



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 2008

No. 51

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Elliott L. Foss, National Chaplain, American Legion, offered the following prayer:

God, bless America. Continue to shine Your face on us, as we need Your guidance and protection now, more than ever. God, bless America, our President, our national, State, and community leaders as they seek to serve our citizens.

God, bless America. Bless these folks here today. I ask You to give them grace and peace, that as they seek Your face, impart to them Your wisdom, Your courage, and Your hope, that they will do Your will at all times.

Please, God, bless America and our citizens who seek to live in peace and harmony as "One Nation under God." Encourage us to do the right thing, at the right time, for the right reason.

May Your love surround our military and their families each and every day and please, God, bless America and bring our troops safely home when all is done.

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.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal. The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. 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 a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 980. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to address online pharmacies.

WELCOMING REV. ELLIOTT L. FOSS

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, Members of the House, it's a great honor today to introduce my friend, the Reverend Elliott Foss, to the chamber and to the folks who are our visitors today. Elliott has been a friend of mine for a number of years, almost going on two decades, in fact. Elliott was appointed the National Chaplain of the American Legion on August 30, 2007, by the National Commander, Marty Conatser. The appointment was made following the closing session of the 89th National Convention in Reno, Nevada.

He is a retired U.S. Navy Command Master Chief and Hospital Corpsman from the Submarine Division, and served during the Vietnam War and through the Gulf wars. Elliott attended Candler Seminary School of Ministry at Emory University. He also served as pastor to churches in Maine, Virginia, Connecticut, Florida, and Georgia. He is a Georgia resident and is an ordained Southern Baptist Minister and Chaplain, even though he has been the minister in four different Methodist churches in my district.

Elliott is a member of the American Legion Post 317 in coastal Georgia, where he serves as Post Commander. Reverend Foss also has served as the 8th District Vice Commander and as Post 9 Brunswick Commander. Chaplain Foss serves as the Department of Georgia Chaplain for now 7 years. He has held numerous leadership positions at the post, State and national levels during the past 11 years.

He and his wife, Arlene, reside in Kingsland, Georgia. I first got to know him when he was the chaplain of the Seaman's House and worked with people and sailors from all over the world and members of our own merchant marine. He is a great guy, a great man of the Lord, and we are very proud to have him as chaplain of the day today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain requests for up to 15 1-minute speeches on each side.

THE DREAM OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, on Friday, April 4, this Nation will observe the 40th anniversary of the tragic assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King,

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H1891

Jr. Dr. King was a great American who fought injustice; not just social injustice, but economic injustice. His beliefs 40 years later have not been fulfilled. His dream is still alive, but not fulfilled.

In his time, he fought a war and was against a war in Asia that this country was fighting and losing, and costing us much in terms of human sacrifice, as well as financial sacrifice. We see that same situation today, as we have the cost in Iraq taking away from our cities and our people. He fought for working people who were working hard but not moving forward. Today, we see working people in the middle-class continuing to having their power eroded and taken away from them.

I ask each person in this House and each person in America to think of Dr. King this week and to think of Dr. King every day and keep his dream alive and move this country forward with economic and social justice, for we need it more now than ever.

TAX AND SPEND HURTS ECONOMY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, right now Americans are feeling the pinch from rising gas prices, health care costs, and food prices. There has been a slowdown in the growth of our economy. In light of this, it seems downright wrong for Congress to be proposing a budget that will raise \$683 billion in taxes, the largest tax increase in America's history. This will hit 116 million Americans, while spending billions more on wasteful government spending.

American taxpayers will have to foot this bill if we do not stand up and protect their wallets from the Washington tax and spend machine. I support the Republican Study Committee budget, a plan that meets the needs of the American people, balances the Federal budget by 2012, fixes the AMT, addresses the runaway entitlement crisis, and does not raise \$1 of taxes on hardworking Americans. At a time when Americans pay too much at the pump, at the store, and at the hospital, it is wrong to ask them to pay more to the government.

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

DEMOCRATS WANT TO WORK WITH REPUBLICANS TO HELP AMERICAN FAMILIES

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

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the American public is rightfully concerned about the future of our Nation's economy. Stagnant wages were already making it difficult for families to afford rising gas, home heating, grocery,

and health care bills. Now, there is the added worry of losing their homes. The housing crisis could lead to more than 2 million homeowners losing their homes in the near future.

