day.

I had just been elected to be a State legislator in the State of Missouri, and I was very pleased and proud of that. No one in my family had ever run for political office or slid that far down the totem pole of life, but I was still looking forward to serving as a State representative. And the first thing on my agenda was to go to an early morning breakfast with other legislators. I got to the breakfast, but it was so early I was there just a little bit late. Just about the time I was sitting down at the table, one of the prominent legislators at the table said, You know, we ought to have a law against engineers serving in the legislature because they are just way too rational for the legislative process. And I was just taking my chair when somebody said, You're not an engineer, are you? And I said, Yes, I am.

So I'm thankful to be one of those seven or so engineers that serve here in the U.S. House. I do believe that there is always a use for the discipline of problem solving that engineering brings. So if there may be someone that's young and considering that career in engineering, I would advise them very strongly in favor of it, even though it involves a certain amount of suffering in undergraduate school.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his work on this resolution. And as a fellow engineer, I could not agree more that we could use a few more engineers here in this body.

I just wanted to say, I mentioned earlier that I have an engineering background, and it really does give a unique perspective. But I think one of the

most important things about National Engineers Week is the inspiration that we are looking to provide.

I remember when I was a kid growing up in Chicago, I was always fascinated by the way things work, especially mechanical things. I remember with my high school calculus and physics teachers, Father Thul and Father Fergus, they were the ones who really helped mold this childhood fascination into an interest in engineering. And I have seen a lot of the work that is done in National Engineers Week to try to provide this inspiration for students who are out there today.

I think this is very critical, as we face so many problems going into the future with energy, that we try and take care of global warming and so many other issues that we face. We need to have more engineers in this country to help us solve these problems. National Engineers Week is a great place to help provide inspiration so we have more engineers. And this resolution provides some more inspiration out there, hopefully, for some students who are watching this, listening to this, reading this later on, that we do need more engineers. I want to encourage that.

I ask my colleagues to vote in support of H. Res. 917.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would like to express my support for H. Res. 917, supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week.

Engineers are important to Texas.

The petrochemical, space, high-tech and transportation industries are integral to Texans' livelihoods.

In fact, Texas ranks first in the nation in industries such as petrochemical, computer, and organic chemical manufacturing. Engineers have contributed to that success.

As a Member of the House Committee on Science and Technology, I am glad to see my colleague, Mr. Lipinski, offer this resolution. It is important to acknowledge engineers for the valuable work that they do. The Texas Society of Professional Engineers works to foster a diverse and skilled workforce.

I want to commend the Society for its work to empower students by educating them about careers in engineering, providing materials for use in classrooms, participating in after-school programs, disseminating scholarship information, and holding math and science competitions.

I would also like to thank the Chairman of the House Committee on Science and Technology, Chairman GORDON, for his leadership on issues of national competitiveness.

I support this resolution and urge my colleagues to support it also.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I am proud to support H. Res. 917, and I thank my colleague Mr. LIPINSKI for introducing this resolution. As a mathematician who spent much of my career working as a renewable energy engineer, I am particularly honored to advocate for the passage of this legislation. H. Res. 917 supports the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week, a valuable opportunity to recognize the importance of the work engineers perform.

Engineers are responsible for many of the vital technological breakthroughs that improve the quality of life for Americans and people around the globe. American engineers and businesses lead the world in innovation, but unfortunately we are no longer producing as many engineers as our international competitors. Without a sustained national effort to train a new generation of engineers, our country is at risk of losing our competitive edge.

I am proud of the work of the 110th Congress to reinvest in the science, technology, engineering, and math education programs that will train the next generation of American engineers. In addition, the America COMPETES Act, which was passed last summer, is a signature bipartisan achievement that marks a major milestone for science, technology, engineering, and math education in our country. More work remains to be done, however, and I hope all of my colleagues will join me in a bipartisan effort to support engineering in America.

I would like to thank my colleagues again for their support of H. Res. 917, and I look forward to watching as American engineering continues to thrive.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 917.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. AKIN. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

NATIONAL OCEAN EXPLORATION PROGRAM ACT

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1834) to authorize the national ocean exploration program and the national undersea research program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1834

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

TITLE I—NATIONAL OCEAN EXPLORATION PROGRAM

SECTION 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''National Ocean Exploration Program Act''.

SEC. 102. AUTHORIZATION.

The Secretary of Commerce, through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, shall, in consultation with the National Science Foundation and other appropriate Federal agencies, conduct a coordinated national ocean exploration program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration that promotes collaboration with existing programs of the Administration, including those authorized in title II.

SEC. 103. AUTHORITIES.

In carrying out the program authorized under section 102, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (in this title referred to as the ''Administrator'') shall—

(1) conduct interdisciplinary voyages or other scientific activities of discovery in conjunction with other Federal agencies or academic or educational institutions, to explore and survey little known areas of the marine environment, inventory, observe, and assess living and nonliving marine resources, and report such findings;

(2) give priority attention to deep ocean regions, with a focus on deep water marine systems that hold potential for important scientific discoveries, such as hydrothermal vent communities and seamounts;

(3) conduct scientific voyages to locate, define, and document historic shipwrecks, submerged sites, and other ocean exploration activities that combine archaeology and oceanographic sciences;

(4) develop and implement, in consultation with the National Science Foundation, a transparent process for merit-based peer-review and approval of proposals for activities to be conducted under this program;

(5) enhance the technical capability of the United States marine science community by promoting the development of improved oceanographic research, communication, navigation, and data collection systems, as well as underwater platforms and sensors and autonomous vehicles;

(6) accept donations of property, data, and equipment to be applied for the purpose of exploring the oceans or increasing knowledge of the oceans; and

(7) establish an ocean exploration forum to encourage partnerships and promote communication among experts and other stakeholders in order to enhance the scientific and technical expertise and relevance of the national program.

SEC. 104. OCEAN EXPLORATION ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator shall appoint an Ocean Exploration Advisory Board, or utilize an existing panel, composed of experts in relevant fields to—

(1) advise the Administrator on priority areas for survey and discovery;

(2) assist the program in the development of a five-year strategic plan for the fields of exploration, discovery, and science;

(3) annually review the quality and effectiveness of the proposal review process established under section 103(4); and

(4) provide other assistance and advice as requested by the Administrator.

(b) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Ocean Exploration Advisory Board.

(2) COMPLIANCE.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Ocean Exploration Advisory Board shall be appointed and operate in a manner consistent with all provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act with respect to—

(A) the balance of membership and expertise;

(B) provisions of public notice regarding activities of the Ocean Exploration Advisory Board;

(C) open meetings; and

(D) public access to documents created by the Ocean Exploration Advisory Board.

(c) UTILIZATION OF EXISTING PANEL.—If the Administrator utilizes an existing panel to fulfill the requirements of this section, the membership of that panel must include relevant experts in the fields specified in subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 105. APPLICATION WITH OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT.

Nothing in this title or title II supersedes, or limits the authority of the Secretary of the Interior under, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.).

SEC. 106. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out this title—

(1) $30,500,000 for fiscal year 2008;
(2) $33,550,000 for fiscal year 2009;
(3) $36,905,000 for fiscal year 2010;
(4) $40,596,000 for fiscal year 2011;
(5) $44,655,000 for fiscal year 2012;
(6) $49,121,000 for fiscal year 2013;
(7) $54,033,000 for fiscal year 2014;
(8) $59,436,000 for fiscal year 2015;
(9) $65,379,000 for fiscal year 2016; and
(10) $71,917,000 for fiscal year 2017.

TITLE II—UNDERSEA RESEARCH PROGRAM

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''National Undersea Research Program Act of 2007''.

SEC. 202. AUTHORIZATION.

The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall conduct an undersea research program and shall designate a Director of that program.

SEC. 203. PURPOSE.

The purpose of the program authorized under section 202 is to increase scientific knowledge essential for the informed management, use, and preservation of oceanic, coastal, and large lake resources through undersea research, exploration, education, and technology development. The program shall be part of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's undersea research, education, and technology development efforts, and shall make available the infrastructure and expertise to service the undersea science and technology needs of the academic community and marine industry.

SEC. 204. PROGRAM.

The program authorized under section 202 shall be conducted through a national headquarters, a network of extramural regional undersea research centers that represent all relevant National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration regions, and a national technology institute. Overall direction of the program will be provided by the program director in coordination with a Council of Center Directors comprised of the directors of the extramural regional centers and the National Institute for Undersea Science and Technology.

SEC. 205. REGIONAL CENTERS AND INSTITUTE.

(a) PROGRAMS.—The following research, exploration, education, and technology programs shall be conducted through the network of extramural regional centers and the National Institute for Undersea Science and Technology:

(1) Core research and exploration based on national and regional undersea research priorities.

(2) Advanced undersea technology development to support the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's research mission and programs.

(3) Development, testing, and transition of advanced undersea technology associated with ocean observatories, submersibles, advanced diving technologies, remotely operated vehicles, autonomous underwater vehicles, and new sampling and sensing technologies such as LEO–15, Pisces, and the Aquarius habitat.

(4) Undersea science-based education and outreach programs to enrich ocean science education and public awareness of the oceans and Great Lakes.

(5) Discovery, study, and development of natural products from ocean and aquatic systems.

(b) OPERATIONS.—Operation of the extramural regional centers and the National Institute for Undersea Science and Technology shall leverage partnerships and cooperative research with academia and private industry.

SEC. 206. COMPETITIVENESS.

Except for a small discretionary fund for rapid response activities, for which no more than 10 percent of the program budget shall be set aside, and for National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration-related service projects, the external projects supported by the regional centers shall be managed using an open and competitive process to evaluate scientific merit, relevance to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, regional and national research priorities, and technical feasibility.

SEC. 207. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out this title—

(1) $17,500,000 for fiscal year 2008;
(2) $19,500,000 for fiscal year 2009;
(3) $21,500,000 for fiscal year 2010;
(4) $23,500,000 for fiscal year 2011;
(5) $25,500,000 for fiscal year 2012;
(6) $27,500,000 for fiscal year 2013;
(7) $29,500,000 for fiscal year 2014;
(8) $31,500,000 for fiscal year 2015;
(9) $33,500,000 for fiscal year 2016; and
(10) $35,500,000 for fiscal year 2017.

TITLE III—INTERAGENCY FINANCING, PLANNING, AND COORDINATION

SEC. 301. INTERAGENCY FINANCING.

The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Science Foundation, the Department of the Navy, and other Federal agencies involved in the programs authorized under title I and II, may participate in interagency financing and share, transfer, receive, and spend funds appropriated to any Federal participant in the program for the purposes of carrying out any administrative or programmatic project or activity under the program. Funds may be transferred among such departments and agencies through an appropriate instrument that specifies the goods, services, or space being acquired from another Federal participant and the costs thereof.

SEC. 302. OCEAN EXPLORATION AND UNDERSEA RESEARCH TECHNOLOGY AND INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, in coordination with the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the United States Geological Survey, the Department of the Navy, the Mineral Management Service, and relevant governmental, nongovernmental, academic, industry, and other experts, shall convene an ocean exploration and undersea research technology and infrastructure task force, or utilize an existing panel, to develop and implement a strategy—

(1) to facilitate transfer of new exploration and undersea research technology to the programs authorized under titles I and II of this Act;

(2) to improve availability of communications infrastructure, including satellite capabilities, to the program;

(3) to develop an integrated, workable, and comprehensive data management information processing system that will make information on unique and significant features obtained by the program available for research and management purposes;

(4) to conduct public outreach activities that improve the public understanding of ocean science, resources, and processes, in conjunction with relevant programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Science Foundation, and other agencies; and

(5) to encourage cost-sharing partnerships with governmental and nongovernmental entities that will assist in transferring exploration technology and technical expertise to the program.

(b) UTILIZATION OF EXISTING PANEL.—If the Administrator utilizes an existing panel to fulfill the requirements of this section, the membership of that panel must include representative of all the agencies and other interests specified in subsection (a).

TITLE I—NATIONAL OCEAN EXPLORATION PROGRAM

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''National Ocean Exploration Program Act''.

SEC. 102. AUTHORIZATION.

The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall, in consultation with the National Science Foundation and other appropriate Federal agencies, conduct a coordinated national ocean exploration program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration that promotes collaboration with other Federal ocean and undersea research and exploration programs. To the extent appropriate, the Administrator shall seek to facilitate coordination of data and information management systems, outreach and education programs to improve public understanding of ocean and coastal resources, and development and transfer of technologies to facilitate ocean and undersea research and exploration.

SEC. 103. AUTHORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program authorized under section 102, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (in this title referred to as the ''Administrator'') shall—

(1) conduct interdisciplinary voyages or other scientific activities of discovery in conjunction with other Federal agencies or academic or educational institutions, to explore and survey little known areas of the marine environment, inventory, observe, and assess living and nonliving marine resources, and report such findings;

(2) give priority attention to deep ocean regions, with a focus on deep water marine systems that hold potential for important scientific discoveries, such as hydrothermal vent communities and seamounts;

(3) conduct scientific voyages to locate, define, and document historic shipwrecks, submerged sites, and other ocean exploration activities that combine archaeology and oceanographic sciences;

(4) develop and implement, in consultation with the National Science Foundation, a transparent, competitive process for merit-based peer-review and approval of proposals for activities to be conducted under this program, taking into consideration advice of the Board established under section 104;

(5) enhance the technical capability of the United States marine science community by promoting the development of improved oceanographic research, communication, navigation, and data collection systems, as well as underwater platforms and sensors and autonomous vehicles; and

(6) establish an ocean exploration forum to encourage partnerships and promote communication among experts and other stakeholders in order to enhance the scientific and technical expertise and relevance of the national program.

(b) DONATIONS.—In carrying out the program authorized under section 102, the Administrator may accept donations of property, data, and equipment to be applied for the purpose of exploring the oceans or increasing knowledge of the oceans.

SEC. 104. OCEAN EXPLORATION ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator shall appoint an Ocean Exploration Advisory Board composed of experts in relevant fields to—

(1) advise the Administrator on priority areas for survey and discovery;

(2) assist the program in the development of a five-year strategic plan for the fields of ocean, marine, and Great Lakes exploration, discovery, and science;

(3) annually review the quality and effectiveness of the proposal review process established under section 103(4); and

(4) provide other assistance and advice as requested by the Administrator.

(b) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Board appointed under subsection (a).

SEC. 105. APPLICATION WITH OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT.

Nothing in this Act supersedes, or limits the authority of the Secretary of the Interior under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.).

SEC. 106. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out this title—

(1) $30,500,000 for fiscal year 2008;
(2) $33,550,000 for fiscal year 2009;
(3) $36,905,000 for fiscal year 2010;
(4) $40,596,000 for fiscal year 2011;
(5) $44,655,000 for fiscal year 2012;
(6) $49,121,000 for fiscal year 2013; and
(7) $54,033,000 for fiscal year 2014.

TITLE II—UNDERSEA RESEARCH PROGRAM

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''National Undersea Research Program Act of 2007''.

SEC. 202. AUTHORIZATION.

The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall conduct an undersea research, exploration, education, and technology development program and shall designate a Director of that program.

SEC. 203. PURPOSE.

The purpose of the program authorized under section 202 is to increase scientific knowledge essential for the informed management, use, and preservation of oceanic, coastal, and Great Lakes resources. The Director, in carrying out the program authorized in section 202, shall cooperate with institutions of higher education and other educational marine and ocean science organizations, and shall make available undersea research facilities, equipment, technologies, information, and expertise to support undersea research efforts by these organizations. The Director may also enter into partnerships, using existing authorities, with the private sector to achieve the goals of the program and to promote technological advancement of the marine industry.

SEC. 204. PROGRAM.

The program authorized under section 202 shall be conducted through a national headquarters, a network of extramural regional undersea research centers that represent all relevant National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration regions, and a national technology institute. Overall direction of the program will be provided by the program director in coordination with a Council of Center Directors comprised of the directors of the extramural regional centers and the National Institute for Undersea Science and Technology. Program direction shall be published not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 205. REGIONAL CENTERS AND INSTITUTE.

(a) PROGRAMS.—The following research, exploration, education, and technology programs shall be conducted through the network of extramural regional centers and the National Institute for Undersea Science and Technology:

(1) Core research and exploration based on national and regional undersea research priorities.

(2) Advanced undersea technology development to support the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's research mission and programs.

(3) Development, testing, and transition of advanced undersea technology associated with ocean observatories, submersibles, advanced diving technologies, remotely operated vehicles, autonomous underwater vehicles, and new sampling and sensing technologies.

(4) Undersea science-based education and outreach programs to enrich ocean science education and public awareness of the oceans and Great Lakes.

(5) Discovery, study, and development of natural products from ocean and aquatic systems.

(b) OPERATIONS.—Operation of the extramural regional centers and the National Institute for Undersea Science and Technology shall leverage partnerships and cooperative research with academia and private industry.

SEC. 206. COMPETITION.

(a) DISCRETIONARY FUND.—The program shall allocate no more than 10 percent of its annual budget to a discretionary fund that may be used only for program administration and priority undersea research projects identified by the Director but not covered by funding available from centers.

(b) COMPETITIVE SELECTION.—The Administrator shall conduct a competition to select the regional centers that will participate in the program five years after the date of enactment of this Act and every five years thereafter. Funding for projects conducted through the regional centers shall be awarded through a competitive, merit-reviewed process on the basis of their relevance to the goals of the program and their technical feasibility.

SEC. 207. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out this title—

(1) $17,500,000 for fiscal year 2008;
(2) $19,500,000 for fiscal year 2009;
(3) $21,500,000 for fiscal year 2010;
(4) $23,500,000 for fiscal year 2011;
(5) $25,500,000 for fiscal year 2012;
(6) $27,500,000 for fiscal year 2013; and
(7) $29,500,000 for fiscal year 2014.

TITLE III—INTERAGENCY FINANCING PLANNING AND COORDINATION

SEC. 301. INTERAGENCY FINANCING.

The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Science Foundation, the Department of the Navy, and other Federal agencies involved in the programs authorized under title I and II, are authorized to participate in interagency financing and share, transfer, receive, and spend funds appropriated to any Federal participant in the program for the purposes of carrying out any administrative or programmatic project or activity under this Act. Funds may be transferred among such departments and agencies through an appropriate instrument that specifies the goods, services, or space being acquired from another Federal participant and the costs thereof.

SEC. 302. OCEAN EXPLORATION AND UNDERSEA RESEARCH TECHNOLOGY AND INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE.

The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, in coordination with the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the United States Geological Survey, the Department of the Navy, the Mineral Management Service, and relevant governmental, non-governmental, academic, industry, and other experts, shall convene an ocean exploration and undersea research technology and infrastructure task force to develop and implement a strategy—

(1) to facilitate transfer of new exploration and undersea research technology to the programs authorized under titles I and II of this Act;

(2) to improve availability of communications infrastructure, including satellite capabilities, to such programs;

(3) to develop an integrated, workable, and comprehensive data management information processing system that will make information on unique and significant features obtained by such programs available for research and management purposes;

(4) to conduct public outreach activities that improve the public understanding of ocean science, resources, and processes, in conjunction with relevant programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Science Foundation, and other agencies; and

(5) to encourage cost-sharing partnerships with governmental and nongovernmental entities that will assist in transferring exploration and undersea research technology and technical expertise to the programs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1834, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1834, the National Ocean Exploration and National Undersea Research Program Act.

I would like to first thank our colleague, Representative SAXTON from the Natural Resources Committee, for his leadership on important ocean and Great Lakes issues. This is a good bill that will expand our knowledge of the ocean and provide information about the vast resources of the seas.

The coastal areas of our Nation support a wide variety of significant activities, but in many respects the oceans remain a mystery, with many areas unexplored. Marine scientists tell us that we haven't come close to tapping the resources available to us from the oceans. I hope that my colleagues today from both sides of the aisle will agree that we should steer research dollars to those fact-finding projects so that humanity might one day reap the benefits of our oceanic resources.

This bill provides the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, with the authorities and direction to support a vigorous ocean exploration program. The bill authorizes two programs to be carried out by NOAA. The Ocean Exploration Program will explore and survey the ocean and assess ocean and costal resources. The National Undersea Research Program will operate through a network of regional undersea research centers. Both of those programs have strong education and outreach programs.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1834 is a good bill. It is a product of a bipartisan effort to promote expanded appreciation

and knowledge of the oceans. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1834, the National Ocean Exploration Program Act.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, is the Nation's lead agency charged with conserving and managing our coastal and oceanic resources. As such, relevant and high-quality research and development is vital to NOAA's ability to better understand the marine ecosystems it manages. NOAA's ocean exploration efforts have been organized in a systematic and strategic manner in order to investigate the farthest depths of the Earth's oceans. NOAA's undersea research programs allow for direct access to undersea environments through submersibles and indirect observation through the use of robots and sea-floor observatories. These programs provide invaluable information that enables us to learn more about our environment that covers more than two-thirds of our planet.

H.R. 1834 authorizes two existing ocean programs: the Ocean Exploration Program and the National Undersea Research Program. Under this authorization, NOAA is required to work with the National Science Foundation to map out a coordinated national exploration program that promotes collaboration with other Federal ocean exploration programs to prevent duplicative efforts. This bill also requires NOAA to conduct an undersea research, exploration, education, and technology development program that coordinates with similar efforts of the academic and marine and ocean science communities.

Most of these research and exploration efforts are conducted by outside groups who receive grants and funding from NOAA. H.R. 1834 requires that such funding shall now be distributed through a competitive bid process. Competition for funding will encourage existing research centers to select their most valuable research projects and partner with each other on other research programs. This competition is essential to ensure that the best research programs and ideas are adequately funded, something that, unfortunately, has not always been the case in the past.

Madam Speaker, at a time when our Nation is struggling to divide resources among a greater number of programs, we cannot afford to allow spending on research programs that do not provide pertinent information related to NOAA's important mission. The authorizing of these two programs and the competitive grant process that is established in this bill will ensure that NOAA is able to fund only the most useful projects and leverage taxpayer dollars in a way that provides the most useful information to understanding and managing our ocean environment.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 1834.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield now such time as he may consume to my colleague JIM SAXTON from the State of New Jersey. He has a long and very well-established reputation here, and, by the way, this is part of his legislation.

Mr. SAXTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his kind remarks and great description, I might add, of the bill.

Madam Speaker, I obviously rise in strong support of H.R. 1834 and am very pleased that it's here under this bipartisan arrangement. It authorizes both the Ocean Exploration and National Undersea Research Programs in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

According to the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, about 95 percent of the ocean floor remains unexplored. This vast area teems with undiscovered species and natural and cultural resources. On virtually every expedition, oceanographers and explorers make fascinating new discoveries. Hydrothermal vents in the Pacific, numerous new species, and important archeological sites are but a few of the important discoveries made in the past 30 years.

Consequently, the report of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy recommended the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Science Foundation should lead and expand our national ocean exploration and undersea research programs.

I am proud to be the sponsor of H.R. 1834. I'm proud that it's a bipartisan piece of legislation, and I'm proud that it promotes implementation of the commission's recommendations.

This bill authorizes two important programs: the Ocean Exploration Program as well as the National Undersea Research Program, also known as NURP. The Ocean Exploration Program was created to investigate the oceans for the purpose of discovery and the advancement of knowledge. It is the NOAA program established to, first, explore and map the oceans unknown and poorly known living and nonliving resources and, second, to gain new insights about its physical, chemical, biological, and archeological characteristics.

Title I of the bill, the National Ocean Exploration Program Act, will create better coordination between NOAA and the National Science Foundation. The purposes of the act are to expand the ocean exploration to discover new marine substances that potentially have therapeutic benefits; to study the unique marine ecosystems, organisms, and the geology of the world's oceans; and to maximize ocean research effectiveness by integrating multiple scientific disciplines in the ocean science community.

A new element created by the legislation is an Ocean Exploration Advisory Board. The National Undersea Research Program is part of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research. As the Federal agency responsible for managing living marine and coastal organisms, NOAA requires a presence beneath the sea and the Great Lakes to better understand the systems under its management. NURP provides NOAA with the unique capability to access the undersea environment. NURP also provides scientists with the tools and expertise they need to investigate the undersea environment, including submersibles, remotely operated vehicles, autonomous underwater vehicles, mixed gas diving gear, underwater laboratories and observatories.

Title II of the bill, the National Undersea Research Program Act of 2007, formally authorizes the National Undersea Research Program for the first time, and we're very proud of this. The legislation creates a competitive process for the extramural undersea research centers to encourage the very best undersea research program for the United States.

Both of these programs authorized in this legislation are core to the mission of NOAA. I urge my colleagues to support this important bipartisan legislation.

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

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Mr. SAXTON for his work on this bill. I'm very happy we were able to work this through the Science and Technology Committee in a bipartisan manner, and I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1834 introduced by my colleague JIM SAXTON. This bill would authorize the national ocean exploration program and the national undersea research program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Our world is defined by its ocean. Planet Earth could be better named Planet Ocean. We are truly an ocean nation. In fact, more than half of the United States lies underwater and all people in the United States and in the world are affected by the ocean. The ocean helps control our climate, influences our weather, and affects our health.

The ocean gives us rain, oxygen, food, medicines, and minerals and energy sources. The ocean supports our nation's economy: it is a highway for transportation of goods and people. Even our national security is affected by the ocean.

Our ocean is important as a heritage to many cultures throughout the world and to our cultures throughout the United States. This one world ocean we all share is also a constant source of wonder and discovery.

In spite of its importance, little of the ocean has been explored. The ocean is our last and largest frontier. More is known about the moon

than is known about the deepest parts of the ocean.

This bill will add to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's ability to conduct research and exploration of the ocean. The bill will foster collaboration between the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of the Navy.

The ocean exploration program and the undersea exploration program will drive technological advances and will increase our knowledge about the ocean to help us understand how to best manage, use, and preserve this resource.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and show that the age of discovery is not over.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1834, to authorize the national ocean exploration prgram and the national undersea research program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

First and foremost, I want to commend my good friend Mr. JIM SAXTON of New Jersey and other cosponsors for introducing this important legislation. I also want to acknowledge the leadership for both the Committee on Natural Resources and the Comnrittee on Science and Technology.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1834, the National Ocean Exploration Program Act, is an important piece of legislation because it will expand ocean exploration and will be a key avenue in understanding better our marine ecosystems and coastal resources and, importantly, maximize effective research relating to the physical, chemical, and biological characteristics of our oceans and lakes. We have succeeded in embarking missions to space but have failed in studying the unknown in our very oceans.

This legislation will provide scientists the necessary equipment to investigate and explore the undersea environment and will allow NOAA to conduct archaeological and scientific voyages of historic shipwrecks and cultural sites important to our academic and local communities.

Again, I thank my colleagues for supporting this bipartisan legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1834, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. AKIN. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO THE FEDERAL INSECTICIDE, FUNGICIDE, AND RODENTICIDE ACT

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2571) to make technical corrections to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 2571

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

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO THE FEDERAL INSECTICIDE, FUNGICIDE, AND RODENTICIDE ACT.

(a) PESTICIDE REGISTRATION SERVICE FEES.—Section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(7)—

(A) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may exempt from, or waive a portion of, the registration service fee for an application for minor uses for a pesticide.''; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by inserting ''or exemption'' after ''waiver''; and

(B) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''WAIVER'' and inserting ''EXEMPTION'';

(ii) by striking ''waive the registration service fee for an application'' and inserting ''exempt an application from the registration service fee''; and

(iii) in clause (ii), by striking ''waiver'' and inserting ''exemption''; and

(2) in subsection (m)(2), by striking ''2008'' each place it appears and inserting ''2012''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) take effect on October 1, 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Senate bill 2571 provides a technical correction to the reauthorization of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act approved by the House and the Senate and that was signed by the President on October 9, 2007.

As my colleagues know, EPA is currently responsible for regulating the sale, use, and distribution of pesticides. In order to facilitate and expedite the approval process, pesticide manufacturers and other registrants have supplemented EPA's annual budget for a number of years. It's a win-win process for both the manufacturer and the end user and a clear example of good government at its best.

Unfortunately, EPA has interpreted the PRIA reauthorization approved by Congress to collect fees for chemicals that are not part of the Interregional Project Number 4, a popular research program that assesses tolerance levels for pest management chemicals applied on specialty crops. These IR–4 chemicals have historically been exempt from fees prior to the enactment of the PRIA reauthorization, and it was not the intention of the House nor the Senate to suddenly assess fees on all these chemicals.

This bill will simply restore the status quo for these particular products and reassert congressional intent.

Because the program fees are being assessed on IR–4 chemicals as we speak, it is vitally important to address this situation immediately. While the farm bill would be the natural vehicle to make this technical correction, EPA is currently unable to process any registration applications without these fees being paid. Therefore, while this fix is not controversial, it is extremely time sensitive, and the uncertainty of the farm bill process dictates that Congress must take action now.

Restoring congressional intent by passing this technical correction to PRIA will prevent delays and backups of applications and stop EPA from collecting and then reimbursing the fees for these chemicals.

It is important that we continue to encourage the type of public-private partnerships envisioned in PRIA. I urge my colleagues to support this technical fix and the underlying goals of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of S. 2571. Madam Speaker, last fall we passed Senate bill 1983, which reauthorized the highly successful Pesticide Registration Improvement Act. That act had been worked on by a number of Members in the House and Senate, including the chairmen and ranking members of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees as well as the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Horticulture and Organic Agriculture. In developing this legislation, we sought the advice and counsel of the administration, the affected industry, and the environmental community. I was very happy to have the unanimous endorsement of all interested parties as we moved forward with that bill.

As is not uncommon in working on complex legislation, language is included that is subject to interpretation, and in this particular case we included language intending to maintain an existing fee exemption for certain chemicals that have limited uses on specialty crops. Unfortunately, the EPA has interpreted the final language to mean that they would not be able to continue to offer this exemption. This bill that we are considering today would simply restore the status quo for these chemicals, as was the congressional intent.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

□ 1500

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I just want to thank my colleague, the

very capable and wise gentleman from Oklahoma who has been a great friend throughout the years that I have been here and thank him for his assistance in this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2571.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. LUCAS. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

PROTECT AMERICA ACT OF 2007 EXTENSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 976, proceedings will now resume on the bill (H.R. 5349) to extend the Protect America Act of 2007 for 21 days.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed earlier today, 13½ minutes remained in debate.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has 7 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I would begin by yielding myself as much time as I may consume.

Members of the House, after delaying consideration of the House-passed RESTORE Act for months, just last night the other body has passed a very troubling FISA bill. Their action comes only 3 days before the expiration of the temporary bill which expires this Saturday, and we have a number of problems with the legislation coming from the other side.

First, it provides blanket retroactive amnesty for telecom companies that took part in warrantless surveillance programs. Now I have never heard, in my legal experience, that retroactive immunity, or immunity of any kind, can be given when you don't know what it is being given for, and that presents quite a large problem. Then there is no FISA Court review of certain authorizations generally referred to as ''basket warrants'' until after the wiretapping starts. It creates a problem that we would use the additional 21 days that we are asking for, I think that would come under very close examination.

And then there are much weaker provisions on stopping other warrantless wiretapping, for example, reverse targeting of U.S. citizens and the question of sufficient congressional oversight.

So based on the documents that have been provided so far, and they are far from complete, I have letters of requests in great detail, the case for amnesty has really not been made.

The administration's bluster and fear-mongering don't do any of us very well. That doesn't serve the purpose of our legislative function and our relationship with the several branches of government. And it should be understood as perhaps another attempt to use national security for partisan ends.

The administration's view is that the President, as Commander in Chief, can spy on Americans in the United States without a warrant, a proposition that is very seriously contested by many of our constitutional and civil liberties authorities. Congress is committed to providing the executive branch the tools it needs. But we need to do so to make sure that the power to spy on Americans is not subject to abuse or misuse. All of us in this body think that that is of paramount concern.