Fortunately, we address some of the housing concerns in the bipartisan economic stimulus plan. In that package, we expanded affordable mortgage loan opportunities through the Federal Housing Administration, and expanded financial counseling for families who are at risk of losing their homes. This was a good start, but more needs to be done. As a member of the House Financial Services Committee, I look forward to working with Chairman FRANK to move through the committee his foreclosure prevention package.

Mr. Speaker, in the coming weeks I hope that we can once again come together as Republicans and Democrats in this important legislation.

□ 1015

CONGRESS IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE HIGH PRICES AT THE PUMP

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, as gasoline prices rise higher at the pump, the American driver is mad and the Congress blames the oil companies. But the real culprit is Congress. Gasoline prices are rising because Congress fails to have an energy policy that encourages the development of our own resources. Instead of making it easier to obtain crude oil, Congress has decided to subsidize the special interest groups to produce unproven, unreliable, and expensive alternative fuels, like corn-based ethanol, which now may pollute the environment more than first realized. Not to mention this idea is bad for land management and increases the cost of agricultural products. So now we have high gasoline prices and higher prices for corn products worldwide, thanks to Congress.

We are the only industrial power in the world that refuses to take advantage of its own energy resources. Congress should lift the absurd restrictions on offshore drilling, allow drilling in ANWR and stop the expensive, unnecessary regulations. This will increase production, supply, and lower costs. Otherwise, we will continue to be held hostage by third world dictators, like Chavez, and the cost of crude oil will continue to grow.

And that's just the way it is.

ON FISA, THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY HAS THE TOOLS IT NEEDS TO PROTECT NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, Washington Republicans are not leveling with the American people on the immediate effects of the expiration of the

Protect America Act. Despite their fear-mongering, even the Bush administration admits that it still has the ability to continue all its wide-ranging surveillance for another 6 months.

Kate Martin, Director of the Center for National Security Studies, said, "If the government learns of new individuals plotting terrorist activities, it can immediately surveil such individuals, the court can issue an order within minutes of being asked, or the government can start surveillance without a court order under the existing FISA emergency authority."

Richard Clarke said, "The President misconstrued the truth and manipulated the facts. It was wrong to suggest that warrants issued in compliance with FISA would suddenly evaporate with congressional inaction."

Mr. Speaker, our intelligence community still has every tool available that it had under the President's Protect America Act. Republicans should stop their misleading fear-mongering.

PROTECTING THE AMERICAN DREAM OF OWNING A HOME

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

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our mortgage market is experiencing housing finance challenges and a credit crisis. Foreclosures are hitting an all time high. My own State of South Carolina is ranked 39th in the Nation for home foreclosures. Mortgage and financial challenges are placing heavy burdens on American families, and the situation has forced thousands of families to lose their prized possession, their home. One person losing their home, Mr. Speaker, is one too many.

As Members of Congress, can we lend money or give credit to people? No. But we can put these families and homeowners in touch with the right people, who can provide them with information on how to escape the mortgage rift.

During the break, I held homeowner education seminars and invited local mortgage lenders and nonprofits to give free one-on-one counseling sessions to constituents with mortgage questions. The event had wonderfully qualified people on hand who were able to give information away.

Let's try to protect the American Dream of owning a home. I encourage other Members to do the same.

THE COST OF STAYING IN IRAQ IS MAKING AMERICA LESS SECURE

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq has now gone on for more than 5 years. Those 5 years have seriously hampered our military's readiness, and the human and financial

costs grow greater by the day. Eighty-eight percent of our current and former military officers believe this war has stretched our military dangerously thin, and 60 percent say it has left us weaker than at any time since Vietnam.

Pete Geren, the Secretary of the Army, said, "We are consuming our readiness as fast as we build it," and the Army Chief of Staff, General George Casey, said, "The last six-plus years at war have left our Army out of balance, consumed by the current fight, and unable to do the things we know we need to do to prepare for the future." In addition to spending hundreds of billions of dollars on this war, the cost to care for our veterans and rebuild this Army will take us decades.

While our military is standing up and facing these challenges with great dignity and professionalism, there are some here who say we need to stay the course and stay in Iraq for 100 years. This is not sustainable. This is not a plan. This is not security. We need real leadership that understands the cost of staying in Iraq and not redeploying our troops is making America less secure and not more.