The administration has requested that the Congress rubber-stamp its proposed legislation but has refused to provide Congress the information that would even purport to support the legislation. It is the administration that has unfortunately played politics with this issue. The administration still hasn't provided us with all of our requested documents.

Just yesterday, another letter was sent requesting the same information we have been asking for for so long. The House can't simply be stonewalled or ignored. And it cannot exercise its constitutional responsibility and then be bullied to rubber-stamp complicated and important legislation that impacts on national security.

We hope that the measure before us today will be passed resoundingly in a bipartisan way.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Madam Speaker, this extension does nothing more than contribute uncertainty to our intelligence community and put our foreign surveillance activities at risk. We have a bill we can pass right now. Yesterday, the Senate approved its bipartisan FISA bill by an overwhelming majority of 68–29. The Senate bill addresses the concerns of our intelligence community and has strong bipartisan support.

The intelligence community needs a long-term fix to gaps in our intelligence laws now, not 21 days from now. What message does it send that we lack confidence in our intelligence community? Why are we making ourselves vulnerable to those who want to hurt us? Spies and terrorists don't operate by deadlines and sunsets. Neither should our intelligence laws.

We cannot allow the Protect America Act to expire and return to the status quo, unable to begin any new foreign surveillance. The time to act is now. Another extension represents a failure by the House Democratic majority to protect the American people.

We should reject this extension and urge the Democratic leadership to allow the House to consider the Senate bill, which has majority support in the House.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I reserve my time at this point.

□ 1515

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

Madam Speaker, what we try to do in the Intelligence Committee is to define the threat that is out there. We know that radical jihadists, al Qaeda, that it is a real threat. We attempt to provide our intelligence community with the tools that are necessary to give us, as policymakers, and others the information that is necessary to keep America safe. And at least some of us are in the business of prevention, making sure that there is not another successful attack against the United States; others are in the mode of, well, let another attack, if it happens, we want to be in a position to prosecute.

When we get down to FISA, I went through this earlier, October 25, 2001; November 14, 2001; March 5, 2002; June 12, 2002, Members of the House of Representatives were briefed on this program. Our Speaker of the House was briefed on this program, understanding what the program was, or hopefully understanding or at least asking the questions to get understanding about what the program was, what it intended to do, and the kind of information it was going to get, and the legal boundaries, the legal ramifications, and who was participating in these programs.

Now what they want to do and some want to do is throw these companies that were the Good Samaritans that decided they were going to help us, just throw them under the bus, even though, on a bipartisan basis, the legislative branch and the executive branch asked these folks and decided that these were the things that needed to be done.

The impact of this is this is having a chilling effect on all of those individuals and corporations that, from time to time, are being asked to help to keep us safe. It is like saying we saw what you did to these other folks. We are not going to be next. We are going to have to wield a fiduciary responsibility to our shareholders.

Again, it is the tradition and the experience and background of what some want to do to the intelligence community. Under President Clinton, there were massive cuts in the intelligence community. We devastated the community through the Deutch doctrine, where we cut back on human assets. And now we are doing it again. We won't give the intelligence community the tools that they need. We focus on global warming and we focus on partisan investigations. That will not keep America safe.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me the time. I thank him as well for his leadership. I thank Mr. REYES for his leadership. And, yes, I thank Mr. HOEKSTRA for his leadership as well, as well as Mr. SMITH.

This is a very serious issue we confront today. This bill passed the Senate less than 24 hours ago; yet this coequal branch of the government of the United States is asked to do what the minority when it was in the majority would never have done, to take exactly what the Senate tells us to take, or, frankly, what the President tells us to take.

Now, let me say that we passed a bill November 15, 3 months ago, which gave the FISA Court and which gave the intelligence community everything they needed, given the technological changes and given the demands of keeping America safe. Everything. The Senate passed a bill out of their committee at about the same time.

But I want to tell my friends on the other side of the aisle, in the Senate you have been slow-walking this bill. You have been slow-walking this bill to put us in the position we find ourselves in today. And you did it because the issue here is not the intelligence community, as Mr. HOEKSTRA talked about. It is the telecommunications companies. That is what the issue is here. Because title I would have been conferenced months ago. But, no, we do not want to apparently look very closely at what happened between the administration and the telecommunications companies.

Now, we passed a statute which said to the telecommunications companies, look, when we make phone calls, they need to be private and you can't disclose those to people, including the government, without a court order. We passed the FISA Court bill specifically to provide for the ability of our intelligence community to intercept communications, but to do so under the aegis of a court. That is what we do in America. It makes us a little different. Some governments, of course, do willy-nilly whatever they want to do.

This is not just about FISA. We incarcerate people without hearings, without lawyers. We torture people, contrary to the edicts of the international law, rationalized by an Attorney General of the United States in a memo to the President of the United States.

But I tell my friends that nobody in this institution ought to have any self-respect if what you are saying is we ought not to go to conference on this important issue, which is what you say by voting against this extension. This extension is caused almost solely by the members of the President's party in the United States Senate who would not allow this legislation to move more quickly in the Senate.

Madam Speaker, I believe our friends on the other side of the aisle and the President of the United States are taking an untenable position. And what is that position? On the one hand, if the Protect America Act expires, America will be at risk. On the other hand, if we extend and keep in force the Protect America Act, the President says he will veto it. Now, I don't know what kind of Lewis Carroll logic that is, but it certainly escapes me. If in fact, and I don't agree with the President, but if in fact it is important to keep the Protect America Act in place, then passing this extension is the best way to do so.

Now, I think there are some things that we can discuss in conference. I, frankly, have told the White House as late as just a few hours ago that I think we can discuss possible ways to move forward on this, because there is not a person on this floor that doesn't want to protect America, that doesn't want to facilitate the interception of communications valuable to that objective of protecting America and Americans.

I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this extension, just as we did by unanimous consent essentially without a vote just a few weeks ago. The contemplation then was that the Senate would act. But the Senate did not act. It did not act until less than 24 hours ago, last night, late afternoon, and now we are confronted with take it or leave it.

Do we have no self-respect in this institution? Do we have no sense of responsibility to oversee that which has been passed, to go to conference and discuss our differences? There are differences, as you know. I would hope that every Member would say to themselves, yes, we have that kind of self-respect, and we understand our responsibility as an independent House of the Congress of the United States.

The logic of the opponents of this legislation, as I said, escapes me. The Protect America Act is imperative, they say, but they oppose its extension, as I said.

Madam Speaker, I support this 21-day extension. I want everybody on this House floor to understand that if we have a 21-day extension, I am hopeful that we will go to conference, I am hopeful the Senate will agree to a conference, and I am hopeful that we can engage Republicans and Democrats on the Intelligence Committee, on the Judiciary Committee, in an honest conference trying to resolve our differences and pass legislation that helps protect America. I want to remind my colleagues that this body has already passed reauthorization, so there is no need to do that. We are ready for conference right now.

So, Madam Speaker, in closing, let me urge every Member of this House, whether you are for or against the Protect America Act, whether you are for or against immunity, whether you are for or against title I of this bill, vote for this extension, just as you would vote for a CR and not shut down the government in order to give us time to pass appropriation bills fully. That is what this is, simply to give us 3 weeks, 10 days of which we won't be here, to address this very thorny issue on which there are legitimate differences of opinion.

The only other thing one could conclude is simply we are taking the position of ''Take it or leave it, House. Don't exercise your judgment, House. Don't meet your responsibilities to the American people, House.''

That is not what our constituents expect us to do. Vote for this extension.

Madam Speaker, I believe our friends on the other side of the aisle and the President of the United States are taking an untenable position on this legislation to provide a 21-day extension of the Protect America Act. On one hand, they argue that the extension of the PAA is vital to our national security. Yet, on the other hand, they come to this floor and oppose—and the President is threatening to veto—the 21-day extension of the PAA.

The logic of the opponents of this legislation escapes me. The PAA is imperative, they say. But they oppose its extension?

Madam Speaker, I support this 21-day extension. Here's why: it represents progress toward a final measure to modernize the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

I want to remind my colleagues that this body has already passed legislation to reauthorize FISA. On November 15—3 months ago this Friday—the House passed the Restore Act, a bill that modernizes the technologically outdated FISA statute, gives the intelligence community the authority to intercept critical foreign communications, and honors our constitutional principles.

As we all know, this is a complicated issue. That is precisely why we're doing this extension today. With this vote, we are declaring that we will not just take whatever legislation the Senate sends us and rubber-stamp it. We are declaring that this body has a prerogative and a role in making law.

The bottom line is: responsible people in both Chambers want an opportunity to work out the differences between the House and Senate bills.

Let me close by saying, I do not agree with those who contend that the expiration of the PAA will jeopardize our national security. And, I am not alone in this view.

For example, Richard Clarke, the former chief National Security Council counterterrorism advisor to Presidents Clinton and George W. Bush, has stated (and I quote):

Our ability to track and monitor terrorists overseas would not cease should the Protect

America Act expire. If this were true, the President would not threaten to terminate any temporary extension with his veto pen. All surveillance currently occurring would continue even after legislative provisions lapsed because authorizations issued under the act are in effect up to a full year.

And, Kenneth Wainstein, the Assistant Attorney General for National Security, recently said in an interview—according to the New York Times—that if the PAA expires, intelligence officials would still be able to continue eavesdropping on already approved targets for another year under the law.

We must not fall prey to fearmongers who claim that our intelligence community could "go dark." That is simply not true.

I urge my colleagues: pass this 21-day extension of the PAA so that we may try to work out our differences with the Senate-passed legislation, and enact legislation that protects our national security and the constitutional rights of the American people.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, 3 minutes, to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN), who has some instructive math to share with us.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I listened closely to the words of my friend from Maryland just a moment ago, and I want to assure him that I do have self-respect and I have respect for this institution. I would not have returned here after a 16-year absence if I had any other feeling. But I returned to this place because of the aftermath of 9/11, feeling that those of us who thought we might make a contribution to the defense of this Nation in whatever way we could ought to do that. And based on that, I will have to tell you, this issue is probably one of the two or three most important issues that I have dealt with since I returned to this institution.

We cannot and we will not continue to protect the American people if we are absent that kind of quality intelligence that is necessary for us to be able to figure out what the threat is and to figure out what the threat is before that threat is acted upon by the enemy. That is why this is so important. And integral to our being successful in doing that is being able to ask for assistance by those who have in their power to give assistance.

That is why it is so important, the matter the gentleman from Maryland referred to, the question of whether or not we would grant immunity to those companies who said yes when the American Government came to them in the aftermath of 9/11 and said we need your help. Without your help, it is impossible for us to get that kind of information that we will be able to utilize to be able to prevent another 9/11.

Now, the gentleman from Maryland said we haven't had enough time. I would suggest as one of the 19 members of the Judiciary Committee, I was given the opportunity, as were Members on your side of the aisle, to review that material that you say we haven't had for a long enough period of time. Interestingly enough, we have had 1 day short of 3 weeks to look at that material. So what makes anybody think if we are given 3 more weeks, 3 more weeks, that the majority side will say that is enough?

The gentleman from Maryland says he doesn't support the Protect America Act, but we are being asked on the floor to extend it for 3 more weeks. The gentleman from Maryland says just 3 more weeks. The vast majority of Members on your side of the aisle voted against it.

So how do we get to a majority position in this House dealing with that necessity of gaining this information while protecting the civil liberties of our fellow citizens? Maybe it is instructive to look at the letter dated January 28 signed by 21 Members of your side of the aisle asking the Speaker of the House to allow us to vote on, what, the very bill passed by the Senate yesterday. The very bill passed by the Senate yesterday was the subject of the letter by 21 Members of your side of the aisle. If you add those Members to our side of the aisle, that is a majority.

Allow us to vote on that up or down. Allow the majority will of this House to be done.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, we have the right to close. Are there any more speakers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

□ 1530

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker and Members of the House, what we have discussed this afternoon is far too important to rush the legislative process. I hope we will rise above partisanship today and act responsibly to defend the Constitution as we have all taken an oath to do. And so I urge the bipartisan passage of the measure that has been debated.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5349, to extend the Protect America Act of 2007 for 21 days. Let me be clear that while I do not support legislation that grants legal immunity to telecommunications companies that provide information to Federal investigators without a warrant, I recognize that the current legislation is set to expire this Saturday, February 16th. Although I do not support the Protect America Act, we need more time to work with our colleagues in the Senate on the substance of this legislation in order to ensure that we reconcile the Senate language with the RESTORE Act (H.R. 3773), which we passed in the House on November 15, 2007.

I would like to thank my Senate colleague Senator FEINGOLD, from Wisconsin, for his diligent work in trying to amend this legislation to protect American civil liberties, both at home and abroad.

Homeland security is not a Democratic or a Republican issue, it is not a House or Senate issue; it is an issue for all Americans—all of us.

The original legislation offered by the House Majority gave the Administration everything that they needed, but what the Senate is proposing virtually throws our Bill of Rights out the window, because they are telling Americans that no matter what your business is, you are subject to the unchecked scrutiny of the Attorney General without judicial intervention.

I am disheartened by the other body for their failure to recognize that we can secure America by passing responsible electronic surveillance legislation that does not compromise our civil liberties.

Madam Speaker, in August of this year, I strongly opposed S. 1927, the so-called "Protect America Act" (PAA) when it came to a vote on the House floor. Had the Bush administration and the Republican-dominated 109th Congress acted more responsibly in the 2 preceding years, we would not have been in the position of debating legislation that had such a profoundly negative impact on the national security and on American values and civil liberties in the crush of exigent circumstances. As that regrettable episode clearly showed, it is true as the saying goes that haste makes waste.

The PAA was stampeded through the Congress in the midnight hour of the last day before the long August recess on the dubious claim that it was necessary to fill a gap in the Nation's intelligence gathering capabilities identified by Director of National Intelligence Mike McConnell. But in reality it would have eviscerated the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution and represented an unwarranted transfer of power from the courts to the Executive Branch and a Justice Department led at that time by an Attorney General whose reputation for candor and integrity was, to put it charitably, subject to considerable doubt.

The RESTORE Act, H.R. 3773, is superior to the PAA by orders of magnitude. This is due in no small measure, Madam Speaker, to the willingness of the leadership to reach out to and work with all members of the House. The result shows. The RESTORE Act does not weaken our Nation's commitment to its democratic traditions. Rather, it represents a sound policy proposal for achieving the only legitimate goals of a terrorist surveillance program, which is to ensure that American citizens and persons in America are secure in their persons, papers, and effects, but terrorists throughout the world are made insecure. Let me direct the attention of all members to several of the more important aspects of this salutary legislation.

First, H.R. 3773 explicitly affirms that the exclusive law to follow with respect to authorizing foreign surveillance gathering on U.S. soil is the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA). As initially enacted by Congress in 1978, the exclusivity of FISA was undisputed and unambiguous. I hasten to add, however, that while FISA remains the exclusive source of law, H.R. 3773 recognizes that the law as enacted in 1978 can and should be adapted to modem circumstances and to accommodate new technologies. And it does so by making clear that foreign-to-foreign communications are not subject to the FISA, even though modern technology enables that communication to be routed through the United States.

Second, under H.R. 3773, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC) is indispensable and is accorded a meaningful role in ensuring compliance with the law. The bill ensures that the FISC is empowered to act as an Article III court should act, which means the court shall operate neither as a rubber-

stamp nor a bottleneck. Rather, the function of the court is to validate the lawful exercise of executive power on the one hand, and to act as the guardian of individual rights and liberties on the other.

Third, the bill does not grant amnesty to any telecommunications company or to any other entity or individual that helped federal intelligence agencies spy illegally on innocent Americans. I strongly support this provision because granting such blanket amnesty for past misconduct will have the unintended consequence of encouraging telecommunications companies to comply with, rather than contest, illegal requests to spy on Americans. The only permissible path to legalization of conduct in this area is full compliance with the requirements of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Moreover, Madam Speaker, it is important to point out that the loudest demands for blanket immunity come not from the telecommunications companies but from the Administration, which raises the interesting question of whether the Administration's real motivation is to shield from public disclosure the ways and means by which government officials may have ''persuaded'' telecommunications companies to assist in its warrantless surveillance programs. I call my colleagues' attention to an article published in the Washington Post in which it is reported that Joseph Nacchio, the former CEO of Qwest, alleges that his company was denied NSA contracts after he declined in a February 27, 2001 meeting at Fort Meade with National Security Agency (NSA) representatives to give the NSA customer calling records.

Madam Speaker, the authorization to conduct foreign surveillance on U.S. soil provided by H.R. 3773 is temporary and will expire in 2 years if not renewed by the Congress. This is perhaps the single most important limitation on the authority conferred on the Executive Branch by this legislation. The good and sufficient reason for imposing this limitation is because the threats to America's security and the liberties of its people will change over time and thus require constant vigilance by the people's representatives in Congress.

To give a detailed illustration of just how superior the RESTORE Act is to the ill-considered and hastily enacted Protect America Act, I wish to take a few moments to discuss an important improvement in the bill that was adopted in the full Judiciary Committee markup.

The Jackson Lee amendment added during the markup made a constructive contribution to the RESTORE Act by laying down a clear, objective criterion for the administration to follow and the FISA court to enforce in preventing reverse targeting.

''Reverse targeting,'' a concept well known to members of this Committee but not so well understood by those less steeped in the arcana of electronic surveillance, is the practice where the government targets foreigners without a warrant while its actual purpose is to collect information on certain U.S. persons.

One of the major concerns that libertarians and classical conservatives, as well as progressives and civil liberties organizations, have with the PAA is that the understandable temptation of national security agencies to engage in reverse targeting may be difficult to resist in the absence of strong safeguards in the PAA to prevent it.

My amendment reduces even further any such temptation to resort to reverse targeting by requiring the administration to obtain a regular, individualized FISA warrant whenever the ''real'' target of the surveillance is a person in the United States.

The amendment achieves this objective by requiring the Administration to obtain a regular FISA warrant whenever a ''significant purpose of an acquisition is to acquire the communications of a specific person reasonably believed to be located in the United States.'' The current language in the bill provides that a warrant be obtained only when the Government ''seeks to conduct electronic surveillance'' of a person reasonably believed to be located in the United States.

It was far from clear how the operative language ''seeks to'' is to be interpreted. In contrast, the language used in my amendment, ''significant purpose,'' is a term of art that has long been a staple of FISA jurisprudence and thus is well known and readily applied by the agencies, legal practitioners, and the FISA Court. Thus, the Jackson Lee amendment provides a clearer, more objective, criterion for the Administration to follow and the FISA court to enforce to prevent the practice of reverse targeting without a warrant, which all of us can agree should not be permitted.

Let us be clear, Madam Speaker, that nothing in the bill or in my amendment requires the Government to obtain a FISA order for every overseas target on the off chance that they might pick up a call into or from the United States. Rather, the bill requires, as our amendment makes clear, a FISA order only where there is a particular, known person in the United States at the other end of the foreign target's calls in whom the Government has a significant interest such that a significant purpose of the surveillance has become to acquire that person's communications.

This will usually happen over time and the Government will have the time to get an order while continuing its surveillance. And it is the national security interest to require it to obtain an order at that point, so that it can lawfully acquire all of the target person's communications rather than continuing to listen to only some of them.

The Jackson Lee amendment gives the Government precisely what Director of National Intelligence McConnell asked for when he testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee:

> It is very important to me; it is very important to members of this Committee. We should be required—we should be required in all cases to have a warrant anytime there is surveillance of a U.S. [sic] person located in the United States.

In short, the Jackson Lee amendment makes a good bill even better. For this reason alone, civil libertarians should enthusiastically embrace the RESTORE Act.

Nearly two centuries ago, Alexis de Tocqueville, who remains the most astute student of American democracy, observed that the reason democracies invariably prevail in any martial conflict is because democracy is the governmental form that best rewards and encourages those traits that are indispensable to martial success: initiative, innovation, resourcefulness, and courage.

As I wrote in the Politico, ''the best way to win the war on terror is to remain true to our democratic traditions. If it retains its democratic character, no nation and no loose confederation of international villains will defeat the United States in the pursuit of its vital interests.''

Thus, the way forward to victory in the war on terror is for the United States country to redouble its commitment to the Bill of Rights and the democratic values which every American will risk his or her life to defend. It is only by preserving our attachment to these cherished values that America will remain forever the home of the free, the land of the brave, and the country we love.

I would ask my colleagues to support this 21-day extension so that we may work together as a body, Members of both the House and the Senate to provide our citizens with the protections they so richly deserve. We need to have time to reconcile the differences between the House and the Senate in order to ensure that the important provisions of the RESTORE Act protecting the constitutional rights of Americans is preserved. I ask my colleagues to support the Bill of Rights and national security by supporting the 21-day extension in H.R. 5349.

Madam Speaker, FISA has served the Nation well for nearly 30 years, placing electronic surveillance inside the United States for foreign intelligence and counter-intelligence purposes on a sound legal footing, and I am far from persuaded that it needs to be jettisoned.

First, I was prepared to accept temporarily obviating the need to obtain a court order for foreign-to-foreign communications that pass through the United States. However, I continue to insist upon individual warrants, based on probable cause, when surveillance is directed at people in the United States. This can be negotiated during this 21-day extension period.

The Attorney General must still be required to submit procedures for international surveillance to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court for approval, but the FISA Court should not be allowed to issue a ''basket warrant'' without making individual determinations about foreign surveillance.

In all candor, Madam Speaker, I must restate my firm conviction that when it comes to the track record of this President's warrantless surveillance programs, there is still not enough on the public record about the nature and effectiveness of those programs, or the trustworthiness of this administration, to indicate that they require a blank check from Congress.

The Bush administration did not comply with its legal obligation under the National Security Act of 1947 to keep the Intelligence Committees ''fully and currently informed'' of U.S. intelligence activities. Congress cannot continue to rely on incomplete information from the Bush administration or revelations in the media. It must conduct a full and complete inquiry into electronic surveillance in the United States and related domestic activities of the NSA, both those that occur within FISA and those that occur outside FISA.

The inquiry must not be limited to the legal questions. It must include the operational details of each program of intelligence surveillance within the United States, including: (1) Who the NSA is targeting; (2) how it identifies its targets; (3) the information the program collects and disseminates; and most important, (4) whether the program advances national security interests without unduly compromising the privacy rights of the American people.

Given the unprecedented amount of information Americans now transmit electronically and the post-9/11 loosening of regulations governing information sharing, the risk of intercepting and disseminating the communications of ordinary Americans is vastly increased, requiring more precise—not looser—standards, closer oversight, new mechanisms for minimization, and limits on retention of inadvertently intercepted communications.

Madam Speaker, the legislation before us is only necessary to give this body time to work with our colleagues in the Senate. The 21-day extension will give us time to impress upon the Senate, how important it is to protect the civil rights of all Americans.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in a vote of support of this 21-day extension. H.R. 5349 gives us time to amend the unwise and ill-considered reauthorization of the Protect America Act of 2007.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5349, a twenty one day extension of the Protect America Act. I believe that this short term extension is necessary to achieve a long term solution to update our foreign surveillance laws in a manner that will protect the civil liberties of Americans.

I voted against the Protect America Act last August because I believe that it seriously compromises the civil liberties of Americans. I am still opposed to it as a permanent solution to our need to conform our surveillance laws to changes in telecommunication technology. Fortunately, it was scheduled to sunset in 6 months to provide additional time to correct our foreign surveillance law in a balanced manner.

The House passed such a balanced bill, H.R. 3773, the RESTORE Act, in November. I voted for this bill because I believe that it establishes the proper balance between the protection of civil liberties and the needs of our intelligence agencies to have access to critical information. Unfortunately, the Senate passed their bill yesterday giving us no time to reconcile the differences between the respective bills. Moreover, I have serious objections to the Senate bill which is dramatically different than its House counterpart.

Significant work must be done to harmonize these bills in a manner that will be acceptable to me. Consequently, it is necessary to provide additional time for the committees of jurisdiction to craft a balanced bicameral solution.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to H.R. 5349, which extends the Protect America Act. Last August, I joined 182 of my colleagues in opposing the Protect America Act. I opposed the PAA then because I felt it did not adequately protect our civil liberties from a continually over-reaching executive branch. The Bush administration has repeatedly tried, and with some degree of success, to extend its powers in ways that I believe encroach on our civil liberties. This legislation continues to allow these surveillance activities without providing adequate safeguards to protect Americans from this encroachment on their civil liberties.

The passage of the PAA was hasty and ill-conceived. Our intelligence community will not stop its activities should this bill expire. In fact, the PAA explicitly states that authorizations issued prior to its expiration would remain in effect until their expiration. Knowing that our Nation can continue to protect itself until more balanced legislation is passed, I can not support this extension.

Last November, the House took a stand and passed the RESTORE Act, a strong bill that gives our intelligence community the resources it needs to do its job, but also ensures that our Constitutionally guaranteed rights remain intact. Because the RESTORE Act was able to achieve all these purposes, I was able to support its passage. Because the PAA does not achieve this balance, I cannot agree to let it remain our rule of law. I continue to believe that we must have the best possible intelligence to protect our nation, but that it can be done in a manner that does not uproot the basic rights and principles guaranteed to us by our Founding Fathers. I look forward to working with my colleagues to build on the RESTORE Act.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 976, the bill is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Smith of Texas moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 5349, to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the text of the bill H.R. 3773 as passed by the Senate on February 12, 2008.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CONYERS. The motion to recommit is not germane to the bill under consideration and therefore should not be considered.

H.R. 5349 seeks a 21-day extension of the Protect America Act as previously amended, thus amending the act so that it would expire not 195 days but 216 days after enactment.

The motion to recommit goes beyond the scope of the bill, and beyond the scope of the Protect America Act the bill temporarily extends, to make permanent changes to the FISA law, including retroactive legal amnesty for telecom companies who may have broken the law in cooperating with earlier surveillance activities. Because it goes beyond the scope of the bill and deals with a different purpose, it is not germane.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Democratic majority is insisting on a procedural objection to block consideration of this motion to recommit. This motion substitutes the bipartisan bill passed yesterday by the Senate 68–29 to improve FISA, a bill that would dramatically improve our national security. It is sad to see the Democratic majority put procedure over substance when it comes to protecting Americans from terrorists.

There is nothing more germane to the security of the American people than to take up the Senate bill as quickly as possible. Therefore, I would ask the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to withdraw his point of order and allow for an up or down vote on the bipartisan Senate reform bill. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order and allow us to take a vote on a bill supported by both parties in the Senate, the administration, and many Democrats in the House.

Again, I would like to reiterate my disappointment that the majority has raised a point of order against this motion to recommit. We need to stop playing procedural games with our national security and take a vote now on the Senate-passed bill to improve FISA.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I have never violated parliamentary procedure, and I would insist upon the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Michigan makes a point of order that the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Texas proposes an amendment that is not germane to the bill.

Clause 7 of rule XVI provides that no proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

The bill, H.R. 5349, extends the Protect America Act of 2007 for a limited time.

The instructions contained in the motion to recommit propose permanent changes in law.

A general principle of the germaneness rule is that where a bill is composed only of a temporary extension of existing programs, an amendment making permanent changes in law relating to such programs is not germane.

The Chair will note a relevant precedent. On December 2, 1982, the Chair ruled that an amendment permanently changing the organic law governing an agency's operation was not germane to a bill that merely provided a temporary authorization for the agency. This precedent is recorded on page 722 of the House Rules and Manual.

Therefore, in the opinion of the Chair, the instructions contained in the motion to recommit are not germane. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to appeal the Speaker's ruling.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is: ''Will the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?''

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I move to table.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and if arising without further debate or proceedings in recommital; and motions to suspend the rules with regard to House Resolution 960 and House Resolution 917.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 196, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—222

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

NAYS—196

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
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
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Gilchrest
Hinojosa
Honda
Lowey
McGovern
Ortiz
Pickering
Renzi
Ruppersberger
Towns

□ 1602

Messrs. ADERHOLT, KINGSTON, INGLIS of South Carolina and CARNEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 960. The vote on the motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 917 will be taken later.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 229, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

AYES—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pastor
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Rush

Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—229

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costello
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothman
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Waters
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Gilchrest
Hinojosa
Honda
Lowey
Ortiz
Pickering
Renzi
Ruppersberger
Towns

□ 1611

So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE CHAMPION NEW YORK GIANTS FOR WINNING SUPER BOWL XLII

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 960, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 960.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 1, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—412

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

NAYS—1

Murphy, Patrick

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Kagen
Shea-Porter

NOT VOTING—13

Blackburn
Ellison
Gilchrest
Hinojosa
Honda
Lowey

Ortiz	Ruppersberger	Waters
Pickering	Stark	
Renzi	Towns	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1619

Mr. WELCH of Vermont changed his vote from ''present'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING ROB COGORNO

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute out of order.)

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, over the years, we have been greatly advantaged by some extraordinary people who work with us and for us. I have been particularly advantaged as the minority whip with an extraordinary man who has worked for me now for 5 years. Prior to that, he worked for Dick Gephardt for many years and has been on this floor working on behalf of not only the majority side or the minority side, depending on what the Democrats were, but also in trying to make sure that this institution talked to one another and worked together as well as it possibly could.

He is going to be retiring now after 25 years of service to this institution. He's been a congressional staffer since 1983. He has served as floor director for the majority leader since January of 2007, myself. In that capacity, he has been responsible for scheduling bills and managing the daily legislative program. He's provided tremendous legislative advice to so many of you on the floor who have gone to him and asked him for his counsel. He's provided policy advice to our side of the aisle and policy discussion with your side of the aisle, and he has also been a communications counsel.

There is nobody who knows this young man who does not like him. He is a decent, good, very smart, wonderful human being.

He served as floor director in my office, as I said, for 4 years. Prior to that, Rob was the chief appropriations staffer for former Democratic Leader Dick Gephardt, and he also worked for Representatives ROSA DELAURO and PETER VISCLOSKY. In those positions, his primary areas of focus included appropriations, global health, and foreign assistance.

During his career, Rob also worked for former Senator Brock Adams and former Representatives Jimmy Hayes, Cathy Long, and Gillis Long.

Rob is a graduate of the University of California Berkeley with a bachelor's degree in physiology and earned a master's in public policy at the University of Washington, and before that, was floor director for the Democratic whip's office.

All of us have deep affection for those people who spend extraordinary amounts of time at pay, which is not comparable to what they would be earning in the private sector. And I want to say, Rob Cogorno, to you, how very much I appreciate all that you have done for this institution, all that you have done for me as an individual, and I know I speak for all of the Members that we will greatly miss your advice and your counsel, your good humor and your good judgment. And we say to you, we wish you the very best of luck in everything you do.

I might also say that the young man who just gave me another piece of paper with some business is Rob's successor, and I urge Members of both sides of the aisle when he can be helpful to you, give you advice in terms of scheduling or the calendar in terms of when we are doing business, Alejandro Perez, my new floor director.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 293) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 293

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, February 14, 2008, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Friday, February 15, 2008, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Friday, February 15, 2008, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, February 19, 2008, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Tuesday, February 19, 2008, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until noon on Thursday, February 21, 2008, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, February 21, 2008, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, February 25, 2008, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Friday, February 15, 2008, through Friday, February 22, 2008, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, February 25, 2008, or such other time on that day as may be specified in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on H. Con. Res 293 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 917.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 203, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

AYES—215

Abercrombie	Edwards	Lynch
Allen	Ellison	Mahoney (FL)
Altmire	Emanuel	Maloney (NY)
Andrews	Engel	Markey
Arcuri	Eshoo	Marshall
Baca	Etheridge	Matheson
Baird	Farr	Matsui
Baldwin	Fattah	McCarthy (NY)
Barrow	Filner	McCollum (MN)
Becerra	Frank (MA)	McDermott
Berkley	Gonzalez	McGovern
Berman	Gordon	McIntyre
Berry	Green, Al	McNerney
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	McNulty
Bishop (NY)	Grijalva	Meek (FL)
Blumenauer	Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)
Boren	Hall (NY)	Melancon
Boswell	Hare	Michaud
Boucher	Harman	Miller (NC)
Boyd (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Mollohan
Braley (IA)	Hill	Moore (KS)
Brown, Corrine	Hinchey	Moore (WI)
Butterfield	Hirono	Moran (VA)
Capps	Hodes	Murphy (CT)
Capuano	Holden	Murtha
Cardoza	Holt	Nadler
Carnahan	Hooley	Napolitano
Carney	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Castor	Inslee	Oberstar
Chandler	Israel	Obey
Clarke	Jackson (IL)	Olver
Clay	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pallone
Cleaver	Jefferson	Pascrell
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Pastor
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Paul
Conyers	Jones (NC)	Payne
Cooper	Jones (OH)	Perlmutter
Costa	Kagen	Peterson (MN)
Costello	Kanjorski	Pomeroy
Courtney	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Cramer	Kennedy	Rahall
Crowley	Kildee	Rangel
Cuellar	Kilpatrick	Reyes
Cummings	Kind	Richardson
Davis (AL)	Klein (FL)	Rodriguez
Davis (CA)	Lampson	Ross
Davis (IL)	Langevin	Rothman
Davis, Lincoln	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Rush
DeGette	Lee	Ryan (OH)
Delahunt	Levin	Salazar
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Dicks	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	Loebsack	Sarbanes
Doggett	Lofgren, Zoe	Schakowsky
Doyle		

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

NOES—203

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
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
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
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
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Ackerman
Gilchrest
Hinojosa
Honda
Lowey
Ortiz
Pickering
Renzi
Ruppersberger
Towns

□ 1646

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

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL ENGINEERS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 917, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 917.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—408

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

NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman
Berman
Braley (IA)
Clarke
English (PA)
Gilchrest
Hinojosa
Honda
Lowey
McCrery
Ortiz
Pickering
Radanovich
Renzi
Royce
Ruppersberger
Sherman
Towns
Waxman
Welch (VT)

□ 1655

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

HONORING AND PRAISING THE NAACP ON ITS 99TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 289) honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 99th anniversary.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 289

Whereas the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), originally known as the National Negro Committee, was founded in New York City on February 12, 1909, the centennial of Abraham Lincoln's birth, by a multiracial group of activists who answered 'The Call' for a national conference to discuss the civil and political rights of African-Americans;

Whereas the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was founded by a distinguished group of leaders in the struggle for civil and political liberty, including Ida Wells-Barnett, W.E.B. DuBois, Henry Moscowitz, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villiard, and William English Walling;

Whereas the NAACP is the oldest and largest civil rights organization in the United States;

Whereas the mission of the NAACP is to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of rights of all persons and to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination;

Whereas the NAACP is committed to achieving its goals through nonviolence;

Whereas the NAACP advances its mission through reliance upon the press, the petition, the ballot, and the courts, and has been persistent in the use of legal and moral persuasion, even in the face of overt and violent racial hostility;

Whereas the NAACP has used political pressure, marches, demonstrations, and effective lobbying to serve as the voice, as well as the shield, for minority Americans;

Whereas after years of fighting segregation in public schools, the NAACP, under the leadership of Special Counsel Thurgood Marshall, won one of its greatest legal victories in the Supreme Court's 1954 decision in Brown v. Board of Education;

Whereas in 1955, NAACP member Rosa Parks was arrested and fined for refusing to give up her seat on a segregated bus in Montgomery, Alabama—an act of courage that would serve as the catalyst for the largest grassroots civil rights movement in the history of the United States;

Whereas the NAACP was prominent in lobbying for the passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006, and the Fair Housing Act, laws which ensured Government protection for legal victories achieved;

Whereas in 2005, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People launched the Disaster Relief Fund to help survivors in Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Florida, and Alabama to rebuild their lives; and

Whereas in 2007, the NAACP was prominent in lobbying for the passage of H. Res. 826, ''The Noose Intimidation Bill'', which expresses ''that the hanging of nooses is a horrible act when used for the purpose of intimidation and which under certain circumstances can be a criminal act that should be thoroughly investigated by Federal law enforcement authorities and that any criminal violations should be vigorously prosecuted'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) recognizes the 99th anniversary of the historic founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and

(2) honors and praises the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its anniversary for its work to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of all persons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HODES). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Today I rise and join my colleague, the Honorable AL GREEN of Texas, in honoring the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 99th anniversary. As we celebrate Black History Month, it is only appropriate that we do so by recognizing our Nation's oldest and largest civil rights organization.

The NAACP was founded on February 12, 1909, by Ida Wells-Barnett, W.E.B. DuBois, Henry Moscowitz, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villard, and William English Walling.

Since its inception, the NAACP has united students, laborers, professionals, scholars, officials, and others of all races to advance its vision of ''a society in which all individuals have equal rights and there is no racial hatred or racial discrimination.''

Historically, the NAACP is probably best known for its role and that of Thurgood Marshall in the seminal case of Brown v. Board of Education, in which the Supreme Court held in 1954 that ''separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.'' Yet we must not forget that the NAACP has been at the forefront of all efforts to secure equality and justice for every American throughout the 20th century and now into the 21st century.

The NAACP spoke out against lynching, challenged racially biased Supreme Court Justice nominees as early as 1930, and pursued nondiscrimination policies in the military, war-related industries, and the Federal Government during the world wars.

At the height of the civil rights era, the NAACP fought battles on the ground, in the courtroom, and in Congress, where it lobbied for passage of civil rights legislation like the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

□ 1700

Since then and during our current session, NAACP has lobbied for hate crimes legislation and other legislation that protects minorities, not necessarily based on race, but based on discrimination.

Today, on the shoulders of distinguished members and leaders such as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Coretta Scott King, Rosa Parks, Medgar Evers, Merlie Evers-Williams, Benjamin Hooks, Julian Bond, Jesse Turner, Jr., Maxine Vasco Smith, and Kweisi Mfume, the NAACP continues to fight the good fight.

Most recently the NAACP is promoting African American graduation and college readiness, protecting and advancing voting rights, and identifying solutions to the subprime mortgage foreclosure crisis. I have the privilege of working with the association to further those important efforts.

So in recognizing the NAACP's past and present, I again salute the organization on its near centennial anniversary. I am confident the NAACP will remain an integral part of our Nation's efforts to protect and promote civil rights in the future and move society forward in a progressive manner on a wide array of issues.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 289.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support and strongly urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 289 which recognizes the 99th anniversary of the NAACP. For almost a century, the NAACP has fought to bring justice and racial equality to this Nation. It is appropriate that we review that history.

In 1917, the NAACP won a major legal victory in the Supreme Court which held that States could no longer restrict and officially segregate African Americans into particular residential districts. The same year, the NAACP fought for the right of black Americans to be commissioned as military officers during World War I.

In 1920, the NAACP held its annual conference in Atlanta, Georgia, which at the time was one of the most active areas for the Ku Klux Klan. As a result, the NAACP showed the world it would not be intimidated by racial violence.

In 1935, NAACP lawyers Charles Houston and Thurgood Marshall won a major legal battle to admit students to the University of Maryland.

During World War II, the NAACP led the effort that resulted in President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's ordering a

nondiscrimination policy in war-related industries and Federal employment.

And in 1948, the NAACP convinced President Harry Truman to sign an executive order banning discrimination by the Federal Government.

In 1954, under the leadership of Special Counsel Thurgood Marshall, the NAACP won one of its greatest legal victories in Brown v. Board of Education.

In 1960 in Greensboro, North Carolina, members of the NAACP Youth Council launched a series of nonviolent sit-ins at segregated lunch counters.

The history of America's modern struggle to live up to our constitutional principles was written in large part by the NAACP. And it continues to champion the cause of social justice today for all Americans.

The NAACP has served as the voice of those who were muzzled by fear. It served as the voice of those who were handcuffed and jailed under segregationist policies. And it carried the weight for those whose backs were nearly broken in brutal beatings fueled by racial hatred. It did so peacefully and with dignity. And as a result, America is a better place.

I am pleased to join my colleagues on this concurrent resolution honoring the historic contributions made by the NAACP to the cause of civil rights in this Nation. And I would like to conclude by acknowledging and recognizing and honoring the leadership of a gentleman in my district, Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth, who marched with Dr. Martin Luther King but who has been ill recently. He has been a leader in our community and really across the entire country in the civil rights movement, and we all keep him in our prayers and hope that he recovers quickly.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank the gentleman for the time.

I would like to thank Chairman CONYERS for being there and making this resolution possible and bringing it to the floor. I also would like to remember Mr. SENSENBRENNER, who at the time we first introduced this piece of legislation was the chairperson of the Judiciary Committee. And I recall how he made a great effort to get this legislation to the floor and to get it passed. I am grateful to the Honorable STEVE COHEN who is our floor leader today, a lawyer par excellence who does an outstanding job on the Judiciary Committee. Thank you so much. I am grateful to Mr. STEVE CHABOT. Thank you for your very kind words. What you said about the NAACP is entirely correct, but it is also something that means a lot to a lot of people. And I think the people across the length and breadth of this country appreciate what you have said and how you have made it clear that the NAACP is important to us in the United States Congress.

I also want to thank the many persons, about 45 of whom signed on to this piece of legislation so that we could bring it to the floor this year. This is the 99th anniversary of the NAACP, having been founded February 12, 1909. The NAACP has always been an integrated organization. It has fought for integration. But it has from its genesis been an organization that has been integrated. And while we remember many of the names of the great NAACPers, James Weldon Johnson, of course, who was one of the great executive secretaries of the organization, we will remember always the name Roy Wilkins, who was a labor leader and executive secretary of the NAACP, W.E.B. DuBois, who was one of the great intellectuals of his time and of all time. We remember Julian Bond who today is the chairperson of the organization, and Dr. Benjamin Hooks who was an FCC board member but also a lawyer and executive director of the NAACP.

But some of the names we don't always remember are names of persons who are not African Americans who were there at the genesis of this organization. Mary White Ovington, this lady held one of the very first organizational meetings of the NAACP in her living room at a time when it was not popular to host a meeting for an organization like the NAACP. I also would remember, if we would, William English Walling and Oswald Garrison Villiard. These persons were not African Americans, but they literally put their lives on the line so that African Americans could have the types of rights and privileges that we enjoy today.

The NAACP, the Nation's oldest civil rights organization, has been there at times of need when it came to issues like the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960 and 1964. It was there for us when we were lobbying for the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Brown v. Board of Education is always mentioned when we think of the NAACP, for it was Thurgood Marshall who took this case to the Supreme Court and won it, integrating the schools across this country.

But the NAACP was also there in the case of Shelley v. Kramer, and the case of Borrows v. Jackson. These cases outlawed restrictive covenants, racially restrictive covenants that barred African Americans from living in certain communities. The NAACP took these cases to the Supreme Court and won them as well.

If the truth be told, we live where we live, we sleep where we sleep and we eat where we eat because of the NAACP. It has made a difference in the lives of all Americans. And I am so grateful that this Congress has seen fit to honor it today for its 99 years of service.

As of late, the NAACP was a party to the legislation that we put before Congress to deal with noose intimidation. Noose intimidation, one of the latest means by which persons are having civil rights violated, and the NAACP was there to help us push this legislation through Congress, so as to make it very clear, transpicuously so, that this country will not tolerate noose intimidation. In fact, the President of the United States, as late as yesterday, made it clear that noose intimidation is unacceptable in this country.

The NAACP has been a part of the fiber and fabric of the human rights, civil rights movement in this country. If we did not have the NAACP, we would have to create the NAACP. It has been there for us. Today we are there for the NAACP.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words Mr. CHABOT expressed and Mr. GREEN. The NAACP is an outstanding organization, and I would submit that during my time here in Congress, I don't know of another group that has had a more effective lobbying force on issues concerning human rights and civil rights and rights of people who are underrepresented and need the help of government and need it in a fair and just way.

In my community of Memphis, the president of NAACP is Mrs. Johnnie Turner. We have had a great NAACP chapter. Ben Hooks, who is a former head of the agency, is a resident of my community, an outstanding individual who recently was honored by President Bush with a Medal of Freedom. And Maxine Vasco Smith and Jesse Turner who have been national officers of the NAACP are residents of my community as well.

The NAACP has been very important to Memphis but very important to this country. I thank Mr. GREEN for bringing the resolution to the floor, and I appreciate the remarks made here on the floor. I urge final passage.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on its 99th Anniversary.

In 1909 the founders of the NAACP came together with the purpose of promoting the rights guaranteed under the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution.

Today, the NAACP works to ensure that all individuals have equal rights and to end racial hatred and discrimination.

The NAACP has influenced some of the greatest civil rights victories of the last century, including: the integration of our nation's schools and the Brown v. Board decision; the Voting Rights Act; striking down segregation; and the Equal Employment Opportunity Act.

Despite the advancements of the past 99 years under the leadership of the NAACP, there is still much work to be done.

The NAACP continues to promote new ideas and leadership in the fields of: educational and employment opportunities, ending health care disparities, and economic empowerment.

The NAACP instilled in America a sense of consciousness, and it continues to do so today.

I commend the NAACP on this anniversary and the thousands of individuals who continue to fight for equality and justice.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to one of the oldest and greatest civil rights organizations in our country's history. The NAACP has served for nearly a century to provide help for those who cannot help themselves, to provide justice for the wronged, and to give a voice to the disenfranchised. Though the group formed to fight for equality for minorities and the disadvantaged, the NAACP has vigilantly stood guard for all Americans so that the basic rights of none are infringed upon.

In 1909, six great Americans, Ida Wells-Barnett, W.E.B. DuBois, Henry Moscowitz, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villiard, and William English Walling, banded together to produce the "Call to National Action." This founding document of the NAACP laid out the organization's goals—to protect the rights guaranteed by the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution. From their ever-present task to preserve these rights to the fight to put an end to lynching, the great victory over segregation won in 1954's Brown v. Board of Education, and their continuing crusade to protect civil rights, the NAACP has been an inimitable champion of the cause of equality and social justice in our Nation. Today, under the leadership of Chairman Julian Bond, the organization has grown to over 2,200 branches with over 500,000 members nationwide.

Connecticut is very grateful for the work that the NAACP has done in the State. Headquartered in Hartford, Connecticut and led by chapter president Scot X. Esdaile, the Connecticut NAACP has been a great advocate for civil rights in the State.

The Connecticut NAACP has been a valuable partner in local efforts to ensure civil rights. Our chapter has worked to ensure that minorities are represented in all levels of government as important legislative decisions are being made. The group worked with other local organizations to develop a talent bank of highly qualified minority candidates to fill senior-level positions in the State and combat any discrimination that might exist. The local NAACP has also worked tirelessly with the seven members of the Connecticut Congressional delegation to ensure that our Federal Government secures the blessings of liberty for all. I am proud to have a 95 percent rating from the NAACP. It remains a prevalent voice in the State and a standard-bearer of the principles of equality and justice.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can honor the work of the NAACP best by continuing to work for the noble cause for which the organization exists: to protect the rights of all persons and eliminate hatred and racial discrimination. I extend to the NAACP my best wishes for a happy 99th anniversary and I commend and thank them for a century of service.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to congratulate the NAACP on its 99th Anniversary. As the Nation's oldest civil rights organization, the NAACP has for 99 years fought to ensure the educational, social, economic and political equality of all persons, so that all may participate and share in this country's great Democracy.

The NAACP was founded by a multi-racial group of activists who answered "The Call" to engage in a national conference to discuss the civil rights of African Americans in the summer of 1908. That year, the NAACP embarked on its mission to ensure equal rights for all citizens and to eliminate racial prejudice in the United States.

Since then, the NAACP has worked tirelessly to accomplish its mission by continually looking for ways to improve the democratic process and by seeking the enactment and enforcement of Federal, State, and local laws that secure civil rights. The NAACP furthers its mission by making the public aware of the adverse effects of racial discrimination and by seeking its elimination. The NAACP also seeks to educate the public about their constitutional rights and goes to court to enforce those rights when necessary.

Shortly after its founding in the early 1900s, the NAACP undertook an anti-lynching campaign and launched a public protest when segregation was introduced into the Federal Government. The NAACP was influential in President Harry Truman's decision to issue an Executive Order in 1948 ending discrimination by the Federal Government. In 1954, the NAACP helped bring an end to segregation in public schools in the case of Brown v. Board of Education. In 1964, it worked to raise support for the passage of the Civil Rights Act. In 1979, it helped expand voter participation through voter registration in high schools. And the list goes on.

Today, the NAACP continues to eliminate racial prejudice when it rears its ugly head, and informs the public of its intolerable presence when it does. It continues to act as a watchdog to protect the constitutional and civil rights of all people. And it educates the public about civil rights so that future generations will know tolerance and equality as the norm, rather than the exception.

I am proud to be a Diamond Life Member of the NAACP and to have once served as President of the Newport News, Virginia branch.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the NAACP on 99 years of service to our great country and its people, and I wish them another highly successful 99 years.

Mr. COHEN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 289.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1715

AMERICAN BRAILLE FLAG MEMORIAL ACT

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4169) to authorize the placement in Arlington National Cemetery of an American Braille tactile flag in Arlington National Cemetery honoring blind members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and other Americans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4169

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Braille Flag Memorial Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) There are more than 175,000 blind veterans.

(2) The Department of Defense estimates that 16 percent of the members of the Armed Forces who have been injured in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom have severe vision loss as a result of their injuries.

(3) The American Braille tactile flag was created by the Kansas Braille Transcription Institute in Wichita, Kansas, to allow blind Americans and blind veterans to experience the American flag.

(4) Arlington National Cemetery, visited by approximately 4,000,0000 people annually, is a national place of remembrance and honor for the Nation's veterans.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF PLACEMENT OF AN AMERICAN BRAILLE TACTILE FLAG IN ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY HONORING BLIND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES, VETERANS, AND OTHER AMERICANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army is authorized to place in Arlington National Cemetery an American Braille tactile flag in Arlington National Cemetery honoring blind members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and other Americans.

(b) APPROVAL OF DESIGN AND SITE.—The Secretary of the Army shall have exclusive authority to approve an appropriate design and site within Arlington National Cemetery for the memorial authorized under subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4169.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the American Braille Flag Memorial Act, H.R. 4169. I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. TIAHRT, for drafting this important piece of legislation and for his leadership in this area.

Today, there are nearly 1.3 million blinded and visually impaired Americans, and approximately 187,000 of those are veterans. It is estimated that 16 percent of these veterans have sustained injuries in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom,

leaving them with some form of severe visual loss and impairment. These veterans, due to their disability, are often not afforded the opportunity to cherish and witness the American flag as those without visual impairment are. That is why passing the American Braille Flag Memorial Act is so important. It would authorize the Secretary of the Army to place an American Braille tactile flag on the grounds of the Arlington National Cemetery to honor the sacrifice of our Nation's blind veterans and members of the Armed Forces.

This legislation would also allow the Secretary of the Army to approve the appropriate design of the flag, as well as the site in the Arlington National Cemetery that would be most appropriate for the memorial, which I understand is likely to be at the visitors center. The bronze Braille American flag, generously donated by the Kansas Braille Transcription Institute, would include the Pledge of Allegiance, and allow the blind and visually impaired to feel the Stars and Stripes and colors of the American flag placed near Arlington National Cemetery Visitors Center.

I am pleased that the Blind Veterans Association, the American Council and American Foundation of the Blind wholeheartedly support this piece of legislation. Our efforts today will show the over 4 million visitors who come to the Arlington National Cemetery each year that we remember and honor the blind veterans who died in service to our Nation, as well as all veterans and servicemembers who live today with blindness and vision loss.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides a way to include all Americans in this wonderful patriotic experience when visiting Arlington National Cemetery and seeing the American flag where heroes are laid to rest. I am told that when feeling miniature mock-up versions of the Braille flag, blinded veterans and servicemembers often break down and cry.

It would only be appropriate to allow our blind and visually impaired veterans and servicemembers to share this experience by paying tribute and honoring them with the recognition they deserve at the hallmark of American memorials, the Arlington National Cemetery.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 4169 without delay.

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

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

I rise also in strong support for H.R. 4169, which would authorize the placement in Arlington National Cemetery of an American Braille tactile flag honoring blind members of the Armed Forces, veterans and other Americans.

My colleagues, our Nation's veterans have fought for our freedom, many at the expense of their health and well-being. Some of our veterans have not just lost use of an arm or a leg as a consequence of service, but now live in darkness from the loss of their sight.

In order to serve the needs of blind Americans, the Kansas Braille Transcription Institute created and designed a tactile American flag in Braille which would enable these blind veterans and other blind Americans the simple ability to see through the use of their hands the beauty of our American flag.

The flag has been specifically designed in a way that informs the blind of the full color of the American flag, 13 stripes and 50 stars on the blue field. Additionally, the tactile flag bears the Pledge of Allegiance in both raised print and grade one Braille. It is a plaque. It is not a traditional flag.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my full support of this great bill, the American Braille Flag Memorial Act. By placing the Braille American flag at Arlington National Cemetery, we do indeed bring honor to our Nation's blind veterans community and allow our blind veterans to see the American flag.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), the author of the bill.

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Texas for their assistance in helping me with this very fine piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, last summer, one of my constituents, Randy Cabral, president of the Kansas Braille Transcript Institute, e-mailed me with an idea, to place an American Braille flag at Arlington National Cemetery. Today, we see the fruition of one man's idea.

Prior to the creation of the American Braille flag, the American flag was not accessible to the blind. This flag was created by the Kansas Braille Transcript Institute in Wichita, Kansas.

As you can see on this poster to my left, the flag has been specially designed in a way that informs the blind of the full color of the American flag, the 13 stripes and the 50 stars on a blue field. Additionally, this tactile flag bears the Pledge of Allegiance, both in raised print and in grade one Braille.

Few know that our Nation has more than 1 million blind and low-vision veterans, and those numbers continue to rise. The Department of Defense estimates that 16 percent of those injured in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom suffer from severe vision loss. An additional 10 to 12 million Americans are blind or of low vision.

The American Braille Flag Memorial Act authorizes the placement of an American Braille flag at Arlington National Cemetery, a national place of remembrance and honor for our Nation's veterans. The cemetery is visited by an estimated 4 million people annually. The American Braille Flag Memorial will bring honor to our Nation's blind community and allow our blind veterans to see the American flag again.

In order to ensure that this effort will enhance and not detract from the cemetery, I have worked with the superintendent of the Arlington National Cemetery, John Metzler. Mr. Metzler believes that a 15-inch by 17-inch bronze replica of the American Braille flag would be a wonderful addition to the visitors center at the cemetery.

This is a unique bronze replica, and, as such, this new drawing and special casting had to be commissioned. The drawings for the bronze replica were completed by Kevin West, a student at Wichita Area Technical College. Kevin is a specialist in the Kansas Army National Guard. He is also a veteran of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. He served in the 778th Combat Heavy Equipment Transport Group, or HET, out of Kansas City, Kansas, as both a convoy security and a HET operator. Let me take this moment to thank Kevin for his service to the Nation.

The actual bronze flag memorial will be cast free of charge by the Truxes Company of Oswego, Illinois. The Truxes Company was founded by another American hero, Mr. Bill Truxes. Mr. Truxes joined the Army Air Corps during World War II and served as a B–24 pilot. While serving in World War II, he was shot down during the Battle of the Bulge and became a POW in Germany in 1944. He was liberated at the end of the war. I greatly appreciate Mr. Truxes' patriotism and generosity in agreeing to donate the bronze casting, and I also want to thank him for his service.

With Mr. West and Mr. Truxes both donating their service, and the Kansas Braille Transcription Institute donating the transportation, this entire project will be provided to the government free of charge.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my 16 cosponsors and the Blind Veterans of America for their endorsement and support of this effort. But more importantly, I want to thank those who served this Nation. We owe a huge debt of gratitude to our veterans, and this simple action will mean much more to our patriotic blind veterans.

I encourage my colleagues to join with me in supporting this effort and placing the Braille flag at Arlington National Cemetery.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to again congratulate my colleague from Kansas for introducing this bill. It clearly shows a special sense of sensitivity to the needs of disabled veterans. I commend my distinguished colleague for doing this and for the support of the institute for their offering this to the government at the Arlington National Cemetery.

Again, it is a lot of hard work by Mr. TIAHRT, and I commend him. I urge my colleagues to support and pass this bill, H.R. 4169.

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

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity also to

thank both the gentleman from Florida as well as the author, Todd Tiahrt, on their efforts in this area.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4169.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1730

COMMENDING THE PEOPLE OF WASHINGTON FOR SHOWING THEIR SUPPORT FOR VETERANS

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 790) commending the people of the State of Washington for showing their support for the needs of the State of Washington's veterans and encouraging residents of other States to pursue creative ways to show their own support for veterans.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 790

Whereas every day, American men and women risk their lives serving the country in the Armed Forces;

Whereas it is important to many Americans to be able to donate money directly to causes about which they care;

Whereas it is important for residents to have a tangible way to demonstrate their support for veterans;

Whereas despite Government funding for the Nation's veterans, many important needs of veterans remain unmet;

Whereas citizens in the State of Washington have banded together in a grassroots effort to create a Veterans Family Fund Certificate of Deposit;

Whereas any financial institution in the State of Washington can choose to offer a Veterans Family Fund Certificate of Deposit;

Whereas the Bank of Clark County has become the first institution to offer these Certificates of Deposit;

Whereas the Governor of the State of Washington and the Washington State Veterans Affairs Department have expressed the State's support for this program;

Whereas when a person buys a Veterans Family Fund Certificate of Deposit from a participating financial institution, half of the interest is automatically donated to the State of Washington's Veterans Innovation Program to address the unmet needs of the State of Washington's veterans and their families;

Whereas the Veterans Innovation Program provides emergency assistance to help current or former Washington National Guard or Reserve service members cope with financial hardships, unemployment, educational needs, and many basic family necessities; and

Whereas the Veterans Family Fund Certificate of Deposit will be officially launched on November 8, 2007: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the people of the State of Washington for showing their support for the needs of the State of Washington's veterans; and

(2) encourages residents of other States to pursue creative ways to show their own support for veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my distinguished colleague, Congressman BRIAN BAIRD of Washington, for drafting this resolution which calls on the States to create innovative ways to supplement State and Federal programs created to assist our Nation's veterans. I would also like to commend the Washington delegation for the strong bipartisan support they demonstrated in introducing this resolution.

This resolution establishes a certificate of deposit in participating financial institutions that would automatically donate 50 percent of the accrued interest to the State of Washington's Veterans Innovation Program. Providing this avenue to invest in our veterans will help ensure that the needs of our Nation's heroes are available when they need them.

I strongly support the resolution and encourage all States to follow the enthusiasm and support for our veterans. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of House Resolution 790.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 790, a bill commemorating the people of the State of Washington for showing their support for the needs of the State of Washington's veterans and encouraging residents of other States to pursue creative ways to show their own support for veterans. This resolution was introduced by my distinguished colleague from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

It was particularly inspired by the Veterans Family Fund Certificate of Deposit, an insured account created through the grassroots efforts of citizens in Washington State to benefit military veterans and their families. The Veterans Family Fund Certificate of Deposit was officially launched on November 8, 2007.

When an individual purchases a Veterans Family Fund Certificate of Deposit from a participating financial institution, half of the interest is automatically donated to the State of Washington's Veterans Innovation Program. The Veterans Innovation Program was created to provide emergency assistance to help current or former Washington National Guard or Reserve servicemembers simply cope with financial hardships, unemployment, educational needs, and many other basic family necessities.

The initiative of the citizens of the State of Washington in creating this program is to be commended. Throughout the years, young men and women across this great Nation have answered the call to duty and taken up arms in defense of our freedom and that of others in this world. We should recognize the service of these veterans and encourage others to honor them by simply passing this bill today.

I would like to thank Chairman FILNER and Ranking Member BUYER for bringing this resolution so quickly to the floor for consideration today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington, BRIAN BAIRD.

Mr. BAIRD. I thank my friend and colleague from Texas and the gentleman from Florida as well. I want to commend Chairman FILNER for his support as well.

I am very, very pleased today to recognize the efforts of my constituents, who joined together with many others from across Washington State to unite in a common endeavor, to help our veterans and their families. The desire of Washington residents to help our veterans has led to the creation of the Veterans Family Fund Certificate of Deposit in November of last year.

As my friends have described earlier, anyone wishing to show their personal support for our veterans can do so in a simple way: They can simply invest in a 6-month Veterans Family Fund Certificate of Deposit. After the 6 months, as mentioned earlier, half of the interest earned on the certificate goes back to the individual who invested, but the other half of the interest is donated as a charitable contribution to the Washington State Department of Veterans Affairs' Veterans Innovation Program.

The Department of Veterans Affairs will use the new funding to provide assistance to veterans and their families in areas where none is otherwise available through the State or Federal Government. This will include direct grants for emergency financial assistance and efforts to promote the long-term financial stability of Washington State's veterans. Speaking personally, as someone who worked in the VA system as a clinical psychologist, I can tell you how valuable this sort of flexible individualized assistance can be to helping our veterans and families.

Last year, Congress stepped up to the plate and provided significant increases in funding for our Nation's veterans, but this is a creative way for the average citizen to show his or her support for the brave men and women who

have served in the Armed Forces. This program was entirely citizen-driven, and it demonstrates the power of interested individuals who come together to make a difference.

I would like to particularly acknowledge Jane Jacobsen, who was the first to come up with the idea for the program, and Mike Worthy of the Bank of Clark County who made his institution the first to participate in the program and has already sold more than $300,000 in CDs, including one which I was happy to invest in myself. I also want to acknowledge John Lee, the director of the Washington State Department of Veterans Affairs, who has supported the project from the very start. And, in particular, I want to give special recognition to the outstanding Governor of the State of Washington, Governor Christine Gregoire, who has been a key supporter and advocate for this program from its infancy.

I am joined in this effort by the entire Washington delegation on this resolution to commend the people of our State for showing their support for the needs of our veterans, and we encourage residents of other States to pursue similar creative ways to show their support for veterans. Again, I thank the Chair, I thank the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Florida for their time, and urge passage of this resolution.

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

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to recognize the Congressman from Rhode Island, Mr. PATRICK KENNEDY, for such time as he may consume.

Mr. KENNEDY. I too want to join in support of this resolution and commend my colleagues from Washington State, particularly my colleague BRIAN BAIRD.

I have always thought, and I have talked to the Bank of America about this and have an appointment with former Treasury Secretary Bob Rubin to discuss a Veterans Visa. We all have credit cards and we all have the affinity cards. They sell us cards where they have the affinity, where you get your bonus miles with American Airlines, you get your bonus miles if you use your card with a particular institution and so forth.

I figure Americans, when they use their credit card, could send their bonus miles or the equivalent of those to veterans, and they would be happy to lay down their credit cards, whether it be American Express or Visa or whatever, with a big red, white and blue credit card. And someone say, what kind of credit card is that, that it's that color? And they say, That's the Veterans Visa. That means all those bonus miles that would have gone to me being able to get a little extra bonus vacation or whatever is going to go to help our Nation's veterans. And I will tell you, I think there would be a lot of Americans out there who would be more than happy to be able to show their patriotic sense of duty when they are going around, especially those who are very comfortable and sitting in the business board rooms of this country doing business transactions all across this country and are sitting comfortably home while our young men and women are overseas fighting for this country, to be able to lay down that Veterans Visa card and have those affinity dollars go to those veterans groups. I think we could send that directly to the very great organization in New York, the Fisher Foundation which has a grade A transparent ruling for all the dollars that it sends to the Intrepid Organization and to the poly-trauma centers and all the vet centers across the country.