CONGRATULATING TYLER HANSBROUGH OF POPLAR BLUFF, MISSOURI

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

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate our Southeast Missouri favorite son, Tyler Hansbrough of Poplar Bluff, Missouri, for his unanimous selection to the AP All-American First Team for collegiate basketball. Mr. Hansbrough has earned this honor through his excellence both on the basketball court and off.

If anything, his receipt of this award ought to focus us on Mr. Hansbrough's character, not on his scoring statistics. This young man recently earned rare praise from long-time coach Rick Pitino, who remarked, "I haven't seen a guy play every possession like that in a long time. I have actually never seen it."

Not only is Tyler a leader, he is a leader by example. His work ethic has improved players, coaches and fans of the game at every level he has played.

Mr. Hansbrough takes his obligation of leadership seriously. His coach at North Carolina, Roy Williams, has called him the most focused player he has ever coached. All of these attributes result in Mr. Hansbrough serving as a role model for his teammates and for every aspiring student-athlete in the Nation.

Undoubtedly Mr. Hansbrough will continue to succeed in basketball. I believe he will continue to succeed in life, too. As he provides a national example of dedication, teamwork, effort and leadership, I congratulate Tyler Hansbrough on his selection as a First

Team All-American. I also commend him for the contributions he makes as a role model to millions of Americans who aspire to the example he has set.

THE IRAQ WAR AND THE IMPACT ON THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, despite the continued lack of political progress in Iraq, we are still fighting and funding this war at a time when the country's economic future is at stake. General David Petraeus, the top commander in Iraq, admitted last month that "no one in the U.S. and Iraqi governments feels that there has been sufficient progress by any means in the area of national reconciliation." And yet we continue to spend \$14 million every hour in Iraq, while more Americans are looking for work, millions of Americans are on the verge of losing their homes, and gas prices have hit an all-time high.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that when we spend \$14 million an hour in Iraq, we are neglecting real needs here in the United States. But we are also hurting our economy because we aren't able to properly invest in America. This war has diverted nearly \$1 trillion away from American schools, roads, research and other areas that would have stimulated the economy in the short-term and produced stronger economic growth in the long run.

It is time to stop spending our money in Iraq and start focusing on helping our families here at home.

SERIOUS ACTION ON SOCIAL SECURITY NEEDED NOW

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent report shows Social Security sliding into the red. We need to protect our younger generation, and I think it is up to the Congress to take serious action now.

The Trustees' Annual Report on Social Security released a couple of weeks ago paints a gloomy picture. Social Security will begin paying out more money than it takes in from payroll taxes in 2017, and by 2041 the Social Security trust fund is going to be exhausted.

These dismal dates come as no surprise to us. Each day that ebbs by we are left with fewer options on how to address this growing problem.

As ranking member on the Social Security Subcommittee, I stand ready to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find real solutions for all Americans for our future. The time is now. We cannot afford to wait.

HONORING AUTISM AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, during my time in this job, I have met with many Utah families, teachers and health professionals about their struggle with autism. I have visited the special education classrooms where dedicated teachers work with youngsters who have been diagnosed as autistic, as well as met with families desperately searching out medical options for their children. I have learned from this that more data, more research and more public education are imperative in order to help these families create a future for their children.

In Utah, one in every 133 kids has autism. That is the third highest rate among 14 States, according to a 2007 CDC study. Nationally, 67 children are diagnosed with autism every single day, which costs our country \$90 billion a year. I am humbled to represent the Utah family that has the highest number of cases of autism in a single-family in the entire United States, six children.

As a member of the Autism Caucus and as a cosponsor of the resolution declaring April National Autism Month, I have been a strong advocate for increased research dollars to help us provide more answers about this disorder and the hardship it inflicts on families.

Awareness is only a first step, but every step forward brings us closer I hope to improved diagnosis and treatment of autism.

SUPPORT THE U.S.-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the Speaker of this House to bring forward for a vote in this House the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement. We know Colombia not only has the most long-standing democracy in all of Latin America, but is our most trusted and dependable partner in counternarcotics and counterterrorism.

We also know that President Uribe, the democratically-elected President of Colombia, is a good friend of the United States, and someone who has brought security in his successful efforts to eliminate the FARC, a narco-trafficking terrorist organization in Colombia, and as a result today he has made tremendous progress in reducing violence in that country and bringing security throughout the entire country.

The U.S.-Colombia trade agreement is good for Illinois, my home State. My district is dependent on exports. Construction equipment that is made in my district and the 8,000 union workers

who make construction equipment suffer 15 percent tariffs when exported to Colombia. Under this trade agreement, they are eliminated on day one. The farm community will tell you the U.S.-Colombia trade agreement is the best ever when it comes to access for Illinois and U.S. farm products to the Colombian market.

The bottom line is, the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement is a win-win for the United States, it is a win-win for Colombia.

Mr. Speaker, we need to bring it to the floor. Colombia is our friend, and this deserves a vote.

THE IRAQ WAR AND THE IMPACT ON AMERICA'S ECONOMY

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, how much longer do the American people have to bear the financial burden of the war in Iraq? Between 2001 and 2008, Congress has appropriated nearly \$700 billion for the Global War on Terrorism, most of that money going to fight the war in Iraq.

Investing in Iraq rather than our own country has contributed to our Nation's economic downturn. According to Columbia University Professor Joseph Stiglitz and Harvard University Professor Linda Blimes, "The Iraq adventure has seriously weakened the U.S. economy, whose woes go far beyond loose mortgage lending. You can't spend \$3 trillion, yes, \$3 trillion, on a failed war abroad, and not feel the pain at home." And Americans are definitely feeling the pain.

Mr. Speaker, during the minute that I have been speaking, the Bush administration has spent \$235,168 on the war in Iraq. It is time that we once again invest in America. Our focus now should be on helping those Americans who face foreclosure, who can't pay their gas and heating bills, and who continue to watch their finances erode, while funding for the war grows every minute.

THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION'S REFUSAL TO REGULATE BIG BUSINESS HAS HURT OUR ECONOMY AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Good morning, Mr. Speaker, it is nice to see a Coloradoan in the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, for 7 years now the Bush administration has done the bidding of big corporate interests. The administration has never supported regulation of big business, and in fact they have eliminated important oversight that is necessary to protect the American consumer. In other instances, agencies have simply turned a blind eye. For a time this benefited big business, but we are now seeing how dev-

astating the failure to enforce the law or regulations can be for both the American people and the American economy.

Last month the Bush administration bailed out Bear Stearns out of fear that if the Wall Street giant filed for bankruptcy, many more supposed giants would follow. What the administration refuses to admit is that had it enforced the law and properly regulated Bear Stearns and the other giants for the last 7 years, they never would have been in this predicament in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, the administration should be commended for finally recognizing the need to enforce the laws and regulations that are on the books. Unfortunately, it should not have taken a huge economic and housing crisis for them to recognize the importance of government oversight. That is, after all, part of their job.

□ 1030

IRAQ

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, next week the administration is poised to give us and the American people a rosy assessment of the situation in Iraq. They are going to suggest that in fact there has been no escalation in Iraq, and that everything is just fine. Well, everything isn't just fine, and there is in fact an escalation going on in the violence all over Iraq. What the President's policy is is a bait-and-switch policy.

The American troops were sent to Iraq to fight al Qaeda, to fight terrorists. Now we see American troops inserted into combat, coming under fire, dying, and being wounded for the sake of one Shia political party that is afraid that it might lose an election in October. What are the American troops doing fighting for the electoral advantage of one Shia party over another?

Recently, the Pentagon suggested that this was all a sign of success of the surge. I think we should watch those words closely; you may miss something. This administration earlier told the people that the troop surge was for the purposes of decreasing the violence and creating an environment of political reconciliation. The people who were supposed to create political reconciliation are now shooting at one another because they think they might lose an election in October, and they want us to sacrifice American lives to impose the majority that they hope to have in that election.

ALL ACROSS WISCONSIN, PEOPLE ARE DEMANDING LOWER GAS PRICES AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE—NOT MORE DEBT

(Mr. KAGEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, all across America and Wisconsin, people are demanding lower gas prices and affordable health care, not more debt.

In recent weeks, our Nation has experienced a dramatic decline in home values. And when our home values decline and disappear, so does the tax revenue in every town, in every county, in every State of the Union.

Our very way of life is now at risk due to this administration's continued economic policy of borrow and spend, and last weekend the administration forced us to swallow a minnow with worms by nationalizing the debt of financial institutions, guaranteeing their debts will be paid by American taxpayers. Whose side are they on? Taxpayers invested in their own homes, not in insider Wall Street deals.