I think this is a terrific notion of the certificate of deposits, having a percentage of those interest payments going to veterans, and I think this is one that I am hoping to get started as well. And it follows on the same concept that you are working on here in Washington State. I hope to take your concept that you are doing in Washington State and bring it to my State of Rhode Island. I commend you on it, and I just want to salute you for the work that you are doing out in Washington State.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. BAIRD. I would just like to thank you for supporting this initiative and would in turn support your proposal.

What this comes out of is citizens saying, Look, we've got young men and women, and as many people know in this conflict, it's not just young men and women, it's people of all ages overseas in Iraq and Afghanistan and throughout the country. And when they come back home, we want to show them our support. It's a fine thing and a proper thing that we would wave a flag and say thank you for your service. But sometimes people need more than just a thanks. Sometimes they need the ability to visit a loved one; sometimes they need a home repaired; sometimes they need a little bit of help financially to go to school. And the kind of program that we are putting forward today allows over and above what we are already providing through our VA services to average citizens to provide support for doing just that. It sounds like that is what you are seeking to do, Mr. KENNEDY. I commend you for your efforts and look forward to working with you.

Mr. KENNEDY: I likewise thank the gentleman.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, let me also take this opportunity to congratulate the author, Mr. BRIAN BAIRD of Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Resolution 790.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 790 and to acknowledge the dedication and support provided to Washington State veterans by the Veterans Family Fund and the Washington State Department of Veterans Affairs.

As someone who is privileged to represent thousands of veterans and their families, I believe that we owe the men and women who have served our country an enormous amount of gratitude and respect.

People who have never served in uniform frequently ask me how they as individuals can support veterans beyond simply displaying a flag on Veterans' Day. Today, I am proud to say that the Veterans Family Fund, in coordination with the Washington State Department of Veterans Affairs, has provided a way for all citizens to directly show their support for our veterans year-round, and provide financial assistance to those veterans and their families who need a bit of extra support.

The program is simple, and requires only a modest financial commitment. When taking out a "Veterans Family Fund" Certificate of Deposit for at least 6 months, individuals pledge that half of the interest earned by the certificate will be donated to benefit veterans and their families, while the investor receives the other half of the interest, and a tax deduction for their contribution. The contributions are managed and disbursed to veterans and their families who are in need by the Veterans Innovations Program, operated by the Washington State Department of Veterans Affairs.

The Veterans Family Fund is an independent organization founded by local citizens to help all Washington State veterans. I would like to take a moment to specifically acknowledge the members of the Veterans Family Fund Steering Committee, who made this program possible: Jane Jacobsen, Executive Director, Confluence Project; Michael C. Worthy, CEO, Bank of Clark County; Robert Friedenwald, Colonel (retired), U.S. Army; Betsy Henning, Principal, Alling Henning Associates; and John Lee, Director, Washington State Department of Veterans Affairs.

I encourage other States to look at the Washington State Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Veterans Family Fund, as a model of creativity and innovation in providing support for our veterans at the local level. I commend their work and ask my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 790.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the

Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL SALUTE TO HOSPITALIZED VETERANS WEEK

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 963) supporting the goals and ideals of National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 963

Whereas February 11–15, 2008, has been designated by the President as National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week;

Whereas the National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans week each year is an opportunity to thank a special group of men and women, the more than 98,000 veterans of the United States Armed Forces, who are cared for every day in Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) medical centers, outpatient clinics, domicilaries, and nursing homes;

Whereas at the 155 VA hospitals across the Nation, there are veterans who face the physical and mental wounds of combat every day, long after their military service has been completed;

Whereas we can never fully repay our debt of gratitude to the veterans, but will thank and support them with our words and deeds;

Whereas Mike Vogel, motion picture actor and star of the newly-released ''Cloverfield'', will lead the VA's annual patient recognition program as the national spokesperson, inviting the public to visit and honor hospitalized veterans during National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week; and

Whereas Mike Vogel will be the youngest celebrity to lead the National Salute, bringing youthful energy to the program at a time when the number of young combat veterans under the care of the VA is growing, and as the VA is looking to younger generations of Americans to replenish an aging volunteer force: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Program and its efforts to pay tribute to and express appreciation for hospitalized veterans, to increase community awareness of the role of VA medical centers, and to encourage citizens to visit hospitalized veterans and become involved as volunteers;

(2) encourages citizens who live near a VA hospital or clinic to take time this week to visit and thank our veterans; and

(3) will continue to work with veterans service organizations to support our veterans with words, actions, and financial assistance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation's history, we have relied on the patriotism, valor, courage and unselfishness of those who wear the uniform of the Armed Forces. With this service comes the real possibility of receiving an injury in answering the call to duty. The global war on terrorism is no exception. To date, over 31,000 servicemen and -women have been wounded in action and nearly 4,000 killed.

For 30 years, the Department of Veterans Affairs has designated the week of February 14 as the National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week. The goals of the program are to pay tribute and express appreciation to hospitalized veterans, to increase community awareness, and to encourage individuals to become involved at their local VA as volunteers.

The VA's Voluntary Service is the largest volunteer program in the Federal Government. Over the past 60 years, VA volunteers have donated more than 689 million hours of service worth an estimated $12.9 billion. In fiscal year 2007, 85,428 active volunteers contributed a total of more than 11.6 million hours of service, equal to 5,574 full-time employees, worth $218 million.

Let's not forget those who have fought for this country in their time of greatest need. Join me in recognizing and paying tribute to the hospitalized veterans. I challenge each and every person to go visit their local VA medical center and brighten the smile on a veteran's face.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I also rise today in support of H. Res. 963, supporting the goals and ideals of National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week, and for other purposes. I would like to thank my colleagues Mr. RODRIGUEZ and Mr. MILLER of Florida for sponsoring this timely piece of legislation.

The President has designated this week, February 11 through 15, as National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week. This week provides the American people the opportunity to thank a special group of men and women, the more than 98,000 veterans of the United States Armed Forces, who are cared for every day by the Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers, outpatient clinics, domicilaries, and nursing homes across this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution specifically shows the support of the United States House of Representatives for the National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Program and its efforts to pay tribute to and express appreciation for these hospitalized veterans. The resolution also seeks to increase community awareness of the role of VA medical centers, and to encourage citizens to visit hospitalized veterans and become involved as volunteers. The resolution also encourages citizens who live near a VA hospital or clinic to just take time to visit and thank our veterans personally.

During my visits with veterans at the Gainesville, Florida VA Medical Center and my trip this past year to Ramstein to visit the troops at the hospital, I have also been inspired by the courage and honor that is displayed by these heroes. You will walk away feeling a whole lot better than when you came in, because you're so proud of what they've done.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this resolution assures our Nation's veterans that we in Congress will continue to work with veterans service organizations to support our veterans with words, actions, and financial assistance.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 963.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1745

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, let me conclude and extend my thanks to Chairman FILNER and Ranking Member BUYER for not just bringing this resolution to the House floor but also the two previous bills. These reinforce Congress' commitment to serving America's veterans.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 963.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week.

The Department of Veterans Affairs facilities care for over 98,000 veterans every day.

The veteran organizations in my district are extremely active in visiting and volunteering to help hospitalized veterans being treated in the surrounding medical facilities.

I would like to recognize the contributions of our local Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, and Disabled American Veterans posts, as well as the Korean War Veterans, Vietnam War Veterans, the Polish Legion of American Veterans and the Brooksville Elks Lodge. The efforts of these groups pay tribute and express the appreciation of a grateful nation, not only to hospitalized veterans but to every man and woman that has ever worn the uniform.

The contributions of volunteers go a long way, but we in Congress need to reaffirm our commitment to providing veterans with the facilities they need to get the care they deserve.

I am pleased to see that in this year's budget the President included $120 million for the new VA Medical Facility in Orlando, FL, on the Lake Nona site. This new facility will provide acute care, complex specialty care and advanced diagnostic services through a hospital, an outpatient clinic, a 118-bed nursing home, and a 60-bed domiciliary.

I was also pleased that the President's budget included funding for the expansion of the Tampa Polytrauma Rehabilitation Center.

This funding will help to improve the facilities and the scope of services available to our severely wounded veterans at the Tampa Polytrauma Rehabilitation Center.

I hope my colleagues will join me in voicing their commitment for the future funding needs of these important projects.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 963, supporting the goals and ideals of National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week.

February 11–15, 2008, has been designated by the President as National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week. In over 155 VA hospitals across the Nation, we have suffering veterans who face the physical and mental wounds of combat every day. As a veteran myself, I understand the real-life sacrifices an individual does through while on duty. Living far away from family and loved ones is a sacrifice that hospitalized veterans continue to face every day.

As President's Day approaches, let us not forget those veterans that are the real-life examples of the courage and service our Nation was founded on. These veterans are our heroes—and now they need a hero of their own to thank them for their service and sacrifice.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this most dignified and deserving honor for our hospitalized veterans.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 963, supporting the goals and ideals of National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week.

National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week this year is February 11th to 15th, and so it is appropriate that we are here today to pay tribute to those who have put their lives on the line for our Nation's freedom.

H. Res. 963 supports the National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Program and the program's efforts to express appreciation to hospitalized veterans for their efforts and increase awareness of the importance of Veterans' Affairs medical centers throughout the country. The resolution also supports the program's work to encourage citizens to visit hospitalized veterans and volunteer their services.

Mr. Speaker, for centuries our brave service men and women have given their utmost to ensure our liberty here at home. We owe our soldiers an eternal debt of gratitude, and giving our support to hospitalized veterans and recognizing their service as we are doing today is one important step toward paying that debt.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to unanimously support H. Res. 963, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 963.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF AMERICAN HEART MONTH AND NATIONAL WEAR RED DAY

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 972) supporting the goals and ideals of American Heart Month and National Wear Red Day.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 972

Whereas diseases of the heart are the Nation's leading cause of death and stroke is the third leading cause of death in both men and women;

Whereas nearly 2,400 American men, women, and children die of cardiovascular disease each day, an average of one death every 37 seconds;

Whereas many people do not recognize that heart disease, stroke, and other cardiovascular diseases are the number 1 killer of American women, claiming the lives of almost 460,000 American women each year or about one per minute;

Whereas we as a Nation have made great progress in reducing the death rates for coronary heart disease, but this progress has been much more modest in women and minorities, resulting in cardiovascular disease disparities;

Whereas many minority women, including African-American, Hispanic, Native-American and some subgroups of Asian-American women, have a greater prevalence of risk factors or are at a higher risk of death from heart disease, stroke, and other cardiovascular diseases, but they are less likely to know of this risk;

Whereas cardiovascular diseases cost the Nation more than any other cause of death, with direct and indirect costs estimated to reach $448.5 billion in the United States in 2008;

Whereas the research is clear that there are tools available to prevent heart disease, stroke, and other cardiovascular diseases and to improve survival rates from cardiovascular disease;

Whereas Congress, by Joint Resolution approved on December 30, 1963, requested that the President issue an annual proclamation designating February as ''American Heart Month'';

Whereas the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health, the American Heart Association, and many other organizations celebrate ''National Wear Red Day'' during February by ''going red'' to increase awareness about heart disease as the leading killer of women; and

Whereas every year since 1964 the President has issued a proclamation designating the month of February as ''American Heart Month'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of ''American Heart Month'' and ''National Wear Red Day'';

(2) commends the efforts of States, territories and possessions of the United States, localities, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and other entities, and the people of the United States who support ''American Heart Month'' and ''National Wear Red Day'';

(3) recognizes and reaffirms our commitment to fighting heart disease and stroke by promoting awareness about its causes, risks, and prevention, supporting research, and expanding access to medical treatment; and

(4) encourages each and every American to learn about their own personal risk for heart disease.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H. Res. 972 which I am proud to have introduced with Congresswomen FALLIN, SCHAKOWSKY, MCMORRIS RODGERS, CHRISTENSEN, and CUBIN. This diverse group of lead sponsors is testament to the importance of raising greater awareness about heart disease, and especially heart disease in women.

The resolution recognizes both Heart Month and National Wear Red Day, both of which occur in February. Heart Month was first designated 45 years ago and has served as a launching pad to spur advocates into action around the country.

In my hometown of Santa Barbara, there will be a Go Red for Women luncheon in the coming weeks. This event provides opportunities for women to learn more about heart health for themselves and also for the role they often play as the health decisionmaker in their families.

The importance of community events like Go Red for Women lunches cannot be overstated. Heart disease is the number one killer of both women and men. But now, in fact, more women than men die of heart disease each year. Unfortunately, there is still an existing knowledge gap both in terms of public awareness and professional awareness.

Despite the fact that almost 460,000 American women die of heart disease every year, women are still grossly underrepresented in clinical trials, as one example. The numbers are even worse for minority women who are at an even greater risk for developing heart disease and who have many more barriers to accessing care.

So today, as we pass this resolution to recognize the importance of Heart Month and Wear Red Day, let us use this opportunity to discuss the real changes we can make to improve women's heart health.

My colleague, BARBARA CUBIN, and I have introduced H.R. 1014 the HEART for Women Act. This act takes crucial steps to address women's heart health. It ensures that research is stratified by gender. In other words, that we recognize that women need to have research

that will take their needs into consideration, provides for an educational campaign for health professionals, and expands the very successful WISEWOMAN program that conducts cardiovascular screening for low-income women that has been, in the pilot phase, proven very successful in various parts of the country.

We had a successful hearing in the Health Subcommittee, and I would like to thank the Energy and Commerce Committee for working hard to move this legislation along in, I hope, the very near future.

Finally, I would like to thank the Speaker for suggesting that we encourage everyone to wear red tomorrow in order that we be even more visible to all of our colleagues and others on the Hill to continue this very important dialogue.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady, my friend from California, for all of the hard work she has put into this issue for the last several years, not just this year. It has been a real passion with her for a long time, and I thank her for that.

I rise in support of this important resolution because it does raise awareness about heart disease and the effect on women, which doesn't get talked about as much as heart disease in men.

As a breast cancer survivor, I spend a lot of time raising awareness about breast cancer and the importance of preventive screening and effective treatments. Those are vital battles, and as a country we have made great strides towards earlier detection of cancer and less invasive treatments.

But when we are reminded that heart disease is the leading cause of death for American women, it is a sobering thought. I remember being surprised to learn that the physical symptoms of heart attacks in women are often different than they are in men. Women are less likely to feel typical chest pains during the attacks. Women's symptoms are often characterized by back pain, nausea, indigestion, dizziness, and fatigue. While typical symptoms are hard to recognize, it is important to be vigilant about heart health.

Many lifesaving treatments like anticlotting drugs and angioplasty work best if given within the first hour of a heart attack, so it is important that we know what is going on with us as women. But before you get to that point, you want to prevent life-threatening heart attacks the easy way, through lifestyle changes that can keep heart disease in check.

The NIH and the FDA have helpful guidelines about steps that all American women and men can take to improve heart health. Some tips are as easy as talking to your doctor about it, and some are as easy as taking a daily stroll.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this resolution, and I hope women all across the country will take some time to do something good for themselves relative to their heart, and to wear red.

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

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield so much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, we are all joining together to sponsor this resolution. Before I speak, I want to commend both the gentlelady from California and the gentlelady from North Carolina for the exceptional work that they have done on this issue.

We all are on the Health Subcommittee. They have worked diligently on this and have continued in their efforts to raise awareness on heart health for women. The resolution is timely. It is something that we hope tomorrow is going to share the limelight a bit with Valentine's Day as we raise awareness on the importance of heart health for women.

It is also something that is important as an educational tool as we each individually, and then all working together, continue our outreach efforts to make certain that women are aware of the signs of the disease, they are aware of the precautions, and they are then properly informed of the steps that they need to take.

Again, I commend my colleagues for their diligence and work. I appreciate the opportunity to sponsor the legislation with them.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. FALLIN), who is a cosponsor of this resolution, such time as she may consume.

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate both of my fine colleagues here and their sponsorship of this great resolution to honor women and, of course, the American Heart Association Go Red for Women Month. It is a very important resolution, and I thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership in the Women's Caucus, especially in highlighting women's health.

I, too, am very proud to be a sponsor of this legislation. As you know, February is American Heart Month, and now is a great time for all of our Members of Congress, and concerned citizens in our Nation, to focus on how we can live healthier lifestyles, to educate ourselves on what we can do to prevent heart disease and to prevent stroke, and to live the kind of quality of life that we all deserve.

I think it has already been mentioned that heart disease is the number one killer in the United States, and it certainly is a huge problem in the State of Oklahoma. Heart disease afflicts more than one in four Americans, and nearly 80 million in total in our Nation. And for many, it is a deadly disease. Heart disease also kills about two Americans per minute.

And contrary to popular opinion, heart disease is every bit as dangerous for women as it is for men. In the last two decades, more women than men have died from it. In my home State alone, almost 20 women a day die from heart-related illnesses.

Tomorrow, millions of men and women are participating in National Go Red Day. I know I have on black today, and I think all the other ladies have on black, but tomorrow we will be wearing our red. I encourage all of our colleagues here in Congress to wear their red, as well as those around the Nation.

As we wear red tomorrow, we will remind those around us of the importance of fighting this disease. And we can fight this disease by starting just to take some simple precautions: exercising, maintaining healthy eating styles, and refraining of course from habits that are harmful to our health like smoking.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues and all Americans to wear red tomorrow, and to remember the millions of people who suffer with heart disease and to think about what we can do to fight this terrible illness.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our colleagues who have spoken to this important topic, and particularly my good friend and colleague from North Carolina, Mrs. MYRICK, who is symbolizing in her attire what we will all be doing tomorrow, which is not only Valentine's Day but Wear Red Day during Heart Month, to underscore the need for all of us to pay attention to women and heart disease in this month of February.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. I have no further speakers, and I also I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 972.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1800

EXPRESSING SYMPATHIES AND SUPPORT FOR THE INDIVIDUALS AND INSTITUTIONS AFFECTED BY THE POWERFUL TORNADOS THAT STRUCK CERTAIN COMMUNITIES ON FEBRUARY 5, 2008

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 971) expressing the sympathies and support of the House of Representatives for the individuals and institutions affected by the powerful tornados that struck communities in Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee on February 5, 2008.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 971

Whereas on the evening of Tuesday, February 5th, 2008, more than 100 tornados devastated communities in Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee;

Whereas more than 50 lives were lost in the deadliest tornado outbreak in the United States in more than 20 years;

Whereas more than a thousand homes, schools, and businesses were destroyed and tens of thousands of residents of the Mississippi Valley have been left without power;

Whereas the effect of the storms on Mississippi Valley families and businesses is still being felt;

Whereas hundreds of volunteers took time from their daily lives to help ensure that the victims of the storm are sheltered, clothed, fed, and emotionally comforted through this traumatic event;

Whereas the Federal Emergency Management Agency, first responders, the National Guard, and additional emergency personnel have coordinated with local authorities and firefighters and have performed beyond the call of duty in the preservation and protection of human lives; and

Whereas the strength, courage, and determination of the citizens of the Mississippi Valley have been evident following the tornados: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its deepest sympathies to the citizens of the States hit by the storms over the devastation caused by the powerful tornados that struck their communities on February 5th, 2008;

(2) expresses its appreciation to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, first responders, and the others involved in the relief effort for their valiant service to those affected by the storms; and

(3) expresses its support as the citizens of these communities continue their efforts to rebuild their community and their lives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. FALLIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 971.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, if it's appropriate, normally I would yield myself time now, but I would like to yield some time on the front end to Mr. TANNER from Tennessee because he has to be somewhere. So with the indulgence of the other side, I would like to first yield to Mr. TANNER for remarks.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. COHEN, I do appreciate this courtesy, and I thank the gentlelady from Oklahoma for allowing me to go ahead and speak.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Federal response to the tornados that occurred in Tennessee. I left here early last week and went down to my district in west and middle Tennessee to view, with the Governor of our State and others, the tremendous damage that was done, the loss of life that occurred. And I want to say that the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Director of FEMA were there as I got there last Thursday morning.

And as we toured in Tennessee, most of the damage that we saw occurred near Jackson, Tennessee, where our daughter, our two grandchildren and son-in-law live, at a place called Union University. President David Dockery met us there that Thursday morning, and I can only describe the devastation to Union, the dorms and so on as horrendous; and also conclude that it was a miracle that there was no more bodily injury or loss of life than occurred at Union.

But the other thing, other than the Secretary and the Director of FEMA being there was, in the aftermath of these tragedies like we've seen, and this is the fourth tornado that has basically hit Jackson, Madison County, Tennessee since 1999, the outpouring of help from friends, neighbors and others there gives one a great sense of resolve and gives one the magnanimous feeling of the human spirit rising out of the ashes of these tremendous natural disasters.

Let me just make the observation that we appreciate the quick response of the Federal Government, the State government, all of the FEMA people there, but particularly to the friends, neighbors and my constituents, of those who were injured, who lost everything, their houses gone, it is truly a blessing to see people come together, even under tragic circumstances.

I want to commend Mr. COHEN for bringing this. It hit Memphis, also, as well as middle Tennessee and the other States. But let me just simply add my congratulations to those who brought this resolution, and my thanks to those for the recognition of so many who are doing so much at this time to help those who have suffered so much.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, if I may go on with my remarks.

I rise to support House Resolution 971, which is a resolution to express sympathy and support for the individuals and institutions affected by the powerful tornados that swept through the Southeastern Conference States of Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Kentucky and Tennessee just over 2 weeks ago.

Over 100 tornados landed, they killed over 50 people, destroyed hundreds of homes, schools and businesses, and left thousands of people without power. In true American spirit and resolve, hundreds of volunteers cared for the victims and provided shelter, food and clothing.

I express my heartfelt sympathy to all of our fellow citizens in the wake of Mother Nature's wrath, and to commend the men and women who serve this Nation as first responders, police officers, firefighters and emergency medical personnel who place themselves in great danger every day but did on this day as well to protect us and the people that were in harm's way. Our neighbors and friends deserve our sympathy and prayers, and the first responders deserve our deepest thanks and respect.

On the occasion of the day after the tornados, Congresswoman BLACKBURN joined me in Memphis, and we toured around Hickory Hills and met with some individuals, the mayors of Wharton and Harrington and other city officials in Memphis to make sure that the proper procedures were followed.

I talked to the FEMA Director, Mr. Paulison, and he assured me, and he's followed through on his promise that FEMA would do all they could to help the residents in Tennessee and in the other States as well.

I would like to commend President Bush for his quick response. He responded to Governor Bredeson's request to have Tennessee and other areas declared disaster areas, and that was done. And FEMA is on the ground, already issuing checks and helping people.

We've seen a great response from the Federal Government when it was needed, and we're looking for more response, which we're working on now, to provide to our people throughout that district.

I appreciate the gentlelady from Oklahoma (Ms. FALLIN) indulging me and allowing Mr. TANNER to speak and make his important appointment.

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

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

I rise today in support of House Resolution 971, introduced by Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. The resolution expresses the heartfelt sympathy of the House of Representatives for the victims of the devastating tornados that struck communities in the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi and Tennessee.

On February 5, 2008, more than 100 tornados devastated communities throughout the Mississippi Valley, resulting in the deadliest tornado outbreak in the United States in 20 years.

The tornados took the lives of 50 people, injured countless others, and damaged or destroyed more than 1,000 homes. Additionally, the tornados have left tens of thousands of residents in the Mississippi Valley without power.

In response to these deadly tornados, local, State and Federal officials and emergency personnel responded swiftly to preserve and protect human lives. Their selfless actions saved lives and helped their communities in their efforts to recover from the disaster.

This resolution is a fitting commendation of the courage and determination of local citizens, businesses and volunteer organizations following the disaster. They have shown their heroism and compassion for their fellow citizens while faced with such destruction.

The citizens of the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi and Tennessee will work hard to rebuild and to make every effort to ensure the recovery of their communities. In recognition of their efforts, this resolution reaffirms our support as they continue to rebuild their homes and their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to extend my heartfelt sympathy and my prayers to all those who have been affected by this tragedy and to their families. I support this resolution and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 971, and appreciate the efforts of Mr. GORDON to bring the resolution forward.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have spoken about being on the ground and seeing firsthand the devastation and, of course, Congressman TANNER, Congressman COHEN and I all have counties that were affected by this.

We had nine counties that saw devastation and destruction with the impact of this EF–4 tornado. We had Shelby County, Fayette, McNairy, Hardin, Hickman, Perry, Wayne, Williamson, Montgomery County. Each saw devastation, destruction of property and loss of life.

Mr. Speaker, indeed, we extend our condolences to those families who have lost their lives, and to their loved ones who have seen that loss of life. And we also extend our condolences to those families who have lost their livelihood because, indeed, as has been stated, the destruction is unimaginable.

I have a poster right here from Sunday afternoon when we were in Hardin County at Sharon Baptist Church, which was a wonderful church and school. It was completely obliterated. All six buildings on the campus of that church were obliterated.

And while you see the destruction that is just unimaginable, what you also see is the rising of the human spirit and neighbors who are reaching out to help. I asked Dr. Spencer, who pastors that church, what next? How do they move forward? Because they had nothing left. They had a hymnal that was found two counties over, but other than that, nothing left.

And he said, well, tomorrow morning we start to rebuild. And tomorrow morning we're going to be pulling out the scrap metal, and we're going to be moving the rubble to the street. And tomorrow morning is a new day. And that is the spirit that we see of individuals pitching in, neighbors coming to help.

Now they've also been so well supported by FEMA, by Director Paulison, by TEMA, and the team that is on the ground, by our State and local elected officials who didn't sit around and wait for someone to say they're coming to take care of it. They took action and said, we're going to get this done. It has been a wonderful testament to the volunteer spirit of our great State of Tennessee.

I commend all of those who have served, who have shown up to help and again extend my condolences to those who have lost family members and have lost the means of their livelihood.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as the gentleman from Pall Mall, Tennessee (Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS) needs.

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman from Memphis, and deeply appreciate your management today of this resolution that we are discussing here on the U.S. House floor.

The tornados and storms and winds that recently tore across the South wrought upon each of our States the tragedy of loss of lives and families being separated. By now all of us have seen the images of fallen trees and toppled homes and, one by one, Tennesseans and other Southerners affected by this disaster have begun the seemingly impossible task of piecing their lives together, clearing wreckage, mourning the lost, and recovering whatever the storm failed to claim.

Our planet, for all its blessings, chooses indiscriminately at times to affront our shores, plains, valleys and farmlands with terrible acts. I'm proud to say, though, as we face the worst of the forces we cannot control, we continue to see the best of the humanitarian spirit that is very much within our power to command.

In this time of need, volunteer associations from the United Way to the Red Cross helped bring aid and comfort to the affected. Within days of the tornados' passing, the Red Cross alone helped provide shelter, comfort and over 44,000 meals with the help of nearly 1,600 Red Cross staff and volunteers in Tennessee alone.

Our local sheriff's departments and volunteer fire departments, neighbors, friends, those from the farm next door or the neighbor next door that may not have lost their home gathered together to offer a shoulder of condolence, hope for the future, and concern and compassion for those affected.

□ 1815

It was not long ago that the people of New Orleans endured the worst of what can happen when we fail to act. And in the wake of the storms in Tennessee and the South, we have shown that we will never commit the sin of inaction again. This week and last, we have shown there is no tornado so powerful, no storm so terrible that the winds of compassion cannot restore and repair any damage brought upon us.

We rise today to honor the losses of those affected, to grieve for those who were so callously and abruptly taken from us that night, and we placed a renewal of our great country and our States in the wake of this storm.

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

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he would consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I think Mahatma Gandhi once said that if all of the people who profess to be Christians would act like Jesus, the world would be at their feet. And I was reminded of that last week, because when we gathered Sunday morning for the Johnson Atchley Sunday School class at Red Bank Baptist Church where I go, ironically the lesson was on witnessing; and many times people consider ''witnessing'' as sharing the Gospel verbally. But we all know the most powerful witness that anybody can give of their faith and their commitment to the Lord is in what they do. And, man, did we ever see that again last week in Tennessee.

I have to tell of the people in Madison County who've been hit and hit and hit again over the last several years by tornados because one of the students at Union University, who was hurt very badly, is David Wilson, who happens to be a very, very close friend of my family. His parents are two of my wife's and my best friends, and he cotaught that Sunday school class with me at Red Bank Baptist Church for a number of years. His son was transported today from the hospital in Madison County across the street to Erlanger Hospital in Chattanooga where he will be continuing in recovery. But he was hurt critically, and he was underneath the rubble for 4 hours with other students at Union University.

I have got to tell you, the experience that the family saw there was a witness of their faith and their goodness. They not only had the basics of water and food and shelter, they found a home and they took care of them, but they went and got him eyeglasses and met every single need, and they made sure he was flown back to the hospital at home today and met every single need. And that's how people express their love for God is by sharing what they have with others, especially in a time of need.

Tennesseans are good people. And, man, when folks are hurting, everybody comes to help. We saw it again in Madison County. And on behalf of the Wilson family, I want to say from the other end of the State, thank you to the good people of that entire area where the tornados hit yet again. Thank you to Union University for meeting every need. Thank God none of the students died.

David Wilson has got a long, long road back to stand and walk again. We pray for the Wilsons. We pray for David. We pray and thank God for all the people who helped at this time of need. Just appreciate the goodness of the people of Tennessee who came out and helped in so many ways and all of those professionals that were there, it has been said.

And thanks to this delegation for pulling together yet again. And for the people who were hurt in other States and affected and for loss of life, our prayers went up. This is really what it's all about is people being there, because that's really all we are here for is to love God and to serve others.

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of Congressman COHEN if he has got any more speakers.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, no.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from Oklahoma for her management and Mr. WAMP, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DAVIS who spoke, and Mr. GORDON and Mr. OBERSTAR who provided statements.

Abraham Lincoln was a great supporter of government and knew that government could do things for people in need and was an important instrument of good in society. Abraham Lincoln might have best expressed it. In a crisis like this, we realize how important government can be when first responders come to the rescue and do jobs of heroic proportion.

Too many times when we are not faced with tragedies and catastrophic events, we don't reflect on the importance of government. And government is the policeman on the street. And it's the paramedic, and it's the firefighter. And it shouldn't just be on 9/11 or on days when you think about 9/11 or tornados you think about these people. But they are government, and they show government works, and they show government worked in this particular situation. It's still working as FEMA's helping people get compensation for their losses and seeing they have habitable places to live in and that the Small Business Administration is helping get businesses started.

Indeed, as Mr. WAMP and others said, it's the volunteer spirit that was shown by people in Tennessee and Alabama and Arkansas and throughout the South. They showed their care for their neighbors. There were people from Georgia and the Red Cross who came into Memphis to help people there.

I want to thank everybody who's helped all of the victims and thank Mr. GORDON for being the proud sponsor on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that everybody join in voting for the passage of this resolution.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the victims of the February 6, 2008, tornados in Lawrence and Jackson Counties, Alabama.

Today, I stand with my colleagues from Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee to express our sympathy to the victims of one of the deadliest storms in the past 20 years. In total, over 50 individuals passed away in five states across the Southeast and more than a thousand homes, schools, and businesses were destroyed.

It is with a heavy heart that I remember those from my community who passed, members of the Coleman family of Aldridge Grove, including Gregory, Rebekah, and Gereck; Linda Tinker of Pisgah; and Faye Nell McCullough of Moulton. Thirty-five individuals in north Alabama were also injured, and hundreds of homes were either damaged or completely destroyed by the storm.

On the Thursday following the storm, I joined Alabama Governor Bob Riley to tour the affected areas, and Mr. Speaker, this region has a long road to recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise to thank north Alabama's first responders and State and local emergency management officials for their work throughout the storm and its aftermath. Additionally, I would like to recognize the people of north Alabama, who are once again opening up their hearts and working hard to support the storm victims. I continue to be amazed by the outpouring of sympathy our community exhibits during times of tragedy. These were scenes that I know were similar in communities across the Southeast and I'm proud we recognize these men and women tonight.

As we know, damages caused by tornados are unpredictable. Some families' homes can be lost completely, while their neighbors' homes go relatively untouched. We owe it to those affected to do everything that we can to help them pick up the pieces. We must help them rebuild their homes, repair their community's infrastructure, and move on with their lives.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution and help these communities recover.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution and to offer my most heartfelt sympathy for all Americans who were affected by the tornadoes and other violent weather systems that hit the Delta region States including my State, Kentucky, on February 5th and 6th.

In the First Congressional District of Kentucky, seven individuals tragically lost their lives and many more were injured or displaced. As with any major weather event, there also was significant damage to public and private property, as well as power, water, and communications outages. In total, this storm claimed more than 50 lives across the Nation and thousands of other Americans' lives were dramatically changed in one of the deadliest tornado outbreaks in decades.

Sadly, we are all too familiar with the tragedy and sorrow that takes place when major catastrophic events occur. I had the opportunity to travel to my District shortly after the storms hit, and I was able to speak with many Kentuckians and see firsthand the devastation. While it was heartbreaking to see, I was encouraged by the sense of community and civic responsibility we Americans have. But, these folks cannot go at this alone,

Governor Steve Beshear recently sent a letter to President Bush requesting a Federal disaster declaration and my colleagues and I in the Kentucky delegation sent a letter in support of this request. I hope that this appeal for help will be answered expeditiously.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to offer my appreciation and gratitude to all the first responders who acted bravely and swiftly to help minimize the effects of these storms. Without their heroism, there could have been far more human suffering that would have taken place.

My thoughts and prayers are with the families and friends of those who lost their lives, and I hope that all Americans affected by this event will soon be able to get their lives back in order.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 971, a resolution to express sympathy for the victims of the tornados that struck Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee.

On the evening of February 5th, 2008, more than 100 tornados devastated communities in Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee and provided us yet another reminder of the horrific impacts of natural disasters. I express my heartfelt sympathy to those who have suffered significant losses as a result of these terrible storms, especially to those who suffered the ultimate loss—the loss of a loved one.

I also rise once again, as I did in May of last year in the wake of devastating fires in my district, and again in August of last year after the tragic bridge failure in Minneapolis, to commend the men and women who serve this nation as police officers, firefighters, and emergency medical personnel, placing themselves in great danger every day in order to protect each one of us.

Twenty-four hours a day, every day of the year, all over this country, when any type of tragedy enters our lives, from a medical emergency facing a neighbor to a large-scale natural disaster, terrorist attack, or other incident, our Nation's emergency responders and charitable organizations are the first on the scene to provide professional services, expert help, aid, and comfort. These well-trained, highly skilled individuals are truly on the front lines in preparing for, responding to, and mitigating damages from a variety of hazards.

Disasters such as the devastating tornadoes that hit just last week demonstrate the countless selfless acts of our Nation's charitable organizations and our Nation's rust responders. These first responders deserve our deepest thanks and respect.

I strongly support this resolution and urge its passage.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 971.

My home State is known as the Volunteer State, and over the last 8 days, the people of Tennessee have proven why we wear that nickname so proudly. When I visited with my neighbors in Macon, Sumner and Trousdale counties after the storm, the devastation was unimaginable. In many instances homes and businesses weren't just knocked down; they were completely gone. People were hurting.

But you could not spend time with them without recognizing how strong the community is. And I saw it again and again last week. In the worst of circumstances, friends, neighbors, complete strangers all banded together to help those who are hurting right now. As many of you watched the news last week you no doubt learned that, while Tennessee took the hardest hit, this was not something exclusive to us. People in Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Indiana also put their lives on hold to help their neighbors recover.

While we can rebuild our communities, we cannot replace human lives. Today I rise to remember the 13 lives lost in Macon County, the 7 in Sumner, the 2 in Trousdale. I also want to honor the First Responders and the volunteers who have treated the injured and who are working so hard to put our communities back together. It's going to take some time, but we're going to get there. And I want to thank President Bush and Governor Bredesen for acting so quickly to get help to our communities.

I thank my colleagues for their support last week and their continued support throughout the recovery process. As the President accurately stated a week ago, at times like these, "Prayers can help and so can the government." In Middle Tennessee and throughout the South, we will continue to need those prayers and need the President's help as we work to rebuild the lives and communities affected by these storms.

The national cameras are gone and the debris is being removed, but we still have a lot of work ahead of us.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALZ of Minnesota). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 971.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BLOCKING PROPERTY OF ADDITIONAL PERSONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SYRIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110–95)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order taking additional steps with respect to the Government of Syria's continued engagement in certain conduct that formed the basis for the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004, including but not limited to its efforts to undermine the stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq.

This order will block the property and interests in property of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of State, to be responsible for, to have engaged in, to have facilitated, or to have secured improper advantage as a result of, public corruption by senior officials within the Government of Syria. The order also revises a provision in Executive Order 13338 to block the property and interests in property of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of State, to be responsible for or otherwise significantly contributing to actions or decisions of the Government of Syria that have the purpose or effect of undermining efforts to stabilize Iraq or of allowing the use of Syrian territory or facilities to undermine efforts to stabilize Iraq.

I delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to take such actions, after consultation with the Secretary of State, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of my order.

I wish to emphasize, as well, my ongoing concern over the destabilizing role Syria continues to play in Lebanon, including its efforts to obstruct, through intimidation and violence, Lebanon's democratic processes.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 13, 2008*.

FARM BILL MUST NOT REDUCE FOOD STAMP BENEFITS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last year the House did its job and passed a fully funded farm bill with important improvements in the food stamp and TEFAP programs. The Senate, unfortunately, was not so responsible.

Now that the farm bill negotiations are under way, we hear that reducing funding for food stamps and food banks is on the table.

Mr. Speaker, this farm bill should not be negotiated on the backs of the hungry. Feeding hungry people is never wrong, but taking food out of their mouths is, and that's what a reduction in the House-passed domestic nutrition title would do.

Mr. Speaker, we must draw a line in the sand and say enough is enough. House farm bill negotiators must stand up to the Senate and say, ''Not this time.''

The recently passed stimulus package does not include food stamp provisions, even though economists across the political spectrum agree that food stamps are one of the best ways to stimulate the economy.

And now food stamps may be cut below the House-passed levels? We can and must do better.

I submit for the RECORD a letter signed by 153 Democrats to the chairman of the Agriculture Committee urging him to hold the line and insist on the House-passed nutrition title in his negotiations.

JANUARY 30, 2008.

Hon. COLIN C. PETERSON,

Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PETERSON: We want to thank you and the Members of the Agriculture Committee for your hard work on H.R. 2419, the Farm, Nutrition and Bioenergy Act of 2007. We appreciate how well you balanced the needs of farmers and consumers in the legislation. One of the key reasons for our support for the bill is the inclusion of a strong nutrition title that addresses the needs of the tens of millions of Americans, including many children and working families, who struggle against hunger by investing in and strengthening the Food Stamp Program. This bill also provides needed long-term support to our nation's food banks.

As you know, hunger is getting worse in America while the costs of food, housing and utilities are rising. We have a responsibility to help low- and middle-income families as they face these challenges. The Farm Bill is a safety net that protects people from going hungry; it represents one of the single most important opportunities we have this year to address the needs of disadvantaged children, struggling working families, seniors and people with disabilities in '' our communities. We will be doing a disservice to anyone who must rely on these programs if we acquiesce to provisions that ultimately deny hungry Americans food in their time of need.

New investments in the nutrition title are long overdue. The average food stamp benefit is a mere $1 a person a meal. The $10 minimum benefit has been stuck at the same level for 30 years. The $2,000 limit on assets for most food stamp households has not changed in two decades. And the shortfall in TEFAP commodities purchases is leaving many food bank shelves empty. It is vital that the conference agreement secure permanent funding at no less than the House-passed levels for the food stamp and TEFAP programs, and we strongly urge to include these improvements in the conference report.

We commend you for the important improvements included in the nutrition title of the House-passed bill. While there are also many improvements in the nutrition title of the Senate-passed bill, there is a profound and very troubling difference between the House and Senate nutrition titles. The House bill would make these provisions permanent law while, under the Senate bill, all the major benefit improvements would terminate after 2012. Simply, this means that these important policy improvements would return to today's law, resulting in a major reduction in benefits to more than 10 million recipients. Should these improvements sunset in 2013 and return to the 2008 levels, more than 300,000 low-income people would be cut off from food stamps altogether. We should be working to end hunger in America. We think you would agree that a final conference agreement that sunsets and underfunds improvements in the nutrition title would be unacceptable.

Again, we thank you for your commitment to the issues surrounding the people in our country who rely on programs like Food Stamps and TEFAP. We strongly urge the conference report to include permanent funding at no less than the House-passed levels for the food stamp and TEFAP programs. We look forward to working with you to maintain all of the critical improvements in these programs in the final Farm Bill.

Sincerely,

McGovern, James; DeLauro, Rosa; Woolsey, Lynn; Lee, Barbara; Solis, Hilda; Kilpatrick, Carolyn Cheeks; Moore, Dennis; Green, Al; Lewis, John; Filner, Bob; Moore, Gwen; Crowley, Joe; Neal, Richard; Grijalva, Raul; Maloney, Carolyn; Kildee, Dale; Nadler, Jerry; Jackson-Lee, Sheila; Kennedy, Patrick; Markey, Ed; Ellison, Keith; Capps, Lois; Towns, Ed; McDermott, Jim; Watt, Mel; Johnson, Hank; Becerra, Xavier; Hare, Phil; Shea-Porter, Carol; Arcuri, Mike; Tauscher, Ellen; Jefferson, William; Wu, David; Sutton, Betty; Frank, Barney.

Davis, Danny; Allen, Tom; Cuellar, Henry; Gonzalez, Charles; Carnahan, Russ; Christensen, Donna; Waters, Maxine; Guitierez, Luis; Clarke, Yvette; Hinchey, Maurice; Serrano, Jose; DeFazio, Peter; Hirono, Mazie; Ryan, Tim; Clay, William Lacy; Schakowsky, Jan; McNulty, Mike; Weiner, Anthony; Brown, Corrine; Berman, Howard; Jones, Stephanie Tubbs; Doyle, Mike; Butterfield, G.K.; Olver, John; Michaud, Michael; Courtney, Joe; Davis, Susan; Levin, Sander; Matsui, Doris; Yarmuth, John; Murphy, Chris; Fattah, Chaka; Jackson, Jesse; Slaughter, Louise; Doggett, Lloyd; Schiff, Adam; Stark, Pete; Loebsack, Dave; Lynch, Stephen; Langevin, Jim; Oberstar, James; Rush, Bobby; Meek, Kendrick.

Rothman, Steven; Berkley, Shelly; Miller, Brad; Wynn, Al; Kaptur, Marcy; Lowey, Nita; Welch, Peter; Thompson, Bennie; Farr, Sam; Hinojosa, Ruben; Sestak, Joe; Udall, Tom; Engel, Elliot; McCollum, Betty; Norton, Eleanor Holmes; Cummings, Elijah; Wilson, Charles; Pastor, Ed; Ortiz, Solomon; Murphy, Patrick; Miller, George; Delahunt, William; Sanchez, Linda; Sires, Albio; Larson, John; Baldwin, Tammy; Reyes, Silvestre; Wexler, Robert; Watson, Diane; Hodes, Paul; Honda, Michael; Velazquez, Nydia; Braley, Bruce; Price, David; Cardoza, Dennis; Napolitano, Grace; Larsen, Rick; Inslee, Jay; Pallone, Frank; Dingell, John; McNerny, Jerry; Tsongas, Niki; Scott, Bobby.

Cohen, Steve; Gillibrand, Kirsten; Van Hollen, Chris; Murtha, John; Andrews, Rob; Cleaver, Emanuel; Brady, Robert; Conyers, John; Sanchez, Loretta; Sherman, Brad; Roybal-Allard, Lucille; Costello, Jerry; Lofgren, Zoe; Walz, Tim; Sarbanes, John; Hooley, Darlene; Bishop, Sanford; DeGette, Diana; Hall, John; Holt, Rush; Bishop, Tim Payne, Donald Pascrell, Bill Eshoo, Anna Higgins, Brian McCarthy, Carolyn; Davis, Artur; Schwartz, Allyson; Shuler, Heath; Costa, Jim; Castor, Kathy; Waxman, Henry.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REJECT ANOTHER SHORT-TERM EXTENSION TO THE PROTECT AMERICA ACT

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I hadn't planned on coming down here tonight, but this is a sad and distressing day for this House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect you know, some may not, but there are companies in America that are patriotic and they want to help our Nation fight against those who would do us harm. But amazingly, Mr. Speaker, they feel that they can't. And why? They believe that if they do, they will be sued. That is right, Mr. Speaker. Companies in America believe, and have been given counsel by their attorneys, that if they help the United States Government assist in making our Nation safer, they will be sued. The threat of trial lawyers are preventing our Nation from protecting itself.

Outrageous you say? So do I. So do I.

If Congress doesn't act this week, this week, critical tools that allow our intelligence officers to monitor terrorist communications overseas will expire. Yesterday, the Senate approved a bipartisan bill, a bipartisan bill by a vote of 68–29, to close the terrorist loophole in our intelligence law. The Senate bill represents a remarkable compromise between Congress and the administration.

It rightly restores the original intent of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, FISA, by ensuring that intelligence officials can conduct surveillance on foreign targets without a court order while still protecting the civil liberties of the American people.

It also grants liability protection to telecommunication companies that helped our government after September 11. Allowing these companies to be subject to frivolous lawsuits threatens their cooperation in the future and would cripple America's counterterrorism efforts. This, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, appears to be what the House Democrat majority desires.

Every American will become exposed to greater threats. Every American: moms, dads, sons, daughters. Every single American is exposed to greater threats because this majority refuses to consider a long-term solution to the problems facing our intelligence community.

I haven't read, Mr. Speaker, that terrorists have placed an expiration date on their plots to destroy our way of life. Congress shouldn't put an expiration date on our intelligence community's ability to protect our Nation.

This bill expires this week. We must act. Mr. Speaker, elections have consequences, and it appears that the Democrat left majority now in charge is beholden to trial lawyers. I just didn't think that they would put those trial lawyers ahead of national security.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day. I can only hope that the American people are paying attention.

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

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1830

IRAQ NUMBER 250

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALZ of Minnesota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a moment that I had hoped would never come. I am rising for the 250th time to oppose the occupation of Iraq. It's a sad task, because 250 times means that the occupation has dragged on and on nearly 5 years.

I had hoped that my first speech would be my last, or my 50th or even my 100th, but the administration continued to follow its blind and destructive path year after year. As the saying goes, ''All that is necessary for evil to triumph is that good people do nothing.''

So, to be sure, I have raised my voice time and time again on this floor to protest the administration's folly and hold it accountable for its reckless actions and its reckless policies.

The American people have raised their voices, also, Mr. Speaker. They have said that they want an end to this occupation and a responsible redeployment of our troops. But our leaders in the White House, who first turned a deaf ear to the people of the world when they invaded Iraq, continue to turn a deaf ear to their very own people in the United States of America.

What makes this occasion even sadder for me is that I will have to rise many more times before the occupation ends because the administration has made it absolutely clear that it will continue its occupation right to the bitter end of its term in office.

And I fear that the occupation may go on long after that. A leading Republican Presidential candidate said that he has no problem with the occupation lasting 100 years. No problem. And this same candidate said the other day, and

I quote, ''There's going to be other wars.'' This is exactly the kind of ''shoot-first, ask-questions-later'' thinking that got us into trouble in Iraq in the first place.

Fortunately, the Democratic Presidential candidates have a different mindset, a mindset that uses diplomacy and international cooperation to solve problems, not war. But the current administration is working hard to tie the hands of the very next President. It's negotiating to establish permanent bases in Iraq. And it is planning to keep troop levels absolutely as high as possible.

Remember all the sweet talk, Mr. Speaker, last September about possible troop cuts? It was an absolute sham. And what are we getting for the tragedy of Iraq? Are we any safer? Absolutely not. In fact, the director of National Intelligence has warned that al Qaeda is getting stronger in its cozy safe haven in Pakistan, and that they are busy training more and more operatives.

A whole new generation is growing up in occupied Iraq. Their memories begin after U.S. forces rolled in. Since electricity and water and basic services have been on the fritz. Since whole neighborhoods have become wandering refugees. Many have never known the cultural gems of their own country. This cannot bode well for the region.

Secretary of State Rice has admitted that the Taliban is resurgent in Afghanistan. And the report of the Congressional Commission on the National Guard and Reserves found that there is an ''appalling gap'' in our ability to defend the homeland because of Guard and Reserve redeployments to Iraq.

Meanwhile, we are squandering $12 billion per month on the occupation while our economy slides into recession and the American people face the loss of their jobs, their health care, and their homes. Let's be clear, Mr. Speaker, the main reason we are in this recession is because of the senseless and unending occupation of Iraq.

And our brave men and women in uniform, what about them? They're paying a very high price for this occupation. Every day, five U.S. soldiers try to commit suicide because the frequency of deployment has put tremendous stress on them and their families. This is simply unacceptable and a national disgrace if we do not act to reverse this trend.

Mr. Speaker, I will be back on this floor talking about this some more, but this is my 250th time, and I want you to know, it's time that this occupation be over.

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.)

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF ROSEMARY MUCKLOW

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the achievements of a friend of mine, Rosemary Mucklow. Rosemary is the long-standing executive director of the National Meat Association and has been somewhat of a legend in the meat and food business. Her dedication to the industry is evident by her business achievements, there are so many of them.

Rosemary was born in Scotland and went to work at the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries for the British Government before being hired as a secretary at the Pacific Coast Meat Association, which was later named the Western States Meat Association, and then renamed the National Meat Association.

In 1996, Rosemary received the E. Floyd Forbes award from the Meat Association for her outstanding service. She was honored again in 2002 by the American Meat Science Association for her ''commonsense leadership.'' She served on the National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection and was the vice president of the International HACCP Alliance. Throughout her career, she has highlighted the importance of information and education of the meat industry to improve standards, efficiency, and quality.

Rosemary will be retiring very soon, but if I know Rosemary, retirement for her won't mean just quietly fading into the sunset. She is going to be active, probably still in the association, and in the industries.

I had the opportunity to get to know Rosemary about 10 or 12 years ago when we, in the House Ag subcommittee of appropriations were passing the HACCP law. At that time we were moving from visual carcass-to-carcass inspection of meat and poultry to microbial testing, taking this to the modern technology. Rosemary knew so many people in the industry, and there was a lot of controversy, but she was able to get the people together to come up with the right compromises and the right push at the right time to get the thing from floundering.

She also was very active at a time when there was some Salmonella and E. coli issues that had threatened to close down the industry and push through, I think, very aggressive mandatory recall authority for the Secretary of Agriculture. Rosemary brokered some ''peace in the valley,'' you might say.

She's got the kind of enthusiasm that can only be called ''contagious.'' I met her through a man who is a sausage manufacturer in San Francisco named Al Piccetti, and the Piccetti family has also become friends of mine. And it seems like birds of a feather flock together. Rosemary's friends are good people. They have invited Libby and me to go visit them out in San Francisco, and we had a very nice time dealing with them. All the hospitality I would say that they have given us over the years and the friendship, those kind of relationships that in this business are rare to find. I will say this, I have no idea what Ms. Mucklow's politics are, if she's Democrat or Republican. In fact, the last time she was in Washington, she really prefers, for some reason, the west coast, but the last time she was here she said, Jack, I don't need to see you, I'm going to go see Chairwoman ROSA DELAURO because that's where the action is now. And she said that with a twinkle and a smile, and then she went up to go see ROSA. But she has that kind of good will that she can deal with both sides of the aisle and get the argument off politics into what is best for the American food consumer. What's best for the industry and the consumer has always been her goal.

I will say I don't even know what kind of activities she does on a personal level, but I know this, that whatever she is doing right now, she's doing it with a smile and a lot of fun and involving a lot of people.

She's the kind of lobbyist or industry advocate that keeps a good reputation for the industry that she represents because she doesn't cut corners, she doesn't do political things, she doesn't think in terms of backroom deals or power moves or anything like that, she wants to do what's fair and what's just for the American people, and has a broad picture far beyond her job or her industry or her association.

We're going to miss her kind of leadership, but I do hope that in her retirement she does not become a stranger. With that, I want to say thank you, Rosemary Mucklow, for your many years of advocacy for the American food consumer and for the industry.

ROSEMARY MUCKLOW, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL MEAT ASSOCIATION, OAKLAND, CA

Rosemary Mucklow is Director Emeritus of National Meat Association, (formerly Western States Meat Association) an Oakland-based trade association representing packers, processors, wholesalers, sausage makers, and other related firms in the U.S. meat and poultry industry.

Until 2007 she was the NMA Executive Director and held this position since 1982 when the Western States Meat Packers Association and the Pacific Coast Meat Association merged to form the stronger, broad-based organization it is today. Rosemary has been associated with the meat industry for over 40 years.

As Executive Director, Rosemary's responsibility's included the administration of the affairs of the National Meat Association. She continues to oversee the activities of NMA as Director Emeritus, and as part of her daily activities she maintains working contacts with NMA's members so that she remains fully informed about the effects on their businesses of government and market activities.

Almost daily, Rosemary advises members on the intricacies of the federal meat and poultry inspection laws, and other laws administered by the Department of Agriculture.

Rosemary has a reputation for ''telling it like it is.'' She is considered a formidable adversary in defending the industry when it's right, and she'll be equally straightforward in making corrections when it is not. In 1996 Rosemary received the E. Floyd Forbes award presented by the National Meat Association in recognition of her outstanding services to the meat industry. In 2002, she was honored by the American Meat Science Association for her ''common sense leadership in the areas of food safety and public policy.'' She was appointed to the National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection and elected Vice President of the International HACCP Alliance. She is an honorary member of the American Association of Food Hygiene Veterinarians.

Aside from her responsibilities as Director Emeritus of NMA Rosemary is a member of various research and industry related organizations. She is a Trustee on several Taft-Hartley Funds administering medical and pension benefits for union workers. She has worked to raise funds in the area of cancer research as President of the Peralta Cancer Institute and has reached out to assist disadvantaged people in the community. She is the President of the Berkeley City Club, as well.

Rosemary was born and educated in Edinburgh, Scotland and had various jobs unrelated to the meat industry before coming to the United States in 1959. She earned her Bachelor of Arts, majoring in Accounting at Golden Gate University, graduating in 1970. She resides in a cottage with a panoramic view of the Golden Gate and surrounded by a woodsy rose garden in Berkeley, California with two feline companions.

JOLLEY: FIVE MINUTES WITH ROSEMARY MUCKLOW, RET., NMA

Rosemary Mucklow is really going to retire this time, No kidding. Ms. Mucklow, the long-standing Executive Director of the National Meat Association and a legend in the meat business, took a first stab at retirement several years ago. It didn't take. After several fruitless months of searching for her replacement, the National Meat Association's board of directors threw in the towel and asked her to stay on a bit longer.

Her second retirement announcement, issued just a few weeks ago, included a surprise. The next Executive Director had already been chosen—Barry Carpenter, the recently retired Deputy Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service and one of the few with the gravitas to follow in the deep foot prints left by Ms. Mucklow.

Note: In writing this, I almost called Carpenter ''her replacement,'' a silly misnomer on my part. To be correct, she will be followed in the office by Mr. Carpenter. No one will ever replace her.

Retirement for Rosemary does not mean she will immediately take up knitting at some condo in Sun City. She won't even hide out at her home in the Berkeley hills. OK, she might do some more knitting, it's always been a hobby. But those needles are much sharper than the standard issue dime store needles—maybe they're those Addi Turbo 47 inch circular brass knitting needles with finely honed points—and they will still be used with great dexterity to prod an occasionally recalcitrant industry onwards.

In this interview, I asked her to construct a mini-hall of fame and induct an inaugural class of people she has worked with in her long career. It was an impressive list but short one name. In any meat industry hall of fame, her name will be listed at the top in recognition of the lengthy and positive impact she's had.

Let's spend five minutes with Rosemary as she prepares to slowly and reluctantly step away.

It's been said that retirement isn't for sissies and that's something you've never been accused of being. So are you really going to do it this time and what does retirement mean to a hyper-active, over-achiever like you?

On February 1, 2007, when Barry Carpenter accepts the position of CEO/Executive Director, my status with NMA will change to Director Emeritus. I expect to turn over the ceo responsibilities to Barry, and as we proceed through a transition time, to be able to focus my time and energy on many undone activities for which there has been very limited time. Retirement is a misnomer really, and because Barry will be recused from certain activities with his former employer, I will be an interim bridge for those purposes. I'm certainly not retiring to my cottage in the hills of Berkeley to knit full time!

In military terms, you seem to be doing a ''phased withdrawal'' from your duties at NMA. What will keep you busy as your time out of the office expands?

Oh, there are lots of things on the horizon! I'd like to visit and work with individual members more, I'd like to have the time to go through lots of history and big files that have accumulated over the years, and probably to do a little writing about the changes we've already seen, and what might lie ahead.

How about a short history lesson? How and when did you get started in the trade association business? A little background on ''why,'' too

I was hired by then Pacific Coast Meat Jobbers Association on February 1, 1961 as the secretary in a two-person office. Our major focus was collective bargaining on behalf of Bay Area meat jobbers and processors. There were a couple of changes in the man that I worked for that year, and we got through labor negotiations, and by early 1962 I had a new boss who was a lawyer and accountant. After the 1964 negotiations, he told me I was not good as a secretary, and why did I not go back to school and get educated, so I went to Golden Gate University and after five years received my BA in Accounting in 1970.

By that time, the boss was back practicing law, and in absentia, so I got to fill the void and apply what I had learned and we were in the years of implementation of the 1967 changes to the Federal Meat Inspection Act. We were innovative and energetic, I made friends with the bigger organization, Western States Meat Packers Association, and in 1982, under the leadership of Cal Santare of WSMPA, we merged Pacific Coast and WSMPA into Western States Meat Association. In 1996, because of broader interest in what WSMA was doing, we changed the name to National Meat Association. It's been an exciting and bumpy ride!

You've had the opportunity to meet and work with many of the legends in the business. Let's construct a mini-hall of fame here and induct the inaugural members. Who would they be and why would you include them?

First the man who hired me: Tom Morton, who went on to be very successful in the investment business. I should have followed him!

Don Houston, FSIS Administrator, was a good friend, and provided critical access for me to the USDA regulatory process.

Cal Santare, who believed that a woman could do it, when many of his cohorts didn't think so!

Al Piccetti, of San Francisco Sausage, a former President of PCMA, who encouraged me to reach for my dreams.

Ben Goehring, of Goehring Meat, another former President of PCMA and later of WMSA, who inspired me with strength and friendship.

Kathi Mosie, of Saag's Products, who never failed to be supportive.

Phil Bauer of Federal Meat, who had to fight for me on principle, and thus earned unpopularity with some associates.

Cal Faello of King Meat who went to the mat for me as a matter of principle.

John Duyn of Carlton Farms who helped me to make change from good old boys to the next generation.

Dick Lyng, whom I knew in California, who showed me by example how to be a better politician

Phil Olsson of Olsson, Frank & Weeda, friend, lawyer, counselor and absolutely straight arrow for over 30 years.

In the industry, many of the toughies reached out to be helpful to me, including Bob Peterson, Ken Monfort, and more recently Joe Luter. John Miller is a longtime friend, People like Bill Buckner, Dick Bond (whose first job was for one of the early WSMPA legends, Homer Glover), Rich Vesta, Bernie and Joe Clougherty, Gary Waldman, Terry Caviness, Dave Wood, Les Oesterreich, Warren Wilcox and Harvey Dietrich. In academia, I can never forget Russell Cross, Gary Smith, Jeff Savell, Roger Mandigo, Gary Acuff, and Elsa Murano and lots more. And Lou Gast whom I first knew at FSIS in the early 80s has come through over and over again.

Indeed, I have been blessed, and while there are many omissions from this group, my strength has come from the generosity and kindness of many, many people in this great industry.

You've accomplished a lot during your tenure at WSMA/NMA. What achievements stand out the most?

Running a trade organization is not like playing a football game. There are not winners and losers after a fixed amount of game time!

Some legal wins, such as the Supreme case on Salmonella Testing at the 5th Circuit Court was a powerful event. Also, the driving energy by NMA to get the U.S. Canadian Border open was a special ''win.''

But the big win is the strong support of people for the goals of NMA and what it stands for, for the respect shown toward me and this organization for what it does to serve the needs and interests of the industry, and for the appreciation of members, large and small, for what we stand for and the efforts we make.

Using your many years of experience, let's look ahead. What does the future look like from your vantage point? Can you talk about issues that we can look at with pride as well as the issues that might create some problems?

I see lots of opportunities that lie ahead! The 21st Century will be a stimulating and exciting time for firms that pay attention to what consumers want to buy, rather than make a commodity product to ship out.

There is a huge amount of innovation going on as we speak in this great industry. I think we need to provide the next generation with relatively simple information about how to make food taste good and be safe, all at the same time. There are a zillion cookbooks, but in addition to easy meals for consumers on the rush, there is a need to demonstrate that good food is a catalyst for good friends and families to get together. I like it best when I hear that competitors can find common ground with each other in the marketplace.

No one is going to eat the same item over and over again. Variety, reasonable portion size, and good taste is very important, I think there are big opportunities for developing new niche markets, and trade organizations will be challenged to fairly represent their members interests in the upcoming debates. I think there are opportunities for

small Individuals to bring forward their idea, and it gives me the greatest pleasure to help small firms that have the dynamic energy to grow their market share with a good idea.

As Barry Carpenter prepares to pick up the torch, what advice do you have to give him?

Barry brings strengths to the leadership of this organization that are quite different to mine. He is highly respected for his capacity to understand this industry, and for honesty and integrity. I am thrilled that he will take over, and I will try not to get in his way as he leads with new ideas and creativity and builds on the strengths of NMA as we know it today.

NMA's member response services have created a new gold standard for the industry, for large and small firms. Our availability to assist and guide firms through the maze of regulatory requirements is legendary. I will continue to support Barry in any way appropriate and possible and am thrilled that the lengthy transition will give us opportunities to work together in a different way to serve the needs and interests of our great meat industry, and liberate me to think about new projects that can be valuable for the future of our organization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CLARKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HINCHEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRESSWOMAN WOOLSEY'S 250TH IRAQ SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to join Congresswoman WOOLSEY in her 250th special order on the ongoing quagmire in Iraq. I just want to take a moment to commend Congresswoman WOOLSEY and thank her for her leadership and her commitment to ending this occupation of Iraq and bringing our troops home. It was her resolution several years ago that we were able to begin, actually, the debate on this floor with regard to bringing our young men and women home. So I do have to salute you, Congresswoman WOOLSEY, and thank you again very much for your commitment and your tenacity and your willingness to be a voice that is so desperately needed to be heard.

Madam Speaker, it's really, though, unfortunate that Congresswoman WOOLSEY, myself, Congresswoman WATERS, and all of our colleagues have to come even once to this floor and speak out against the invasion and subsequent occupation of Iraq. But the reality is, we are in Iraq. And the reality is, also, that the cost of our invasion and the subsequent occupation of Iraq have been very high.

As of February 10, 2008, according to the Defense Department, 3,955 of our brave young men and women have given their lives, nearly 30,000 United States troops have been injured, and countless thousands of Iraqis have been killed. We've committed a half trillion dollars and gotten what in return? We are still occupying a country which has undermined our standing and credibility in the world, what we have done as it relates to our occupation of Iraq.

And so we have an opportunity once again to talk about why we do not believe funding the President or giving the President another blank check for waging war in Iraq makes any sense. We have the opportunity to turn this around in the coming war supplemental, which I understand may be once again before us next month. We must insist that the only funds that the President should get should be to protect our troops on the ground and bring them back home safely, not one more dime to continue the occupation, nor one more dime to continue the combat that is taking place in Iraq. And of course we call that, and it is better known as a fully funded redeployment.

Equally as important, when our troops come home, we must ensure that they all come home. And that's why we continue to work with our colleagues to include provisions to prohibit permanent military bases in Iraq. We have been successful, in a bipartisan fashion, in including language in a number of authorizing and appropriation bills, as well as a stand-alone bill, H.R. 2929, which passed the House in July of 2007 by an overwhelming bipartisan vote.

In spite of the fact that the President has signed these provisions into law, I believe it's six times since 2006, he issued a statement as he signed the fiscal year 2008 Department of Defense authorization bill signaling his intention to ignore the provisions banning permanent military bases, to ignore that provision. Sadly, unfortunately, this is a pattern coming from the White House that really does seem intent on cutting Congress out of any decisions relating to the permanent stationing of the United States military in Iraq.

At the end of last year, without formal congressional input, this declaration of principles for a long-term relationship of cooperation and friendship between the Republic of Iraq and the United States of America was discussed between Prime Minister Maliki and President Bush. Now these ''principles'' will set the stage for future agreements on the disposition of United States troops in Iraq. To make certain that this does not end up being a backdoor way to keep our troops in Iraq indefinitely, which of course many of us are worried about, I recently introduced H.R. 5128, which will require that any formal agreement emerging from this declaration of principles has the approval of both the House and the Senate. Further, it states a sense of Congress that the Iraqi Parliament should put their seal of approval on any agreement as well, which just makes sense.

Finally, it will prohibit funding for any agreement that may emerge from these principles that does not have the approval of the House and the Senate.

There's no denying that a majority of the American people are with us. A recent CNN Opinion Research Corporation poll has found that nearly two-thirds of all Americans oppose the occupation of Iraq.

Madam Speaker, we need to end this occupation and bring our troops home as safely and as quickly as possible. And it is because of the courage and fortitude of Members such as Congresswomen WOOLSEY and WATERS, who come to this floor each and every day. When the history of this period is written, historians will look back and say that there were some who opposed this and wanted it to end and end quickly.

□ 1845

FIGHTING IDENTITY THEFT AND DEFENDING THE HOMELAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CLARKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, according to a 2005 GAO study, employers reported the use of 1.4 million Social Security numbers that did not exist. Nearly 1.7 million numbers had been used by multiple individuals, sometimes as many as 500 times for the same Social Security number. In my district, the Waukegan police find that at least 20 fake Social Security cards are found by law enforcement every week.

Now, upgrading the Social Security card should be common sense. It's about seniors. It's about identity theft. It's about illegal immigration. And it's about keeping Americans safe.

When we look at today's Social Security card, we find a 1930s design. It lacks a picture. It lacks a bar code. It lacks a magnetic strip. It poses almost no barrier to the thousands of counterfeiters that make false Social Security cards.

Today, along with my colleague from Illinois Peter Roskam, we have introduced legislation to finally give Americans the choice between the old 1930s design Social Security card and the new secure Social Security card. This card offers enhanced protections across the board. It would replace that flimsy and easily counterfeitable Social Security card with a 21st century identity document that gives seniors real protection. Our legislation and this design is based on the government's common access card. Already the U.S. government has issued 10 million of these cards, and its protections, in our judgment, we believe, should be offered to people in the 21st century against Social Security card counterfeiters.

We think this legislation is important to propose a significant barrier to those who would counterfeit Social Security cards, to help seniors in fighting identity theft, and to make sure that a person who has that number and this card is really who they say it is.

We saw on September 11 that 18 of 19 hijackers had valid U.S. IDs during their crime of the century. I think it's time to make sure that at least the Social Security card has the 21st century protections that we can offer to make sure that we protect seniors, to make sure that we protect all Americans, and to protect the Social Security system. That's why we think that this legislation to create these secure Social Security cards is an idea whose time has come.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR ADOPTION OF H. RES. 979, RECOMMENDING THAT HARRIET MIERS AND JOSHUA BOLTEN BE FOUND IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS, AND ADOPTION OF H. RES. 980, AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO INITIATE OR INTERVENE IN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS TO ENFORCE CERTAIN SUBPOENAS

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–526) on the resolution (H. Res. 982) providing for adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 979) recommending that the House of Representatives find Harriet Miers and Joshua Bolten, Chief of Staff, White House, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with subpoenas duly issued by the Committee on the Judiciary and for the adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 980) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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. 110–527) on the resolution (H. Res. 983) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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.)

THANKING THE HONORABLE LYNN WOOLSEY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FOR ALL SHE HAS DONE IN TRYING TO CONVINCE CONGRESS TO BRING OUR SOLDIERS HOME FROM IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, this evening I come to the floor to be with my friend and colleague Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY as she gives her 250th speech and Special Order on this floor. I come to be with her to commend her for the tremendous leadership that she has provided not only in speaking out against the war in Iraq, but because she has given numerous press conferences, she has been on numerous speaking engagements, she has spoken with editorial boards, she has written articles, she has done everything that could be done in order to provide leadership and to encourage and urge the Congress of the United States to bring our soldiers home.

Unfortunately, her messages have not always been heard. But there are those of us, those of us who work with her in the Progressive Caucus, those of us who work with her in the Out of Iraq Caucus, who have tried to not only give support but to do the same kinds of things that she has been doing in order to end this war.

The American people are tired of this war, and I find it disingenuous for some of the pundits to say that somehow this is off the radar screen, that this is not an issue that the American public cares about anymore, that somehow it is the economy. Of course it is the economy, but you cannot separate what is going on within our economy from the war. We must look at this war for what it is.

First of all, it is a war that we certainly should not be in. We were misled. There were never any weapons of mass destruction. Saddam Hussein is dead. Four thousand of our American soldiers have been killed in this war. Countless Iraqis, Iraqi civilians, and others who have made up the coalition forces from other countries are also dead. And so here we are, and the pundits are talking about it is not about the war, it's not on the radar screen of the American public, that the economy is, when, in fact, our economy is in recession because of this mismanaged war.

We have a President of the United States who came in as a fiscal conservative supposedly belonging to the party of the fiscal conservatives who have been spending, spending, spending on this war in Iraq, over $500 billion on this war in Iraq, at the same time giving tax cuts to the richest 1 percent of the corporations of America and denying the dollars that we need to invest in our own domestic problems that need to be addressed.

We had a bridge fall down in Minneapolis, and people wondered why did that happen. And when we took a close look at the reviews, the assessments that had been done about the state of affairs of our bridges and our infrastructure, we learned that many of our bridges in America are in the same position that that bridge was in, and we know that they have been assessed to be dangerous, that they need repair.

Why don't we have the money to invest in our infrastructure? Why is it we cannot create the jobs by investing in our infrastructure? Why can't we repair the bridges and the roads and the highways and build credible transportation systems? It is because this administration has decided that we are going to spend a disproportionate amount of the taxpayers' dollars on this war in Iraq, and we don't know when we are going to get out of this war in Iraq. And this administration would have us believe, because they have sent more soldiers and spent more money in the so-called surge, that somehow we are winning the war. What are we winning? What does winning look like? I don't recognize it.

I know this: I know that these 4,000 soldiers that have been killed in Iraq are not with their families, that their families, many, are in disarray; many of them very patriotic, who went to war because the President said that they were needed; and many of them who are no longer with us, their families are suffering. And we have others who have been injured who have come home, and they have not gotten the best medical treatment that they should have received, even though they were promised that, if they serve, they would be taken care of.

So here we are. We have destabilized the Middle East and we have occupied Iraq. We have Iran that is threatening us, Syria, Lebanon destabilized, and Pakistan is a joke.

I will simply conclude by thanking LYNN WOOLSEY for all that she has done to try to convince this Congress we should bring our soldiers home.

DEATH IS LESS COMPLICATED THAN FILLING OUT YOUR 1040

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, it's been said over and over again that nothing in this world is certain except death and taxes. I was a practicing physician for over 25 years back in Texas, and I will tell you that sometimes death even seems a little less complicated than our tax system.

The complexity of the Tax Code is a consequence of countless deductions and exemptions aimed at steering a social agenda, a social agenda, when it's supposed to be a Tax Code. The result is a Federal law fraught with opportunities for avoiding taxes and loopholes to be exploited all at the expense of fellow Americans.

Everyone is familiar with the problems inherent in our convoluted Tax

Code. Criticizing the Tax Code is as American as apple pie and baseball, and for good reason. Each year Americans spend billions of hours and billions of dollars trying to do their best to comply with our complicated Tax Code. That's not counting the billions of hours they spend complaining about it.

Madam Speaker, time is precious, and too often we don't have enough of it for the personal things we like, such as earning a living, raising our families, spending time with friends. And then there is the dollars and cents side of this equation where time is money, and valuable resources are squandered navigating tax law instead of spent growing the economy and creating jobs. Taken together, this is a strong prescription for real change in our Tax Code.

We know what works when it comes to changing the code because we caught a glimpse of it when Ronald Reagan cut the code in half in 1986. As a result of that reform, the economy grew, revenues increased, and jobs were created. I can't think of a better prescription for our slowing economy than replicating the reform of the Tax Code on an even greater scale.

So what should we do? The prescription is also pretty simple: flatten the tax, broaden the base, and shift the burden away from families and small businesses.

The encouraging news is that we have a practical and effective blueprint for making this real change across the board. This blueprint is called the flat tax. In 1981, Robert Hall and Alvin Rabushka proposed a new and radically simple structure that would transform the Internal Revenue Service and our economy by creating a single rate of taxation for all Americans. Today, several States have implemented a single-rate tax structure for their State income taxes, and from Utah to Massachusetts citizens are seeing the benefit.

In Colorado, a single tax rate generated so much income, so much revenue, that lawmakers actually reduced the rate less than 10 years after its implementation. In Indiana, the economy boomed after a single rate went into effect in 2003, and since that time, the corporate income tax receipts have risen by 250 percent.

Here in Congress we have several people working on the problem. People such as myself; Congressman DAVID DREIER from California, the ranking member of the Rules Committee; and PAUL RYAN of Wisconsin, the ranking member on the Budget Committee, are all working to establish a simple tax rate structure for our United States. Other Members are working on it in the other body as well.

I brought a poster to show you how a faster, flatter, fairer tax structure would work, and it's pretty simple. Here you go: Your name, a little bit of identification data, write in your income, a line for personal exemptions, calculate your deductions for personal exemptions, taxable income, calculate the tax by multiplying by a flat rate, subtract taxes already withheld, and you're done. What did it take, 30 seconds? Not very long.

No more expensive tax attorney bills. Gone are the hours of stressful research trying to figure out whether your military service or your marital status will adversely affect your return. No more headaches trying to determine where the estimated tax payments go.

□ 1900

A single tax rate structure would eliminate taxes on capital gains, taxes on dividends and taxes on savings. Personal savings would increase. Businesses would expand and create jobs. Without the heavy corporate income tax, which is currently the second highest in the industrialized world, companies would have less incentive to offshore their headquarters, and more importantly, less incentive to offshore their earnings.

And here is where the all-American principle of freedom comes into the prescription: The decision to move to a single rate system would be entirely up to the individual or business, not the government. This would be an optional program. If somebody has constructed their domestic finances or their business finances to maximize earnings under the current Federal income tax code, they will be allowed to stay in the code. But if you are tired of the shoe box, if you want to fill out a single page form and spend the rest of that time with your family or on a personal vacation, you are free to do so.

A flat tax would be much less costly, saving taxpayers more than $100 billion per year, and reduce tax compliance costs by over 90 percent. The resulting increase in personal savings, there is a stimulus package that would have an immediate effect on our American economy.

Recent polling by American Solutions shows that over 80 percent of Americans favor an optional one-page tax return with one rate. After all, who could complain about making something easier, especially a process that comes at such high cost?

Madam Speaker, this is a very political year. We hear a lot of talk about change. You can't turn on the television without hearing talk about change. Let's consider how that change could improve the most complicated of institutions, the Internal Revenue Service, and more importantly, deliver prosperity and return time, return time, to the American taxpayer. That is a stimulus package worthy of everyone's vote.

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.)

HONORING THE MEMORY OF DEREK BRIAN JOHNSON

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

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Derek Brian Johnson and the efforts of his father, Robert Johnson, a resident of Easton, Pennsylvania, to seek justice for his son.

Derek Brian Johnson was only 32 when he died. He worked as an Internet security manager. He enjoyed singing, skydiving and motorcycle racing. He was passionate in his support of the Make-A-Wish Foundation. He also loved music and bands. And it was this last love that ultimately cost him his life.

On February 20, 2003, nearly 5 years ago, Derek went to a club called The Station in West Warwick, Rhode Island, to hear a band called Great White. The club was jammed that night with patrons. As the show ensued, tour manager Daniel Biechele set off a pyrotechnic display that was part of the band's floor show. The display ignited the building's soundproofing foam.

The Station went up like kindling. People rushed for the exits, and panic ensued. Many were crushed as the crowd stampeded to get out of the burning building. In the end, 100 people died that night at The Station, including Derek Johnson.

Ultimately Biechele and club owners Jeffrey Derderian and Michael Derderian were charged with manslaughter as a result of the fire and ensuing deaths. And there began my constituent, Robert Johnson's, quest to find justice for his son, a search that from his point of view has not been at all fruitful.

First, there was the matter of the club itself. There were more people in the club than there should have been. The Station had no sprinkler system, which would have prevented, or at least minimized, the conflagration. And the soundproofing foam was not treated with flame retardant materials.

Second, there were the court proceedings. Biechele pled guilty to 100 counts of manslaughter. He could have gotten 10 years to serve under a plea agreement that Bob claims he did not know about. The judge gave Biechele 15 years but suspended all but 4. Michael Derderian was allowed to plead no contest to 100 counts of manslaughter pursuant to a plea agreement. He too only received 4 years to serve.

Finally, there were the parole hearings. Even though both of these men were responsible for the deaths of 100 people, the State parole board in Rhode Island has decided to release them.

I have to say that I agree with Bob Johnson when he tells me that serving less than 4 years after being found legally responsible for so much carnage hardly seems just. I commend Robert Johnson for the hard work he has put

forth to find justice for his son and for the other victims of The Station nightclub fire. I know that the memory of Derek Brian Johnson will live on in his father's heart forever, and I applaud his efforts to soldier on on behalf of a man who was taken from us all too soon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

GETTING THE NATION BACK ON TRACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to come tonight and talk a little about spending, talk a little bit about the budget, talk a little bit about reform, talk a little bit about entitlements, and talk a little bit about earmarks.

What we want to do, Madam Speaker, over the next hour is talk a little bit about what is going on in Washington, what is broken, what needs to be fixed and have a big-picture discussion. We can talk about line items. We can talk about things down in the weeds. But what we want to talk about tonight is a philosophical difference between the Republicans and the Democrats on how we are going to get this country, Madam Speaker, back on track.

Now the President's budget lays out critical fiscal issues that the Congress is going to have to deal with in the near future. Key among them are balancing the budget, promoting sustained economic growth, slowing the growth of Federal spending and addressing the coming entitlement crisis.

First on deficits. Last year at this time, after several years of dramatic declines in the Federal deficit, we found ourselves on what may be described as a glide path to balance in the near term. Now that path has been interrupted, mainly due to the slowdown in the economy and the stimulus package, but we will still balance the budget.

Even while addressing current challenges in the economy, the President's budget achieves balance by 2012 without raising taxes. Now let me say that again, because I think that is extremely important. The President's budget achieves balance by 2012 without raising taxes by demanding the Federal Government get in control of guess what? Spending.

The budget also achieves balance through sustainable fiscal policies that support economic growth and job creation. It maintains the tax policies that have supported the solid growth which until only recently succeeded in producing appreciably higher revenue, appreciably higher revenue, and dramatic reductions in the deficit, and we have got some charts to show you just that.

Finally, the President's budget recognizes that our Nation's challenges go well into the next few years. It takes a significant critical step towards addressing the greatest threat to our Nation's future strength and prosperity, the unsustainable growth of our largest entitlement programs.

While the President's budget doesn't fix the entitlement problem in one fell swoop, it does propose specific reforms, ones which would reduce Medicare's $34 trillion in unfunded liability by nearly a third, and that would be a tremendous step, Madam Speaker, $10 trillion, and I congratulate the President on this step.

These are issues that we can debate on how best to approach that. But to cut the unfunded liability by $10 trillion is remarkable. And if the people want to criticize the President's specific proposals for addressing that problem, that's fine. Then let's make sure they come forward with solutions on how we can fix this stuff. Don't just tell me the problem. Tell me how to fix it.

We must reform these programs so they can meet their mission of providing health and retirement security and a reliable safety net today and in the future. The administration has a proposed plan, but it is Congress who has the power of the purse strings. It is Congress who will decide the Federal budget. And it is Congress who is ultimately responsible and accountable for ensuring a sustainable path to our Nation's future.

Let me show a couple of charts to kind of substantiate what we are talking about, Madam Speaker.

The first chart. Now a lot of people have said the Bush tax cuts, let's make them permanent. Let's do away with them. When we talk about the Bush tax cuts, what are we talking about? We are not talking about the Bush tax cuts. We are talking about real things. We are talking about capital gains. We are talking about the marriage penalty. We are talking about dividends. We are talking about a death tax. A child tax credit. Things that affect everyday Americans, Madam Speaker.

Now this chart shows the best Bush tax cuts of 2001 and 2003. If you look at the red first, this shows what happened before the tax cuts, and the blue shows what happened after the tax cuts. Now my friends on the other side have always said, well, what we need to do, we need to tax the rich. We need to make sure that they are paying more than their fair share.

Let me show this. After the Bush tax cuts, the top 1 percent, their taxes actually went up. That's right. The top 10 percent, guess what? After the Bush tax cuts, their taxes actually went up. The top 50 percent, after the Bush tax cuts, guess what? Their taxes actually went up.

Now, again, the Democrats will argue, well, we need to do more for the little man, for the guy that is in the middle. Look at the bottom down here. The bottom 50 percent after the Bush tax cuts went into effect, their tax liability actually went down. So the argument that we need to tax the rich more to save the little man doesn't quite fit that chart, does it?

Let's show another one. Job creation before and after the Bush tax cuts. If you look at the red lines going south, or below the line, this is before the Bush tax cuts. Look what happened after the Bush tax cuts. Now it appears to me on this chart that job creation went up. So we have got the lower 50 percent that are actually paying less, and we are creating more jobs.

□ 1915

An interesting concept. Let me show another one.

Now, Madam Speaker, I really love this one. This is one that me being from South Carolina can truly understand. This is before the Bush tax cuts. Then, after 2003, everything was fully implemented. The line goes increasingly up. So even after the Bush tax cuts were fully implemented, revenues to the Federal Government soared through the roof.

It just proves that when you allow Americans to keep more of their hard-earned money, that they know how to spend it better than we do. They are going to buy a new truck. They are going to build a new building. They are going to hire a new employee. They are going to grow the economy. And the way you grow the economy is through the private sector and not the public sector.

Now, let's change subjects just a little bit. Spending. No matter what we do, whether it is tax policy, whether it is changes here or changes there, we have got to get spending under control. The red line assumes that my friends on the Democrat side are successful and the Bush tax cuts are going to go away. We will have higher taxes. The red line shows here that the taxes are increasing.

But look at the green line. The green line, Madam Speaker, is runaway spending, and you can't address one without addressing the other, because unless we get our fiscal house in order, none of it is worth anything.

Now, I want to read you a quote here. Comptroller General David Walker came in front of our committee and said, ''You are not going to tax your way out of this problem. You're not going to grow your way out of this problem. You are not going to do it by constraining spending. You are going to have to do a combination of all these things, and the biggest thing is going to be entitlement reform, Social Security and Medicare, health care being a much greater challenge. And

we need to start soon, because time is working against us.''

Let's look at entitlements. Now, of course, the top of it says ''mandatory spending.'' There is actually nothing mandatory about this, because Congress can change this if we need to. It is entitlement spending.

In 1995, entitlement spending was roughly about 49 percent of our Federal budget; in 2005, which, by the way, was 3 years ago, 53.4 percent of our budget. And, lo and behold, unless we do something to address entitlement spending, by 2018, it will be 63.3 percent of our budget.

Now, you look at the interest, how it has kind of stayed the same, actually gone down a little bit. But discretionary spending has gone from 36 to 29 percent. Roads, education, infrastructure, defense, things that are vital to our Nation, things that are vital to our national security, are being eroded because of this monster that we call mandatory spending.

This is the last chart I want to show. Now, again, I want to applaud the President for trying to attack entitlement spending. There is $34 trillion, as we speak, of unfunded liabilities. And what his budget proposes is an estimated $10 trillion trying to trim that off.

Now, my chairman, Chairman JOHN SPRATT from South Carolina, an honorable man, sat right in the committee and said these are draconian cuts to Medicare, to Medicaid. But, Mr. Chairman, tell me how to fix it? Let's have an open and honest debate on how to address entitlement spending, because, Madam Speaker, this is the camel that broke the straw's back literally; not the straw that broke the camel's back, but the camel that broke the straw's back.

Madam Speaker, I can go on, and I want to do that, but I have some tremendous partners here with me tonight that want to talk about spending, that want to talk about runaway spending, that want to talk about this system that, personally, I think is broken.

The first gentleman I would like to recognize is a dear friend of mine, a classmate of mine from the great State of Minnesota, Representative Colonel JOHN KLINE.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, this is a huge topic that we are talking about tonight of tremendous personal importance to every American. My dear friend and colleague from South Carolina said that we want to talk a little bit tonight about budgeting and about things that are broken in Washington and about spending and all manner of things.

You know, when we budget, whether the President sends over a budget and then Congress works its will on that budget, we are assigning priorities on how we spend taxpayer money, how the government is going to spend that money, and that ought to be a deliberative process, and it is a deliberative process. But then we throw it out the window.

We have a couple of things that I wanted to touch on tonight which break the system. One of them is a subject that has been much in the news lately, and that is porkbarrel spending, earmarks. This is a system that is completely broken in Congress and in Washington, DC.

Spending for pet projects for Members of Congress has nothing to do with an orderly, reasoned system for setting priorities on how we set spending. Decisions are made not on the merits of a proposed project. No, not at all. Decisions are made based on how long a Member has been in Congress, perhaps what committee they are assigned to, perhaps what party they are in. It has nothing to do with the merits of the project.

So we spent last year over $15 billion, that is the entire yearly budget for the State of Minnesota, $15 billion on these pet projects, and done in a way that had nothing to do with an orderly system for assigning priorities on how we spend money.

I don't think I ought to be asking the people of the Second District of Minnesota to spend money on a project for the LA fashion district. I am sorry, I just don't think that is the right set of priorities. We ought to establish those priorities through the institutional system that is here in Congress. We don't do that. We award money based on an entirely arbitrary system.

My friend, our friend, my friend from South Carolina, Mr. BARRETT, and others that are here with us tonight know that we have a friend, Congressman JEFF FLAKE from Arizona, and every time we have a spending bill he brings up six or eight or 10 or 12 examples of this porkbarrel spending and tries to shed some light on it and get a debate and give us a chance to vote on whether or not we think that is the right priority for how we spend taxpayer dollars. But do you know what? It is not a debate. It is not a debate. It is not going to have anything to do with the merits of the project.

Mr. FLAKE's amendments almost, I can only think of one exception, never pass. And why is that? Because the system is broken. Members of Congress don't want to vote against that earmark, because they are afraid that somebody will vote against their pet project. It is a broken system. We need to check it.

Is it a lot of money? Well, the entire annual budget for the State of Minnesota, we think that is a lot of money, and we ought to get that under control. And it is symptomatic of problems we have here.

Another problem that is symptomatic of a broken system is what happens after we go through the process of debating the budget, deciding on a budget, deciding on how much money we are going to spend for defense, for education, for transportation and roads, setting priorities in the way we should be setting priorities.

Then what happens? The system here in Washington, in Congress, says that we have to have a spending bill, an appropriations bill that dictates how much money we are going to spend in theory in keeping with that budget. But what happens? These bills come up. They are loaded down with this porkbarrel spending. We get to the end of the fiscal year here in Washington, which is the end of September, and we don't have these bills passed.

We get to the end of October, we get to the end of November, and suddenly there is pressure to get the spending bills passed, and the system that has been in place here for a long time is to do what? Take all of these spending bills and roll them up into one great big monstrous bill of spending which they call an omnibus. This omnibus ends up breaking every rule, every priority of spending. It is just one big, huge massive spending bill. That is part of what is broken in Washington.

Now, my friend Mr. BARRETT is talking about entitlement spending, and I am sure we have colleagues here tonight that are going to talk about that and other issues that are trillions of dollars, but we can't even get the relatively small pieces right here.

I am very pleased to say that many people in my party, in the Republican Party, have stepped up and said we have had enough of this porkbarrel spending. We need to take serious action to stop this nonsense. Some of us have said we are not going to participate, me included, until it is fixed. Many of my colleagues have done the same thing, some of them here in this room tonight. But as a party we have taken the position that we need to fix this.

I was very pleased to see that one of our Democrat colleagues today was in the paper saying no more earmarks, because the system is broken, and we welcome that sort of bipartisan support and recognition of a system that is completely, absolutely broken and needs to be fixed.

I know it is symptomatic of some bigger problems. It is not huge money, but it is big enough money that we ought to step up and fix it. And then we ought to fix these other underlying problems like this gigantic omnibus mess, because the green line that my friend showed of this increased spending has got to be brought under control. Even in the wildest dreams of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they can't raise taxes enough to fix that. We have to get the spending part of this equation under control.

I believe, as I know Mr. BARRETT does and some of our other colleagues here tonight, that keeping the tax burden low and allowing American families and businesses to spend money according to their priorities will keep this economy growing and tax revenues will continue to flow. We just have to get the spending side under control.

I thank my friend for yielding some time to me and letting me address a couple of the issues in this big picture that he has been trying to lay out for us tonight. I know we have other colleagues, so I yield back.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I guess it is a philosophical question: Who do you trust? Who do you trust? Do you trust a Federal bureaucracy that has grown and grown and grown? Or do you trust the men and women in South Carolina? Do you trust the men and women in Minnesota? Do you trust the men and women in Texas or Tennessee? Because they are the ones out there day after day busting their humps, making a living, trying to make ends meet. And all they want is a fair shake. All they want is for us to spend their money wisely.

I have never met a constituent, Madam Speaker, that didn't say ''I don't want to pay my fair share.'' But every one of them will tell you ''I don't want to pay more than my fair share.'' And it is incumbent upon us, it is incumbent upon the United States Congress, to do the right thing.

With that, Madam Speaker, there is a lovely lady in the Chamber tonight that is a budget hawk, that is a stalwart when it comes to conservatism in the House, a lady that speaks with a gentle voice but carries a big stick, and I am talking about my dear friend from Tennessee, MARSHA BLACKBURN.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Thank you so much.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding the time, and I thank my colleagues for taking the time to come and talk to our colleagues and also to the American people a little bit about the issue of spending.

You have the right to know how we spend your money. Madam Speaker, I think that that is something we need to think about. This is not our money. It is not the government's money. This is the taxpayers' money. And to each and every individual, each and every taxpayer who is listening, you do have a right to know how your money is being spent.

The gentleman from South Carolina spoke so well to the issues that are encapsulated in the budget process. Some of you may be wondering about that budget document. Yes, the President did get it out to us last week. You can actually download the budget document if you want to see it. It is about 2,000 pages.

You think about how small the Constitution is and how big the budget is for this one year. But at Whitehouse.gov/OMB/budget/FY2009, the fiscal year 2009 budget, you can go to that Web site and you can actually print it off and go through and search and look at it, as the gentleman said, entitlements, and the entitlements that are there, the mandatory spending, as it is called, even though it is items that just don't seem to be addressed.

□ 1930

They are put on auto pilot, if you will. And it really takes strength to get in there and address Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security and those items that have been put on auto pilot.

Are these items things that are going to continue to grow every year? Yes, indeed, they do. Do they need to be addressed? Absolutely, they need to be addressed. And the gentleman is right in that, as he was pointing out the amounts of money. And then just making a small little reduction in that spending, you have a Budget chairman who is saying, oh, my goodness, draconian cuts. We can't do that.

So it is important to keep up with actually what is in that document. And I do encourage everyone to print that out, look at it, and stay in touch with us as we continue on a regular basis to come to this floor and talk about how this body spends your money.

Now to follow the good members of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina and a couple of Members you will hear from yet a little bit further tonight and to follow some of the process, the process of getting this budget together. The President proposes that budget. You can go to budget.house.gov/republicans, and you can follow the actions that are going to take place as we talk about spending, talk about how the limits are going to be set for the different categories in the budget, as we go through amending that budget and the House putting its mark on that budget. We are the keepers of the purse. And I invite you to follow those actions.

Those of us that are in the Republican Study Committee, which are bringing you this hour tonight and this discussion, you can follow what we are doing with the budget at house.gov/hensarling/rsc, and we encourage you to do that.

We do recognize this is your money, it is not the government's money, and you deserve information on what is happening with spending. As you have heard from the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), and also from South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT), you deserve that info so that you can decide if you think you are getting a good value for the tax dollars that you are sending into the Federal Government. So work through this with us, and then you make the decision as to what kind of value you think you are getting.

Now I will tell you, I am one of those that thinks the President spends too much. I have disagreed with how much he spends. I think this body spends too much. There are all sorts of good ideas that are out there. But every time there is a good idea, you have a price that has to be attached to that. And it is not only a price as to what we are spending here, but it is also the price that is paid because neither the private nor not-for-profit sector is going to fill that need or address that need if the public sector is doing it.

I think as we talk through the issue and as you are listening to the Members that will speak to you tonight, you will agree, government spends too much. As you have heard tonight, taxes are too high. The American people are overtaxed and government has overspent. The bureaucracy is bloated and the bureaucracy needs to be trimmed back. Every year they take a little more and a little more and a little more and go through this process of baseline budgeting, never going back to dollar zero like you do, like we all do with the family budget. Every year they just add on. So the bureaucracy is bloated. And in this season of a new year and new resolutions, the Federal budget is one that needs to be put on a diet. But we all know that government has an insatiable appetite for the taxpayers' money.

There are some actions that need to be taken. As you have heard tonight, you see the mandatory spending, the things that are on auto pilot approaching 60 percent of this budget. It's time to get our hands around that. We're looking forward to beginning some of that process this year, just as we've begun it every year with the budget discussion and driving that debate a little bit further to make certain that fiscal responsibility is restored to this House, to make certain that future generations of Americans have a free Nation in which they can grow up, which they can dream big dreams, where they can have great adventures and they have the confidence of knowing they have a government that is going to work well, a government that is going to be efficient and effective in the tasks that they undertake and the services they provide.

I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding.

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

Madam Speaker, I couldn't have said it any better. Mrs. BLACKBURN does a beautiful job, and we really appreciate her coming down and sharing some thoughts with us tonight.

My next speaker again is a classmate of mine, a wonderful man, the author of the Family Budget Protection Act, which was a fantastic piece of legislation, and I hope he talks a little bit about it tonight, also the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, and a dear friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his leadership in this body, and I thank him for his friendship.

Madam Speaker, I know of no one in this body who represents greater integrity and greater honor than the gentleman from South Carolina. His district was very wise to send him to the United States House of Representatives. I want to thank the gentlelady from Tennessee who preceded me who is one of the most dynamic Members

we have in this entire body for the clarity and persuasion of her speech, a lady who knows how challenging it is for families to be able to put food on the table, put gasoline in the car, pay for their health care expenses, and knows that ultimately it is the family budget that ends up paying for the bloated Federal budget.

Now I didn't join the Budget Committee because I enjoyed numbers. In fact, I think probably the worst grade I ever made in my life was in an accounting course at Texas A&M University many, many years ago. But I joined the Budget Committee because ultimately the budget is about priorities. And, Madam Speaker, I came to this body because I believe America needs greater freedom and greater opportunity. And you can't have more freedom and more government. You have to choose between one or the other. And sometimes, Madam Speaker, especially at a time of challenging economic times, you have got to decide which is more important, a government check or a paycheck. And right now government increasingly is taking a bite out of that family paycheck to pay for bloated Washington spending.

Well, Madam Speaker, I don't know if the American people know it, but right now the Federal Government is spending over $23,000 per American family. It is the first time since World War II that the government has spent that much money, over $23,000. Madam Speaker, I wonder how many families that are listening to this debate tonight think they are getting their $23,000 worth out of the United States Federal Government.

Now some will say government has great needs. But you know what, it's not always how much money you spend in Washington that counts, it's how you spend the money. And I want a Federal Government that does a few things well, like guards my family and the families of all Americans against radical Islamic terrorists. I want a Federal Government that can control our borders. I want a Federal Government that will provide a social safety net for those who are too old, too young, and too disabled to help themselves. But outside of that, I want people to go out and have greater freedom and greater opportunity, and have the greatest welfare system known to mankind. And when I say welfare, I mean greater education, greater housing, greater nutrition. That program is called the American free enterprise system, and it is under assault. And one of the things that is assaulting it is the Federal budget.

Now let's talk about the fight that is taking place in Congress right now, and that is a fight about whether or not Americans ought to receive a huge automatic tax increase that our friends on the other side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, the Democrats, have passed into legislation.

Right now over the next 3 years there will be a huge automatic tax increase on the American people. Now is that what this economy needs now, when people are concerned about their job losses, when they are having trouble filling up their Ford F–150 pickup trucks, when they are having trouble buying milk at the grocery store? I have a 5-year-old and a 4-year-old and they're very thirsty and they drink that milk. And it is expensive.

And so the question right now is, should there be a huge automatic tax increase on the American people? Well, Madam Speaker, the Republicans think that there shouldn't be, that we shouldn't have a huge automatic tax increase. Let me tell you what the Democrats have passed.

Right now, if we don't change this, the top tax income bracket will go to 39.6 percent, an increase of 13.1 percent. Now why is that important? We always hear, well, you know, this is the wealthy and they need to pay more taxes. Well, you know who files at this rate, Madam Speaker, is small businesses. And, guess what, you can't have capitalism without capital. I used to be a small businessman. I signed the front of a paycheck. I used to sign the back of the paycheck, but I signed the front of the paycheck and I have risked capital. So now all of a sudden the Democrats have put into law a 13.1-percent tax increase on hundreds of thousands of small businesses across our Nation at the very time when they are trying to meet their payroll. What sense does that make, Madam Speaker?

Capital gains. The capital of capitalism. Democrats want to increase taxes on that 33.3 percent. If you want to talk about something that's going to send more jobs overseas, it's increasing the tax rate on capital gains. Dividends go up 164 percent. That's right, 164 percent, under the automatic tax increases that the Democrats are going to impose on us.

The death tax. You have already paid taxes on it once. You shouldn't have to visit the undertaker and the IRS on the same day, and yet that is going to go from zero up to 55 percent, Madam Speaker.

The child tax credit is going to get cut in half. And the lowest tax bracket for the lowest wage earners in America, their taxes are going to increase 50 percent. Under the Democrat plan, Madam Speaker, it is going to go from a 10 percent bracket to a 15-percent bracket.

Now is this the recipe that our economy needs? I don't think so. I don't think so. But yet Democrats tell us, well, we need more money because we've got to do all this Washington spending. Well, if you look in the rearview mirror, Madam Speaker, you will see that over the last 10 years government has grown by about 75 percent, and yet the family budget, which has to pay for that Federal budget, has only grown 30 percent.

Now ultimately something has to give. And so again our Democrat colleagues, Madam Speaker, tell us, well, we have to raise taxes. And all those tax increases that they want to impose right when the economy is having troubles, they say, well, we've got to raise taxes to somehow balance the budget.

Well, Madam Speaker, if people would look at this chart, we don't have a taxation problem, we have a spending problem. Right now the difference between this blue line and red line is this huge massive tax increase that the Democrats want to impose upon hardworking American families, on farmers, on teachers, on small businesses. And look at how much revenue it gains you. And this, Madam Speaker, not to get into too much inside baseball, is what we call a static analysis. This assumes that raising people's taxes has no impact on economic growth. We know that's not true.

So given the Democrats' every single assumption, if they do this massive tax increase which is going to amount to roughly $3,000 per American family over the next 3 years, it doesn't get anywhere close to the green line. That's the spending line. That is the line that represents the Federal Government on automatic pilot. That is if no new programs are added, that is how much is going to be spent. And what does that represent? Don't take my word for it; take the Comptroller General's word for it, the chief fiduciary officer in the United States Government. He says that line right there represents either, number one, a doubling of taxes on our children, or it represents a Federal Government that consists of almost nothing but Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. And anybody in charge of counting money for the Federal Government will tell you the same thing. Where is the ethic in that? Where is the morality in that? Imposing that kind of burden on the next generation? But, no, we have so many colleagues that care about the next election and not the next generation.

□ 1945

Almost 6 years ago I got in the next generation business because I have a 5-year-old daughter and a 4-year-old son, and I care desperately about their future. So we have to do something about out-of-control spending, and yet our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, every single day they add a new program, completely oblivious to the cost on our children and grandchildren, the least of these, those who cannot vote and those yet to be born.

If we are to work our way out of the economic challenges we have today, much less spare our children and grandchildren a doubling of their taxation to where we would be the first generation in American history to leave the next generation with a lower standard of living, if we are going to keep our faith with our forefathers, if we are going to show fidelity to the future generations and be good stewards

of the American dream, we have to defeat these massive Democrat tax increases. We have to defeat their massive increases in spending.

Madam Speaker, it all starts with something we call earmarks, congressional earmarks. As a dear friend of mine in the Senate, TOM COBURN of Oklahoma said, ''Earmarks are the gateway drug to spending addiction.'' There are too many bridges to nowhere, there are too many indoor rainforests. There are too many teapot museums. And the American people are waking up that all too often somebody in this body has taken a bite out of their paycheck so that some Member of Congress can keep his. The system is broken.

Republicans in this body have called for an earmark moratorium. They have called for a select committee to clean up this system where the American people too often see money going into campaign contributions. Money coming in one end of Washington, DC, and they see earmarks coming out the other end. The system is broken. It has to be changed, and all the Democrats have said is no, we are not going to join you. They have gone the complete opposite direction.

I am proud to be a member of this Republican conference that is trying to clean up this earmark mess, trying to control spending and control taxation so we can get this economy going and Americans can keep their jobs and have a brighter future for themselves and their children and their grandchildren.

I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his leadership, and thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. HENSARLING, I thank you for being here tonight and for your hard work. Your steady leadership with the RSC is truly appreciated. We appreciate you coming down here tonight.

Madam Speaker, my next speaker tonight is a gentleman that we call our songmeister in the Members' prayer breakfast every Thursday morning, a gentleman who is dogmatic when it comes to being a true conservative, when it comes to spending constraint, and when it comes to doing what is right in the United States Congress, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Well, thank you very much for yielding me some time here. I agree with you entirely that Congressman HENSARLING from Texas really does us proud, and we think an awful lot of his constituents for sending Mr. HENSARLING here. He is a great leader and really understands the basic principles and levers on what makes Congress work.

Mr. BARRETT from South Carolina, I appreciate your managing the time before us this evening, and your integrity and leadership, and the fact that you are pretty smart and on top of these issues. We need people like that here.

The question before us tonight, do we want tax increases or tax decreases. It is a pretty simple choice: Tax increases or tax decreases. Historically there were two guys, one guy plugging each one. One was called little Lord Keynesian economics. That is the one that said what we want to do is we want to do tax increases. If the government just spends enough money, by golly, it is just like standing inside a bucket, grabbing the handle and lifting up, and we will just float our way out of any economic problems. So the idea is government will spend a lot of money and increase taxes. That is a Keynesian approach.

The other approach was advanced a little later, after Keynes, and it was Milton Friedman. He said no, when you have your economy in trouble, you are starting to get into a recession, you want to do tax decreases. Now that might sound like a crazy idea because if you cut taxes, you think, I won't be able to pay for all of the things that government is doing. We already have a deficit, how can you cut taxes.

Well, one of the ways to take a look at which one of these ideas is a better idea is take a look at how it has worked historically. We have a long record on that, actually. You can go back to the 1920s, and Calvin Coolidge cut taxes at a time when the economy was having a hard time, and the economy surged. In fact, they gave it a name, they called it the Roaring 20s.

Next was FDR. Now FDR in his earlier years, he was in trouble politically, so he got a clever idea. He said I am going to take some Federal money and start building using Federal money in the States where I need some votes. He goes out and doubles and then triples the budget of the Federal Government. The Federal Government was only spending about 3 percent, and he took it up to 9 percent. That was the 1930s and 1940s. And, of course, the Great Depression was brought on by that extensive spending on the part of the Federal Government and the tax increases that were necessary to try to cover that.

In 1960, and this is a place where we step a little out of the political pattern. In general, Republicans have been on the side of cutting taxes. But here was a Democrat, John F. Kennedy. In 1960 he said the economy is in trouble, and we need to cut taxes. JFK did that, and we had 7 or 8 years of very strong economy.

So again, when you cut taxes, the economy surged and did better.

In the 1980s, Ronald Reagan was stuck with a very difficult economy. He did a huge tax cut. Everybody says Reaganomics, it was foolish to cut taxes, except it worked. We had a tremendously strong economy. It was that strong economy that allowed Ronald Reagan to spend money on defense and basically economically break the back of the Soviet Union, thus winning the Cold War.

Then we came back with Bush I and Clinton. They went back to the raise-taxes formula. The economy gets in trouble. Bush II comes into office in 2000, and we have a recession starting. What happens, in 2003 he does a major tax cut particularly where it was necessary to help small businesses to help invest in the economy, and now we have had about 5 years of a very strong economy because of the tax cuts.

Well, where are we today?

The Democrats today are really into the idea of tax increases. Not only have they raised billions and billions in additional spending in 2007, but they have proposed the mother of all tax increases. That does make me scared around Thanksgiving when you hear about the mother of all tax increases, a $3-plus trillion tax increase. That is going to repeal all of the Bush tax cuts.

So now you have the economy that is pretty shaky right now, and what are you going to do; you are going to slam it with massive tax increases, and that is the formula that goes right back to little Lord Keynesian that the Democrats are pushing.

The question could be asked, we are not being able to cover all of our bills, how can you talk about cutting taxes, being responsible when you talk about cutting taxes, wouldn't you have to pay all of these bills for the government. Well, here is an interesting thing, and it is one that I heard talked about but I never really quite analyzed it. I would like you to picture in your mind that you are king for the day and your job is to try to raise some money for your government to do some programs. The only thing you get to tax is a loaf of bread.

So you start to think this one out. You see this loaf of bread sitting in front of you, and you think, am I going to put a one penny tax on a loaf of bread, and you start calculating how many loaves of bread that we use in the country, and figure out what you raise. You think, why not charge $100 for taxes on a loaf of bread.

Then you think maybe no one would buy the bread then. Common sense says somewhere between a penny and $100 there is some level of tax on the loaf of bread that if you increase it, you will lose tax revenue. And if you decrease it, you will lose tax revenue. So what is going on here is that there is some optimum level of taxing, and when you go beyond it, even though you raise taxes, you are actually crashing the economy and you are not going to collect as much money because the economy is going to die.

You think about the fact in this last Bush administration people were complaining about the tax cuts and the cost of the war. The interesting thing is if you add the cost of the war in Iraq and Afghanistan and the cost of the tax cuts, they don't equal as much as what the recession was costing us in the beginning of 2000. Recessions are very expensive. So if you drive your taxes too much, the economy slows and you don't get the tax revenue. You can raise taxes as much as you want, but if

the economy is sick, you are not going to get revenue in.

So that's the logic. It is like a loaf of bread. If you tax it too much, you actually get less revenue coming into the government.

Now the thing that I find ironic about this whole thing, we have all of this history in America and we know that tax cuts are the medicine you need when you have a recession. We don't want excessive spending, and we cannot afford these huge tax cuts. And the ironic thing is that the socialistic Europeans have figured this out. We have the economists who figured it out, and yet we are not acting on the intelligence that we have. The Europeans, they figured hey, this is a good deal, we will cut taxes and our economy will grow. And so they whacked taxes 8 or 9 years ago, and their economy is going gangbusters. All of Europe asks, What did Ireland do? Oh, Ireland cut its taxes. And so good old socialistic Germany and socialistic France, they are working to cut taxes. They figured it out.

And here we are, the people who actually came up under Milton Friedman with this understanding of economics, and what are we doing, we are talking about the mother of all tax increases. This is insanity. I can't understand why the Democrats want to do this. If I were a Democrat, I would want to hand out pork and programs to people; I would want a strong economy. I would want to cut taxes so I would have more money to spend. It doesn't make sense to pass these huge, massive tax increases.

I think we could learn from history, or we could just learn from the Irish.

I certainly appreciate the gentleman from South Carolina yielding me the time to talk about this. The question is are we going to do tax increases or tax decreases? If you care about the economy and if you care about the future of our children, the answer has to be that we have to use the Milton Friedman approach and we have to get control of our spending and we have to cut our taxes.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman. I can certainly tell one thing, Madam Speaker, and I know the other folks in the Chamber will agree, that the gentleman from Missouri is certainly passionate and believes in what he is talking about.

Madam Speaker, now it is an honor and a privilege to turn to one of our newer Members, but a Member who has proven himself time and time again, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding, and appreciate this opportunity that RSC has put together to talk about taxes and spending and some of the challenges we face as a country.

We live in the greatest country in the world, but we do face some serious challenges. Obviously we face the challenge of terrorism, the threat from people who want to do our country harm and who don't believe in the great values that made us the greatest country in human history.

Also, we face another challenge, and that is the challenge of dealing with the fiscal situation that confronts us as Members of Congress. Just some numbers. The previous speaker from Missouri talked about tax issues. It is important to understand, you hear from time to time tax-and-spend politicians, it is really not that, it is really spend and tax. Spending drives the equation, and we have got to get Federal spending under control.

Just some numbers. The greatest economy in human history is the U.S. economy. It is the largest economy ever, a $14 trillion annual economy.

The second largest economy in the world is the nation of Japan, approximately $3.2 trillion.

The third largest economy, if I can use that term, is the Federal Government. We all just saw the budget that came out last week, a $3 trillion Federal budget. We have a $3 trillion annual operating budget, and we have a $9 trillion national debt. The Federal Government spends $23,000 per year per household; the top 25 percent of income earners pay 84 percent of the taxes. So when you hear these elected officials say we have to give tax cuts to the middle class, we are going to tax the rich, it is already happening. So when people talk about only taxing the rich, what they really mean is they are going to tax taxpayers. Every single family is going to pay more.

We have to get spending under control if we are going to keep taxes low so families have more of their money to spend on their goals and their dreams, their kids and their grandkids.

Last year I was proud to be part of the RSC who worked hard at lowering spending. In fact, we didn't really work to lower spending. What we said to the majority party is, let's spend what we spent last year. We offered a series of amendments. The way the process works around here is we have to have 12 appropriations bills in law by the end of our fiscal year, which is September 30.

□ 2000

So as those bills were moving through, we offered a series of amendments that said, let's spend what we spent the previous year. After all, all kinds of families, all kinds of business owners, all kinds of taxpayers in this great country have had to do that from time to time. Doesn't it make some sense for the Federal Government, where everyone instinctively knows we have waste in spending, doesn't it make sense for the Federal Government to maybe just live on what they did the previous year? But no, the majority party wouldn't do that. And they increased spending on those bills at three and four and in some cases five times the rate of inflation. And all we said was, let's just hold the line.

And the argument we got when we offered our amendments was, you know what, if we can't spend more, the world's going to end, the sky's going to fall, all kinds of terrible things are going to happen. We just can't do that. We've got to spend more.

Well, as the process unfolded, and so that the American people understand, Madam Speaker, we didn't have any one of those bills, not one single bill was enacted by September 30. And so on September 30, we had to pass what's called a continuing resolution, which is a fancy way of saying, let's live on last year's budget.

A few weeks into that, I came to this floor, same spot here, and gave a speech. I said, you know, a few months ago, a few weeks ago we had talked about the fact that we wanted to hold the line on spending and we were told that if we didn't increase spending, all kinds of bad things were going to happen; the sky was going to fall, the sun wouldn't come up.

I said, you know what? For the past 6 weeks we've been living on last year's budget and imagine this: The government's still running. The sun's still coming up; the world hasn't ended. I said, how can that be? And my rhetorical question was, You know what? If we can do it for 6 weeks, I bet we could do it for 6 months, I bet we could do it for a whole year, and save the taxpayers a lot of money and, more importantly, and maybe most importantly, begin to better position ourselves as a country to deal with the long-term problems that we know are out there.

It is important that we get spending under control because when we do, we can make sure our economy continues to grow, we can keep taxes low, and we can let families have the kind of resources they need, their resources, to spend on their goals and dreams.

The last thing I will say is this before yielding back to the gentleman from South Carolina.

The way the world works is this: The economic leader in the world is the military leader in the world. Right now that is one country, the United States of America, and that's a good thing. It is good when American leads.

You know, folks at home in Ohio, folks back home in Carolina, they get it. They understand that instinctively. I think maybe the only people who don't understand that fact is the editorial page of the New York Times.

I love the line Cal Thomas has, syndicated columnist Cal Thomas. He talks about how normal people perceive things, and how sometimes the elite national press perceives things. And he has a great line. He says, I get up every morning, I read my Bible and the New York Times so I can see what each side's up to. And there's some truth to that statement.

It's important that we lead economically. We can do that by keeping spending low and keeping taxes low. And when we do that we can be the leader of the world, which is a good thing for safety around the planet.

With that I would yield back to the gentleman. I appreciate again his putting this hour together and talking about this very important challenge that we face as a country.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman from Ohio so much.

My last speaker, Madam Speaker, I don't know what to say. I mean, he's awesome. When you need somebody watching your back in a fight, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is the guy I want beside me. It is my pleasure to introduce him.

Mr. MCHENRY. Thank you. I appreciate your kind words, Congressman BARRETT, and I really appreciate your leadership. I know the people of South Carolina do as well. As deputy ranking Republican on the Budget Committee, he has his work cut out for him leading us on the Budget Committee.

I want to bring out just a few facts for the American people tonight, Madam Speaker. Congressman JORDAN pointed out very aptly the size of the Federal Government, just so the American people can understand what a $3 trillion government costs, what that actually means though. You say $3 trillion. What does $1 billion look like?

Well, sure, Bill Gates could tell you what $1 billion looks like. He's got that in his checkbook. But for the average American, what does that mean?

And to point out the fact that it's larger than most countries are. We have the third largest economy in the world held just in our Federal budget; greater than the whole economy of China. It's absolutely amazing.

But when we talk about boondoggles in government, folks in North Carolina know about that. Look, in western North Carolina, where I represent, in Hickory, where I'm from, Cherryville, I've got to tell you, the American people know the government's wasteful.

If you're out in the eastern part of the State like in New Bern, for instance, if you're out there, you recognize this stuff, but let's talk about a great, enormous in size and scope boondoggle that we have here in Washington, DC.

There are 111,000 bureaucrats here in Washington, DC. Some don't do much. Others are very active. But 111,000 bureaucrats. The average wage for those bureaucrats here in Washington, DC is $89,561 a year. That's amazing to me that the sheer size of that, the average wage is so high. It's enormous.

But in the Department of Education, we know that education is critical. It's especially critical in western North Carolina. We have 3,224 bureaucrats here in Washington, DC in the U.S. Department of Education. The average wage is $93,773. Now imagine that. The average teacher in America makes $47,000 a year. I would much rather take that money from the bureaucrats and put it in the hands of teachers who are actually educating children.

Madam Speaker, we have a crisis on our hands with the size and scope of government. We have to limit the size and scope of government. We have to bring the budget to balance and do it without raising taxes.

I appreciate and applaud my colleague from South Carolina for hosting this special order so we can bring out these facts to the American people, because as their family budgets tighten, so should the Federal Government's budget.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. In closing, Madam Speaker, when I was working in the furniture store, my furniture store in Westminster, South Carolina, I had a guy named John R. McAllister. I called him Hoss. And Hoss would come in every Friday to see me and he'd make his payment. And it didn't matter whether I was working in the back or working on a truck or unpacking furniture, Hoss would look me up and come grab my hand and shake it and say, thank you for what you're doing. You know, Hoss McAllister probably didn't have an idea close to what I did. But I think about Hoss McAllister tonight, Madam Speaker, and all the Hosses out there that want a fair shake.

We're going to do the right thing. We're going to keep taxes low. We're going to give more money to Hoss so he can make a living.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLISON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's so good to see my friends on the Republican side talking about making sure that we help people and help the economy. And today, you know, we had a bipartisan piece of legislation that the President signed, which is good, this stimulus package. Of course all of the pieces in that package did not turn out the way everyone wanted it to turn out, but we knew that we had to get it in the hands of American people. It puts hundreds of dollars into the hands of almost 130 million Americans, disabled veterans, also seniors, who will spend these dollars immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I must also say, here in the 30-Something Working Group we talked a lot about the bipartisanship. And my good colleague, YVETTE CLARKE from the great State of New York represents Brooklyn, and was a part of that bipartisanship that we shared here on this floor.

Here in the 30-Something Working Group, we talk about how we can work together on behalf of all Americans, not just Democrats, power Democrats or power Republicans, but also independents. And I think it's important when we work together we're able to achieve goals on behalf of the American people. That's what we're looking for.

But, Ms. CLARKE, one the things that I guess, or two of the things we're going to talk about tonight, not only the President's signing the stimulus package that the House and Senate worked on in a bipartisan way, but we also have to talk about the budget a little bit tonight. I was hoping, since it's one of these cold nights in Washington, DC, that maybe we can accomplish this in a record time of being able to allow folks who, the Federal Government was delayed 2 hours today in opening, but pretty much everyone showed up at my office, and we know that folks have to get home.

But I think it's important, because so many Americans, when the tax rebate comes in, which will be a separate check, their stimulus check will come in and hopefully it will be able to help folks be able to make ends meet.

This tax credit has also offered a one-time rebate of $300 per child. I think that's very, very important for those that are eligible to be able to get that one-time rebate per child.

Also, it expands financial opportunities for Americans in danger of losing their homes because of the mortgage crisis. And as you know, Mr. Speaker and Ms. CLARKE, we have to make sure that we bring about the comprehensive reform that we need. A number of Americans are losing their homes. A lot of us back in our districts, you know, I'm going to have not only a workshop, but an ongoing working group in helping the folks in my district be able to keep their homes. That's the number one investment tool that we use when we do need money. Having that home and owning that home and having equity in that home is very, very important. Also it promotes small business investment in plants and equipment, and it helps create 500,000 jobs by the end of this year.

And I think that just looking at some of the points in this economic stimulus plan, this is a temporary fix. It's not what all of us here wanted. But on behalf of the American people and on behalf of our economy, we have to make sure that we make these ends meet.

One other thing I just want to add, and this is an AP story, Ms. CLARKE, that the President acknowledged today that the country is suffering a tough period of economic uncertainty. We're going to talk about that when we talk about the Federal budget a little later on, a couple of these charts. You know I love charts. But we're going to talk about that, this economic uncertainty and how we get there because I think it ties into what our colleagues were talking about on the other side of the aisle, talking about all and every last tax cut is a good tax cut. And some tax cuts, especially when you're borrowing the money, I mean, we've got to talk straight to the folks, Ms. CLARKE, this economic stimulus package that's going to benefit 130 million Americans, is borrowed money. Let's just go ahead and put it out there now. It's borrowed. I think it's important that we, if we're going to stop borrowing so much

money, then we have to be able to set the stage to allow Americans to see exactly what's going on, especially during the political scene. Folks have all these great proposals. Is it paid for? That's my question.

When I got here, Mr. Speaker and Ms. CLARKE, it was, we're selling the future generation. Now I can honestly say that we're selling today when we talk about some of these charts, especially with the President releasing this budget.

But with those opening statements, I yield to you, Ms. CLARKE, at this time.

Ms. CLARKE. Thank you so much, Mr. MEEK. It's great to be back here once again with the 30-Something Working Group in what I call my sophomore year of my freshman term. I wanted to just share some reflections on the economic stimulus package, because I think before we even get to the point of looking at where our economy is today, there should be a moment to pause and look back about 7 years ago when our Nation's budget was in surplus. And in such a short amount of time we've seen our economy just totally get out of kilter, get out of whack, a lot of hocus-pocus being done in the markets, particularly around subprime mortgages, in addition to the fact that there's just been a slow economic growth in some of the sectors that have traditionally provided that economic growth and boost in our economy.

But it's great to know that we all recognize the writing on the wall, and that there wasn't the type of struggle that we have seen around other pieces of legislation with regard to economic stimulus. It was bipartisan effort, and we recognized that it was important and critical that we do this timely, we do it targeted, and we make sure it's temporary because, as my colleague, Mr. MEEK, has already stated, we're borrowing this money. But we know it's important. It's important to jump-start our economy. It's on life support right now, and this is just the type of jolt that we need. It, as has been stated, gives hundreds of dollars to people who will spend it. That is the ultimate goal here is that we spend this money, that we get it back into the stream of economic growth as quickly as possible.

□ 2015

And that will be going to 130 million American families and seniors, including about 8.3 million families in my home State of New York. And what we were able to determine is that the average rebate for New York families would be about $807, putting an estimated $6.7 billion into the hands of New Yorkers, into the hands of those who really, really need it.

And I think what is so crafty about the stimulus package that the Democrats led here in our caucus was the fact that we looked at the struggle that our parents are having; that for our children there's going to be a rebate for each child in the family; that there will be an ability for us to make sure that our small businesses are able to invest in new equipment and that workers will have half a million jobs by the end of this year.

We are looking at providing relief for lower wage and part-time workers by guaranteeing at least $300 for those who are making at least $3,000 in earned income.

This is phenomenal. It's unfortunate that we have to come to these measures, but we know that this stimulus is going to be going directly to those who have suffered the most in our economic crises right now. And I think that the Democratic caucus has certainly led the way with innovation with regard to this stimulus package, and I want to commend, to the extent that I can, the folks on the other side of the aisle who saw that this was a much needed measure and did not spend a whole lot of time debating it but putting it in place, so that by May of this year, we should begin to see some of this really kick into effect across this Nation. It's extraordinary.

You know, our Democratic Party worked with our Republican counterparts in the House and the Senate and the administration to pass this quick relief to help prevent a full-fledged recession, but we didn't get everything we wanted. We really didn't just get everything we wanted. We got it done quickly.

I believe that we need to expand upon the stimulus to keep the relief coming, because even after the rebate checks come, there are people who will continue to be hurting. We need to increase funding for food stamp programs and unemployment benefits, then we need to address the infrastructure problems in our country, Mr. Speaker, including needed repair to our schools, waste water systems, transportation systems, which will also create jobs. We need to invest in affordable housing. That creates jobs. But it also creates local economic development.

Creating jobs through many different means, and the buzz word is ''green'' jobs, which is, of course, looking at renewable energies and how we really embed that into our economy, so that as we wean ourselves off of the dependency of foreign oil, we see the growth of industry across this Nation from the rural parts of our Nation to the urban parts of our Nation, like New York City, where green jobs can be a major engine for sustainable growth in our Nation.

Of course, we have looked at summer jobs, which is critical. This is a way that we can immediately impact, particularly on our young people and their families, is by giving them that opportunity for exposure to the workplace in the summer job capacity, job training for our workforce, to reorient them to a lot of the emerging industries that we have. We just need the jobs.

So we have a full plate ahead of us. Economic stimulus is just the beginning. That is just shocking the system so we can begin to put the treatments in place to repair and restructure it, and I'm really looking forward to that, because coming out of this Democratic caucus had real innovation, real forward thinking, and real focus on the needs of our people.

As has been stated, Mr. MEEK, you are struggling with the foreclosure crisis in your community. I'm struggling with it in my community where we're in the process of rolling out a series of clinics so that people will feel free to come forth and have their financial situations assessed, their mortgages assessed. Those that can be refinanced, we want to get them in the stream right away, because this is predicted to be a foreclosure phenomenon that will last a number of years.

So we want to try to head it off at the pass for those who may be struggling today. And this economic stimulus package can at least put some funds into the stream by helping homeowners who are struggling with their mortgages and who are in danger of losing their homes.

So I'm excited about the fact that the President signed the package today and that we can get the wheels of the bureaucracy moving to get this stimulus into the stream, into our communities, into the hands of our families as quickly as possible. It's really an important measure, and I look forward to seeing it implemented in each of our communities.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, let me just say, I think it's important that you talk about our stimulus package, talk about the realities of the stimulus package, this bipartisan package. And I think it's important that everyone pay very close attention to not only what we are saying but what we must do. This is a perfect example of how we worked in a bipartisan way. And I have always said bipartisanship is only allowed when the majority allows it to happen. And how we came off of the recess, came back here to Washington, DC, to respond to the crisis that's facing the country. It is not over. It is a temporary fix. You have a Band-Aid box. This is one of the medium-size Band-Aids in the box. It is not one of the big Band-Aids that's there.

I think it's important, and you gave the numbers out, on what happens in New York. But we have 8.3 million households on average that will receive $819 for those that are eligible for this stimulus package. And, Mr. Speaker, it was targeted towards the working families and seniors and those that fall under certain thresholds that we will be talking about in further detail here on the floor when we can talk about the stimulus package and talk about some of the benefits, especially for some of the working Americans who are trying to figure things out.

A lot of the folks, they like to sit down at their dining room table and kind of work this whole piece out on their taxes. Everyone doesn't go into

what you may call an H&R Block or something like that to get their taxes done. Some folks sit right there at the dining room table and try to work it out themselves.

So I think it's very important that it's really no secret when we provide tax incentives for rebates for small businesses so that they can grow, and also when we provide those rebates for those families that are eligible, especially the tax child credit, because a lot of folks miss out on that. They're not paying attention to what is going on. And even sometimes individuals that are preparing your taxes, you have to kind of know something when you sit down at that table.

There are Americans in all parties and those that are nonaffiliated parties and those who have not even started voting yet, there are a number of people that you sit down with your tax person, you don't want to sit there with your mouth hung open not necessarily knowing what is going on. You need to know a little bit about what is happening. It is almost like walking into a car lot. You want to know something about the Blue Book value of the car. You want to know the sticker price. You want to know list. You want to know all of those things so that you will have at least some level of knowledge and edge on what is happening.

So many Americans leave money on the table, and I think, Ms. CLARKE, I have asked some of my staff members to get with the Ways and Means staff to talk about how much money is left on the table every year that Americans are eligible for, working Americans are eligible for, small businesses are eligible for that they're not aware of.

So they sign that tax document, not the person that's preparing. I mean, they do, too, but ultimately, the taxpayer has to sign it. And you are responsible for what is on it and what comes back to you, if you have anything that's coming back.

Ms. CLARKE. What I found interesting was our commitment to small business in the stimulus package. I think that too often small business is overlooked and forsaken for the big, megacorporate folks who are always getting the tax breaks. But this stimulus package also takes into account our small business, our ''mom and pop,'' our emerging new start-ups and other organizations in our communities.

The plan will double the amount small businesses can immediately write off their taxes for capital investments made in 2008 from $125,000 to $250,000, and for purchases of new equipment up to $800,000 from $500,000. And that's significant because with the cost rising for materials, and there is a rising cost for oil, and people don't recognize what the rising cost in oil alone does to small business, particularly for those who have to have their goods or their services trucked or shipped. All of that goes into the bottom line of someone who is trying to operate a small operation. It also provides immediate tax relief for all businesses to invest into new plants and equipment by speeding up the depreciation provisions so that firms can write off an additional 50 percent off of investments purchased in 2008. That is extraordinary.

That is extraordinary because, again, because small business is really saddled with the weight of an economy that has been skyrocketing, particularly with the cost of oil and with the cost of doing business overall just escalating each and every year.

And we expect that there will be about $7.5 billion sent out to small business and small business investments over the next 10 years, close to $44 billion in 2008 alone.

So we have looked at every sector of our economy that may be struggling as a result of the sluggishness of the economy at this time, and a recession in some areas; some folks would say even depression in others. But for our businesses, it's important that we provide that buffer so that they're enabled to continue to grow, notwithstanding the challenges that they're facing right now.

So we have covered many bases with this stimulus package. We have covered both the home and the family as well as the small business environment of our communities. And I hope that, as you've said, everyone will take advantage of the rebates and the incentives that have been built into this stimulus package because we are counting on you to spend it out there. It's important. We want to make sure that we can provide the life support to our economy that's required so we don't fall in any deeper into economic crisis.

And this is just the opening salvo. We have a lot more to work out for our communities, for our Nation with regard to sustainable job development and job growth, and I'm looking forward to that part of the conversation, because we are in the 21st century here. We've got the talent, the expertise. We've got the ability out there. We have to be able to make sure that we drive the process of economic growth right here starting from the Hill.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy when the two of us, Ms. CLARKE and I, are on the floor because I like that New York-Florida thing going on, and I tell a lot of folks, Mr. Speaker, whenever I'm in New York, I will always smile at New Yorkers because I think eventually they're going to be my constituents one day in Florida. But it's always good to work with Ms. CLARKE who is a public servant and who has served in the local government and where the rubber meets the road as it relates to that.

Mr. Speaker, as we start to talk about the budget, I want the Members to have the information that I am providing and Ms. CLARKE is providing here on the floor. And all of this information can be found on-line on www.majorityleader.gov. It is a budget clearinghouse that's there. Everything that we show here on the floor will be eligible on www.majorityleader.gov. And they will be able to pull this information down. And I think it's important to share and have transparency as we look at this budget. I think the success of the 30-Something Working Group that we have had over the years is that we've shared the good, bad, and ugly as it relates to not only budgets, but also to initiatives that we are trying to push through Congress.

But like I said, just 2 weeks ago we were talking about holding the line on bipartisanship and making sure the stimulus package passed, and I'm glad we were able to do it and we can all stand under one flag.

I'm going to try to kind of zip through these charts real quick because I know Ms. CLARKE and I have some back-and-forth to do in discussing this budget and what it means, but I just want to frame the debate here.

□ 2030

As you look at this dramatic deterioration in the budget picture, you have to look at the deficit in the billions. These numbers you see are in the billions. The last Clinton administration, when you look at after President Clinton left office, there was a $1.28 billion surplus that's there. You can see that right after President Bush took office, we automatically started deficit spending. This chart is not a chart that was put together by me independently. This is what the Office of Management and Budget has put forth. These are the numbers from the Office of Management and Budget that is overseen by the President's administration, and so these are their numbers.

When you're looking at $158 billion in 02 deficit; $378 billion in '03; $413 billion in '04; and in '05, $318 billion; '06, $248 billion, '07, $162 billion; and here we are in '08, for the FY09 budget, the President is looking to carry us to $110 billion. And then following in '09, $107 billion. This is his proposed budget.

Now let's just talk about this one chart just for a second. I just wanted to shed some light, and then we will move to the next one very quickly.

It's important that Americans understand what we're talking about. So when you hear folks on the floor start talking about tax cuts for the very wealthy and those who did not ask for tax cuts and saying that has to stay alive to be able to help our economy, I want you to reflect back to this chart here. This chart can be seen on majorityleader.gov.

Ms. CLARKE, I know you're familiar with this chart. This chart has been an ongoing chart in the 30-Something Working Group. We talk about President Bush more than doubles the foreign-held debt. It took 42 Presidents 224 years to build up $1 trillion of foreign-held debt. What do we mean by foreign-

held debt? This means that foreign countries like China, OPEC, oil-producing countries, this means that Taiwan, this means that Japan, this means that India, this means that countries that we may have issues with, Argentina, a number of countries, they have bought our debt and we borrow money from them.

What does this mean? Forty-two Presidents, $1.01 trillion, 224 years of history in the country, from 1776–2000; 7 years of George W. Bush, some of it is with a rubber-stamp Congress until recently, until the American people spoke in the last election, and we're looking at $1.33 trillion in foreign-owned debt.

What does this mean for the country? I can tell you exactly what it means. It means that countries now look at America in a totally different light. It's almost like you having a friend, Ms. CLARKE, and you borrowing some money. If I was to come to you and say, goodness, Ms. CLARKE, YVETTE, can I borrow $20? Okay. But you see me 3 weeks from now and on your mind, right here in the center of your forehead, you're thinking about that $20. You're thinking if I am ever going to pay you that money again. So, now my influence as it relates to being a ''Member of Congress'' has been altered a little bit because you're now judging my ability to handle my own finances. We make the same money and all that kind of stuff, and you're saying, why does he have to borrow $20, and, better yet, has no real will or desire to pay me back? So that's where we are right now as it relates to the country. I think that people need to pay very close attention to that chart. And that was just updated in December of last year.

What's left out of Bush's budget? The cost of the war beyond 2009. I think that's very, very important because when you look at this cost of the war, it is not included, and budget analysts have said that it will be $489 billion over the next 5 years. But then again, the President says he is going to balance it very soon.

The AMT, which is alternative minimum tax reform, beyond 2008 is not there. That means that those middle-class families that you're not even recognizing in the President's budget, the spending policy details and beyond of 09 as relates to discretionary is not there. So it's kind of like saying we're going to balance the budget, but we're going to leave major ingredients out to be able to balance it and show how we're going to do it.

The President may only have one more year in office, but the responsibility as chief executive officer goes beyond that to be able to set the stage. What you want to do when you come into a job or you're leaving a job, just for anyone, if you're leaving a job, what do you do? You get everything in order for the next person to come in and to be able to have something to work with when he or she gets there. I think that it's important that the President does that. You're talking about the chief executive of the United States of America.

So look at what he was left with, a $128 billion surplus. And look what he is proposing to leave for the next woman or man to take office. So he had a very ideal situation. And now I'm not blaming this on the President, I'm just saying the Republican majority that we're trying to work with to get out of it now proposing to leave for the next woman or man that deficit.

So when we look at the President's proposed deep cuts and key priorities, I want to make sure that every law enforcement officer, which I used to be a State trooper, Ms. CLARKE and Members, when you look at the COPS program, that's the Community Oriented Police, these are your bicycle patrol, these are your individuals that prevent crime, don't show up after it's done, but prevent it, and provide other alternatives to youth so that they don't get into trouble. The President cuts that 100 percent. And so when you look at that in the 08 budget, and what we fought for here, we started out with $587 million, I think it's important that everyone understands that that has been cut 100 percent.

Weatherization, and this is important in Ms. CLARKE's area especially. This is the home heating and all the things that our seniors and financially challenged folk need, 100 percent cut. When you look at Department of Homeland Security, State first responder grants, 78 percent cut. First responders, police officers, pay attention to what I'm saying because I want to make sure when folks around here are ho-humming and talking about, well, you know, I'm in support of the present situation as it relates to the White House, I want you to pay attention. This is not my budget. This is the President's budget that I'm talking about here that is not reflecting the priorities of the American people.

The EPA clean-up for water grants, 21 percent cut. When we look at community development block grants, these grants build fire stations, they build community centers that allow local government to be able to do something with Federal dollars for the betterment of their community, a 20 percent cut. And the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, which is again for those that are financially challenged in the country, they're receiving these deep cuts.

I'm coming in for a landing here and I know, Ms. CLARKE, you're going to take it home for me. What Bush inherited and what Bush is leaving behind. I started to tee that up, and that's a golf term, before I got to this chart. A record $1.6 trillion surplus. $400 billion annual deficits. You've got to look at it from this standpoint, and this is available from that Web site I gave you. On track to pay down all publicly held debt when he came in. Exploiting debt burden, short term, so that folks can understand what's going on. The strongest economy in three decades. Economic slowing down sharply, on comparisons. When you look at a robust job growth, and then also when you look at what Bush is leaving for the next person, the weakest job growth since the Hoover administration.

I think when you look at this, I am teeing this thing up, and the way I'm trying to line it up, and Ms. CLARKE is going to share with us, also, is the fact that the only way we can bring about change is in a bipartisan way that Democrats and Republicans work together and do what we did in the economic stimulus plan. Everyone didn't get what they wanted, but the American people are going to be the short-term winners of being able to receive those dollars and being able to make ends meet. And it was an emergency situation. But I think as it relates to our fiscal situation, that is an emergency. And I think it is something that so many folks should be able to pay attention to.

The costs that weren't there, as I turn it over to Ms. CLARKE, the $187 million that was left out of the President's budget. Also alternative minimum tax costs not included, some $408 billion over the next 5 years. The costs for the war not included, $489 billion over the next 5 years.

Again, all of this information is on majorityleader.gov ''budget clearing house'' for you to see this information, Democrat, Republican, individuals that are concerned about what's going on here in Washington.

Ms. CLARKE.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. MEEK, I think you're being too kind. We have to put this where this is. The President released his last budget, and this budget is devastating. It's a Republican budget that plunges our country deeper into debt, a debt that we will pass onto our children, our grandchildren, and maybe even our great-grandchildren if we don't turn this situation around and turn it around quickly.

In the area of health care alone, the types of cuts in Medicare and Medicaid for our seniors and to low-income Americans, it's unconscionable. Again, we're facing a crisis in health care. And what are we seeing? Cuts. Cuts to the SCHIP program that are almost $20 billion over the next 5 years. After all we've done to try to expand the program for all eligible children, the National Institutes of Health funding frozen just as we're about to have some breakthroughs in research around Alzheimer's disease and Parkinson's disease and cancer and other diseases that we're desperately looking for treatment and cure for. I mean, in the area of education, and this is supposed to be the leave-no-child-behind administration, we see that the budget totally eliminates crucial programs that provide to the States for technology in classrooms. It eliminates vocational education programs altogether. It completely eliminates the supplemental

educational opportunity grants, Perkins loan programs. I mean, our commitment to the development of our Nation has to include a robust educational system.

We are in competition with nations from around the world. And in other nations they're cranking out their engineers and their scientists by the hundreds. We're struggling to keep up. We're struggling to be competitive. This Republican budget does nothing to aid in our cause to go forward in a robust manner. It reduces the funding for after-school programs by over 26 percent.

These are the areas where our communities, our States across this Nation need the support systems in place now that we have a 21st century society where parents are working, where they're not going to be there necessarily all the time at 3 o'clock to pick up their children from school. This is that period of time where all law enforcement agencies will tell you that children get into trouble between 3 and 6 o'clock. Here we see this Republican budget does not take into account the realities of the lives of the constituents that we present. So we're going to have to bring that to the table and make sure that is a part of the conversation as we move forward to shape what has been presented to us, which is really something that is devastating to our Nation at this time.

Homeland security. Now this is an area that really hits home for me. Coming from New York City, knowing what has gone into just building out a new bureaucracy to address our concerns for safety and for real protection of our homeland, to hear after all that our first responders have done to really bring themselves up to speed to be able to meet the needs of their jurisdictions, to then have the Federal Government renege on its commitment to them is a shame and it's a sham. To cut assistance to firefighters where local fire departments have needed equipment to keep our communities safe is unconscionable, totally unconscionable. For example, in New York State where New York City's FDNY are considered national heroes, almost $32 million have been cut in funding. Where do they get that money from? Where are these departments around this Nation going to be able to make up for the shortfall of the commitment made to them by our national leader? Unbelievable.

Cuts to homeland security grant programs, which funds every State based on risk by $750 million, that's an ounce of prevention there, and we see it being pulled away.

□ 2045

The important Urban Area Security Initiative, UASI, homeland security funding received an increase of only $5 million, which is not even enough to keep up with inflation. So what are we talking about here?

I often hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and their concern about border protection. Well, this is it folks. And it's the other side of the aisle that has turned the other way in addressing the priorities through this budget. Cuts to port security, critical transportation infrastructure, targeted infrastructure protection grants programs, and other important homeland security programs, right before our very eyes. And one of the areas that I would have thought we would have really just taken a little time to get fixed up, the Office of Appeals of Redress, which was totally left out of the budget, this department is the department that is responsible for enabling us to travel across this Nation. And for those who have, unfortunately, been put on the terrorist watch list, this is the area where just a little bit of funding would have made the difference between how we are currently conducting business that has shown a low value for our civil liberties and really bringing our processes up to date to meet the needs of real Americans.

So it's devastating. This budget is not reflective of the needs that Americans have been talking about, are concerned about, and it's unfortunate. But it's my hope that we will push, we will move, we will negotiate so that we can get some of this turned around in time for it to make a difference in our lives.

Just think about cuts to child care development block grants, when so many parents now need that extra assistance to be able to make sure that their families are well taken care of as they earn income to keep up with the cost of living. The Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, as my colleague Mr. MEEK talked about, this is critical in the northeast region where energy costs are skyrocketing and we're seeing some of the worst record winters in my lifetime, perhaps in many folks' lifetime, and not only here but in the Midwest and up the whole northern seacoast.

Social services block grants, these have been the areas where our communities have been just sort of held together by a safety net. It continues to be cuts.

And then of all places, veterans' health care. We talk so much about our concern and our gratitude to veterans particularly in this time of war, and it is just so hypocritical to see the type of budget cuts that are taking place in terms of health care services for our wounded warriors. This is unbelievable.

The Republican budget also assumes that the alternative minimum tax is not fixed. This assumes a significant increase in taxes for over 21 million Americans after 2009, 21 million Americans, and enacting a permanent fix to prevent this tax from taking effect will cost about $313 billion over the next 5 years, and it is something that we as Democrats are committed to doing. Yet nothing, we receive nothing in this budget that indicates that we are gearing up to address this very important issue for working-class Americans.

The Republican budget does not contain accurate numbers for the cost of the Iraq War, as has been stated by my colleague Mr. MEEK, and the administration requested $70 billion, but the average monthly cost of the war is over $10 billion a month. That means that the true cost of the war will be upwards of at least a baseline of $120 billion next year.

So as you can see, we have a real dilemma. The dilemma is do we accept the last budget of Mr. Bush, the Republican budget, which continues to plunge our country deeper and deeper into debt, or do we, as we have in the Democratic caucus, continue to push, to organize, to negotiate, to make sure that the needs of all Americans are attended to in this upcoming budget? It's a mammoth task, but I believe, Mr. MEEK, we are up to it. It is critical that we do this. We have to get on good ground going forward. I mean, it's going to take a lot to get us out of this deficit.

First of all, we are going to have to bring an end to this war in Iraq because that's unfettered spending. That's unfettered spending. But, simultaneously, we need to really set priorities for the American people. And that priority has to be demonstrated in the budget that we pass here. It has to be demonstrated in the way in which we fund the critical areas of our growth and our development as a Nation. And, believe me, this budget falls far short of that.

It's time for folks to get their act together. This Republican budget plunges this country deeper into debt. We cannot afford that. We must become much more sober about our work here and recognize that in order for us to grow, we have to make sure our educational system is sound, our health care system is sound, and certainly make sure that our homeland is protected. And based on what we have received thus far, the Republican budget falls extremely short of that, and that is totally unacceptable.

So, Mr. MEEK, I know that our time together here is winding down. I just wanted to say that this is a very important time for this House. And as we look at our priorities going forward, the stimulus package gave us a window into where we are right now, and that is we are in an economic crisis. And anyone who can't see the writing on the wall is walking around with blinders on. When you compound the economic distress that we are in with a budget that doesn't account for hundreds of billions of dollars that can be spent at a moment's notice, particularly in the misadventure in Iraq, and neglects to build the infrastructure of the Nation, areas of education where we become competitive, our talent is cultivated and developed, providing the support systems for working families like child care support, being able to make sure that we are healthy enough as Americans to continue to do the job and being productive, these areas are very important and crucial areas for us to move this Nation in the 21st century.

I think President Bush has thrown up his hands. This was his last budget. This was the best that he could do. And, unfortunately, it fell too short.

I want to thank you, my colleague, for sharing this time. I look forward to participating with you further in the future.

And I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me this time during the 30-Something Working Group.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Ms. CLARKE, you are a proud member of the 30-Something Working Group.

And, Mr. Speaker, as I mention a lot on the floor, we just don't come to the floor and say, hey, let's go to the floor and talk to our colleagues, let's give a floor speech. Actually, there are is number of meetings that take place in gathering this information to make sure that it is factual. And I think the reason why we are a solid tree in the forest, the 30-Something Working Group, on both sides of the aisle and dealing with the executive branch is that we do our homework. We don't just come to the floor to say things that we think sound good. It's actually something backed up by fact, not fiction. And I think it's important. If we were to play more in the fact versus fiction arena, I think we would get a lot more done here in Washington, DC.

Some of the things that we talked about in the stimulus package, just to recap, are things that are not there. There were some unemployment issues that folks wanted in there. There were some infrastructure issues and putting Americans to work, need it be building bridges or building roads or what have, to put Americans to work.

Also, there was a great discussion about green collar jobs. When you talk about green collar jobs, a lot of folks hear that out in the political world, but I don't think people really break it down to what it really means. And those jobs where we can reduce energy costs in many of our communities. For instance, if you have a flat or an angled roof, trying to put sod on the top, seal it off and put sod on the top to bring that heating and also cooling cost down, that will be a green collar job. That won't be an overseas job. That will be a job where someone could have dropped out of high school or graduated from high school, those that went on and received a 4-year education, those who went on to a master's, doctorate's, architect's, all of these folks will be employed through those kinds of efforts.

We have had an economy, Mr. Speaker and Ms. CLARKE, that has been really based on borrowing, when you think about it. The economy has been set towards your taking out that second mortgage to keep the economy going, cutting interest rates to encourage more borrowing. Back in the old school not too far along, I remember when folks wouldn't buy a car unless they could pay for it. Now it's just common to say what's that interest rate, or is this the rebate I get back from the company? And then now I'm all into this thing for 5 or 6 years, and in some instances for some Americans so they can have transportation to move their kids around and make it to their job, 9 years. I have some constituents that are out there for 9 years on a car loan. So it's a serious situation, and it is something that is an accepted practice now.

When you have a home, of course, getting a loan, you know you will get some equity. Hopefully, that value will go up. But because of the economy, because of the slowdown in the housing market, values are not going up on homes. So some people are losing, and that's the reason why we have this whole mortgage piece. Folks got excited again with subprime mortgages, getting people into homes that they couldn't afford, and we are in this situation on a borrowed economy. So I think it's important to be able to break that, to be able to have an economy based on jobs, not borrowing.

And that's the reason why it's important that folks pay very close attention on whom they elect to be the next President of the United States, that they pay very close attention to those they have already elected to be able to govern here in this House and in the Senate, because you shouldn't forestall this off to January of next year when the next President, he or she, raises their hand on the west side of the Capitol and swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States. We know that the President sets forth the budget. We know we also have a say here in the House. The Senate has a say. We should exercise that.

I think, Ms. CLARKE, your presentation was right on target. And I'm glad you said that I was being kind, because I am glad that Brooklyn is represented once again, making sure that people know what they need to know.

With that, Mr. Speaker, we're going to continue to work on this issue of the budget. We want to come back and get into further detail as it relates to incentives that are out there for small businesses and also for families that are eligible for rebates, working families, and also continue to shed light on the Bush tax cuts that are out there. I think it's important that people pay very close attention. How did we get to those recordbreaking deficits, giving people tax breaks that they didn't ask for. And that is not turning over into the economy, because if it was turning over into the economy, we would not have had to pass a stimulus package. We wouldn't be on the floor talking about some of the issues that we are facing right now.

So we are about solutions. That's why we come to the floor this time of night, with the Democratic majority that's willing to work in a bipartisan way with the Republican minority to be able to do what's best on behalf of the American people.

With that, Mr. Speaker, we would like to encourage the Members, if they have any comments or anyone has any comments based on the presentation tonight, to e-mail us at 30SomethingDems@mail.house.gov.

With that, Mr. Speaker, it was an honor addressing the House once again.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of business in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COHEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PRICE of Georgia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, February 14.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on February 12, 2008 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3541. To amend the 'Do-not-call' Implementation Act to eliminate the automatic removal of telephone numbers registered on the Federal 'do-not-call' registry.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 14, 2008, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5321. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Liberia that was declared in Executive Order 13348 of July 22, 2004, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5322. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six

month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Cote d'Ivoire that was declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5323. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Lebanon that was declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5324. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5325. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the Agency's reports containing the 30 September 2007 status of loans and guarantees issued under Section 25(a)(11) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5326. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a report in accordance with Section 25(a)(6) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), describing and analyzing services performed during FY 2007 by full-time USG employees who are performing services for which reimbursement is provided under Section 21(a) or Section 43(b) of the AECA; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5327. A letter from the U.S. Global AIDS Coordinator, Department of State, transmitting the report entitled, ''The Power of Partnerships,'' the Fourth Annual Report of the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, pursuant to Public Law 108-25, section 301; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5328. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-281, ''Non-Resident Taxi Drivers Registration Amendment Act of 2008,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5329. A letter from the Executive Director, Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, transmitting pursuant to the Accountability of Tax Dollars Act, the Foundation's Form and Content Reports/Financial Statements for the First Quarter of FY 2008 ended December 31, 2007, as prepared by the U.S. General Services Administration; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5330. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Department's Report to Congress on FY 2007 Competitive Sourcing Efforts; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5331. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5332. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's Performance and Accountability Report Highlights 2007; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5333. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5334. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's report entitled ''Annual Report to Congress on Implementation of Public Law 106-107''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5335. A letter from the Comptroller General, Government Accountability Office, transmitting the Office's Performance and Accountability Highlights for Fiscal Year 2007; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5336. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Fiscal Year 2009 Performance Budget, in accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5337. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's FY 2007 Annual Federal Information Security Management Act and Privacy Management Report, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3544(c); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5338. A letter from the Acting Controller, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the 2007 Federal Financial Management Report as required by the Chief Financial Officers (CFO) Act of 1990, marking the 15th report submitted by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on the government-wide status of financial management; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5339. A letter from the Secretary, Postal Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5340. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eclipse Aviation Corporation Model EA500 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0247; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-083-AD; Amendment 39-15278; AD 2007-24-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5341. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100B SUD, 747-200B, 747-300, 747-400, and 747-400D Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0194; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-306-AD; Amendment 39-15266; AD 2007-23-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5342. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International, S.A. CFM56-5C4/1 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2007-0108; Directorate Identifier 2001-NE-15-AD; Amendment 39-15270; AD 2007-24-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5343. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 206A and 206B Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2007-0176; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-14-AD; Amendment 39-15263; AD 2007-23-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5344. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-100, -200, -200C, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0211; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-221-AD; Amendment 39-15268; AD 2007-24-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5345. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited Model 206A, 206B, 206L, 206L-1, 206L-3, 206L-4, 222, 222B, 222U, 230, 407, 427, and 430 Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2007-0179; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-36-AD; Amendment 39-15264; AD 2007-19-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5346. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company, Model 525B Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0198; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-085-AD; Amendment 39-15262; AD 2007-23-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5347. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries Model DA 42 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28955 Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-067-AD; Amendment 39-15260; AD 2007-23-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5348. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aeromot-Industria Mecanico Metalurgica Ltda. Model AMT-100/200/200S/300 Gliders [Docket No. FAA-2007-28844 Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-066-AD; Amendment 39-15261; AD 2007-23-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5349. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. Model 204B, 205A, 205A-1, 205B, 210, 212, 412, 412EP, and 412CF Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2007-0180; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-37-AD; Amendment 39-15265; AD 2007-19-53] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5350. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200, A330-300, A340-200, A340-300, A340-500, and A340-600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0076; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-241-AD; Amendment 39-15246; AD 2007-22-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 5, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5351. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification that the Department intends to use FY 2008 IMET funds for the enclosed list of countries, pursuant to Public Law 110-161; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2, of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Committee on rules. House Resolution 982. Resolution providing for the adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 979) recommending that the House of Representatives find Harriet Miers and Joshua

Bolten, Chief of Staff, White House, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with subpoenas duly issued by the Committee on the Judiciary and for the adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 980) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas (Rept. 110–526). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ARCURI: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 983. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on rules and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 110–527). 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. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 5404. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a Federal grant program to provide increased health care coverage to and access for uninsured and underinsured workers and families in the commercial fishing industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 5405. A bill to protect seniors from identity theft and strengthen our national security by providing for the issuance of a secure Social Security card; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 5406. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on over-the-range microwaves; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H.R. 5407. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain wooden wall plates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 5408. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Paraquat dichloride (1,1'dimethyl-4,4'-bipyridinium dichloride); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 5409. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 4-(trifluoromethyl)-benzaldehyde; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 5410. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 3-oxido-5-oxo-4-propionylcyclohex-3-enecarboxylic acid calcium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 5411. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Methyl (E)-methoxyimino-2(2-o-tolyloxymethyl) phenyl) acetate (kresoxim methyl); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 5412. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 4-[3-(4-chlorophenyl)-3-(3,4-dimethoxyphenyl)-1-oxo-2-propen yl]morpholine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE:

H.R. 5413. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Thionyl chloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE:

H.R. 5414. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Phosphorus Thiochloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE:

H.R. 5415. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Sodium Methylate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE:

H.R. 5416. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Spiroxamine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE:

H.R. 5417. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Permethrin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE:

H.R. 5418. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2-Chloro benzyl chloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE:

H.R. 5419. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on product mixtures containing Imidacloprid: 1-(6-Chloro-3-pyridinyl)methyl-N-nitroimidazolidin-2-ylidene amine Z9: (9Z)-9-Tricosene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE:

H.R. 5420. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Resmethrin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE:

H.R. 5421. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on N-3[3-(1-methylethoxy)phenyl]-2-(trifluoromethyl)benzamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE:

H.R. 5422. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on mixtures containing methyl 2-(4,5-dihydro-4-methyl-5-oxo-3-propoxy-1H-1,2,4-triazol-1-y l)carboxamidosulfonylbenzoate; sodium (4,5-dihydro-4-methyl-5-oxo-3-propoxy-1H-1,2,4-triazol-1-ylc arbonyl)(2-methoxycarbonylphenylsulfonyl)azanide & methyl 4-iodo-2-[3-(4-methoxy-6-methy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H.R. 5423. A bill to extend and modify the suspension of duty on polyisobutylene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5424. A bill to prohibit the charging of any fee for admission to any permanent exhibit in any museum or facility of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. LAMPSON):

H.R. 5425. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to extend the authorized time period for rebuilding of certain overfished fisheries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 5426. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase the per resident payment floor for direct graduate medical education payments under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 5427. A bill to provide that no tax or fee may be imposed on certain coins and bullion; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mrs. TAUSCHER:

H.R. 5428. A bill to direct the Commandant of the Coast Guard to issue regulations requiring pilots of certain vessels to carry and utilize a portable electronic device equipped for navigational purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5429. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to authorize appropriations for marine mammal cooperative management agreements in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 5430. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain porous hollow fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 5431. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain cellular plastic sheets for use in filters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 5432. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain plastic mesh for use in filters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 5433. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain plastic fittings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENSARLING:

H.R. 5434. A bill to protect innocent Americans from violent crime in national parks; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SOLIS (for herself, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 5435. A bill to address the digital television transition in border states; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Con. Res. 293. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment or recess of the two Houses; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. DRAKE):

H. Con. Res. 294. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense take immediate steps to appoint doctors of chiropractic as commissioned officers in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H. Con. Res. 295. Concurrent resolution expressing the deepest appreciation of Congress to the families of members of the United States Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. BERRY):

H. Con. Res. 296. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the designation of August 2008 as ''National Heat Stroke Awareness Month'' to raise awareness and encourage prevention of heat stroke; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. Res. 979. A resolution recommending that the House of Representatives find Harriet Miers and Joshua Bolten, Chief of Staff, White House, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with subpoenas duly issued by the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. Res. 980. A resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to initiate or intervene in judicial procedings to enforce certain subpoenas; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. SESSIONS):

H. Res. 981. A resolution recognizing March 6, 2008, as the first-ever World Glaucoma Day, established to increase awareness of glaucoma, which is the second leading cause of preventable blindness in the United States

and worldwide; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GIFFORDS (for herself, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H. Res. 984. A resolution expressing support for the designation of July 26, 2008 as ''National Day of the Cowboy''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TERRY:

H. Res. 985. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 7 as National Information and Referral Services Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. RANGEL introduced a bill (H.R. 5436) for the relief of Kadiatou Diallo, Sankerala Diallo, Ibrahima Diallo, Abdoul Diallo, Mamadou Bobo Diallo, and Mamadou Pathe Diallo; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 82: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 136: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 260: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 303: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 368: Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. KELLER.
H.R. 506: Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 555: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 618: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 643: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.
H.R. 690: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 706: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. COSTA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. BONO Mack, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. Richardson.
H.R. 715: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 849: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 850: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 871: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 971: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
H.R. 1014: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1076: Mr. HALL of Texas.
H.R. 1078: Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 1306: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 1359: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 1363: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1436: Mr. SAXTON.
H.R. 1439: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
H.R. 1537: Mr. ELLSWORTH.
H.R. 1539: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1576: Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1643: Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 1644: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. HERSETH SANDLIN.
H.R. 1653: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1665: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1767: Mr. AKIN and Mr. GRAVES.
H.R. 1783: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1890: Mr. ROSS and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2040: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. EVERETT, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2091: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2131: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 2232: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 2303: Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. MACK, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2325: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 2392: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 2458: Ms. GIFFORDS.
H.R. 2503: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 2564: Mr. FEENEY.
H.R. 2593: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2702: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 2708: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 2744: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 2820: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 2923: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 2991: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. SALAZAR.
H.R. 3005: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 3008: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3014: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3049: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 3088: Mrs. DRAKE.
H.R. 3197: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3282: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 3303: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 3453: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 3457: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 3563: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 3616: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3642: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 3652: Mr. WATT.
H.R. 3654: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
H.R. 3674: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3697: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 3822: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
H.R. 3980: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 4008: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 4061: Mr. CAMPBELL of California and Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 4091: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4099: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 4105: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. WELDON of Florida.
H.R. 4116: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 4129: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4173: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 4188: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 4196: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4296: Mrs. GILLIBRAND.
H.R. 4355: Mr. MCCARTHY of California and Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 4449: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4450: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4611: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 4749: Mr. SALI.
H.R. 4838: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
H.R. 4852: Ms. FOXX, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. DONNELLY.
H.R. 4935: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 5056: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5058: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5109: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 5152: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 5161: Mr. GINGREY.
H.R. 5173: Ms. HOOLEY.
H.R. 5178: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5179: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 5232: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. DRAKE, and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 5233: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 5236: Mr. SHULER and Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 5244: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 5268: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 5400: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. SPACE.
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.J. Res. 12: Mr. RAHALL.
H.J. Res. 67: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H. Con. Res. 223: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Con. Res. 244: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. CAPUANO.
H. Con. Res. 263: Mr. UPTON.
H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H. Con. Res. 289: Mr. BACA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 49: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 259: Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. KILDEE.
H. Res. 543: Mr. WOLF.
H. Res. 711: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 753: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 820: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 892: Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BARROW, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. BERRY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SPACE, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HILL, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HARE, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. GOODE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. HODES, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. ROSS, Mr. TANNER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. TIM WILSON of South Carolina.
H. Res. 924: Mr. ARCURI.
H. Res. 937: Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. GOODE.
H. Res. 945: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
H. Res. 951: Mr. BONNER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HELLER, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. SALI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H. Res. 953: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. SAXTON.
H. Res. 958: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GINGREY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H. Res. 959: Mr. PITTS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GINGREY, and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H. Res. 962: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 968: Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H. Res. 972: Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H. Res. 977: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. KILDEE.

H. Res. 978: Mr. HINOJOSA.