This administration is in bed with big banks, big insurance, and Big Oil, and businesses who are shipping our jobs overseas. If this administration was on the side of taxpayers, what would they do? They would cut the price of gasoline. Wisconsin wants lower gas prices, not more debt.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5501, TOM LANTOS AND HENRY J. HYDE UNITED STATES GLOBAL LEADERSHIP AGAINST HIV/AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS, AND MALARIA REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1065 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1065

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5501) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to provide assistance to foreign countries to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment,

and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 5501 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 (Mr. SALAZAR). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1065.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1065 provides for the consideration of H.R. 5501, the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008, a structured rule. The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate and makes in order four amendments, each of which is debatable for 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, all Members of this House should be very proud of the bipartisan collaboration and careful compromises that have resulted in the underlying bill before us today, H.R. 5501, the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act. I wish to express my appreciation to the work of the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman DONALD PAYNE, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health, and Subcommittee Ranking Member CHRIS SMITH, as well as House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman HOWARD BERMAN and Ranking Member ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN. And, like all of my House colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I am grateful that the committee named this bill after the great leaders of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Chairmen Tom Lantos and Henry Hyde, who guided the original 2003 act into law. May the collegial spirit of these two great champions for global health guide us all during today's debate.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5501 would authorize \$50 billion over the next 5 years for

U.S. global programs that address the prevention, care, and treatment of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. It strengthens, sustains, and expands a program that is universally recognized as one of the shining accomplishments of the Bush administration.

The challenge for this reauthorization is to move our HIV/AIDS programs beyond the emergency phase first called for under the President's Emergency Program For Aids Relief, or PEPFAR, and make them sustainable over the long term. Over the past 5 years, we have literally gone from watching people die from HIV/AIDS to watching people live and return to productive lives in their communities.

The 2003 Act provided \$15 billion over 5 years; H.R. 5501 provides \$50 billion, a direct response to the needs identified over the past 5 years for life-saving medicines and well-trained, effective national health care systems.

The 2003 law relied upon the health care workforce and infrastructure already in place in developing countries. In a farsighted move, Mr. Speaker, today's bill invests in strengthening HIV-related health care systems and building the capacity of the health care workforce in these nations. Under this legislation, funds will be used to train some 144,000 new health care workers over the next 5 years to care for people infected with HIV.

This is just a start on easing the severe shortage of health care workers in the developing world, and it is our hope that other donor nations will follow our lead. If there is ever to be a hope that these programs can become self-sustaining, health care capacity must be significantly strengthened in countries hard hit by HIV/AIDS.

The 2003 bill focused on creating new programs to tackle the HIV/AIDS crisis. This reauthorization builds stronger linkages between our global HIV/AIDS initiatives and existing programs designed to alleviate hunger, improve health care, bolster education, and increase income security and stable livelihoods, an approach endorsed by the President's Global AIDS Coordinator in February in his annual report to Congress. These changes ensure that our HIV/AIDS programs no longer operate in isolation from our other development priorities, and that the expertise and benefits from these other programs are provided in an effective manner to HIV/AIDS affected individuals, families, and communities.

In addition, the bill increases U.S. contributions to the Global Fund for HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria, and provides benchmarks to improve the transparency and accountability of the Global Fund.

And while the majority of the funding authorized in H.R. 5501 is focused on the prevention, care, and treatment of HIV/AIDS-infected people and communities, I would like to emphasize that the bill specifically authorizes \$4 billion over 5 years for a comprehensive strategy to combat tuberculosis,

and \$5 billion for the prevention, treatment, control, and elimination of malaria. In addition, it better integrates our HIV/AIDS programs with the diagnosis, testing, counseling, treatment, prevention, care, and health care treatment needed in the fight against TB and malaria.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5501 also removes the requirement that one-third of all funds for HIV/AIDS prevention be dedicated to abstinence-only programs. Over the past 5 years, this restriction has proven to hamper the effectiveness of our health care efforts in the field, as documented by two recent independent reports produced by the Government Accountability Office, GAO, and President Bush's own Office of Personnel Management. This reauthorization now requires the Executive to promote a balanced prevention program that includes every element of abstinence, being faithful, and condoms, the ABC approach toward HIV transmission prevention.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5501 also allows U.S.-supported family planning organizations to provide HIV/AIDS testing and counseling services. This will ensure that many more women of reproductive age receive vital information related to their HIV status, as well as HIV/AIDS education.

Mr. Speaker, we all need to recall that 20 million men, women, and children have perished from HIV/AIDS; 40 million people around the world are HIV positive; and each and every day another 6,000 people are infected with HIV. It is a moral imperative that we act strongly, decisively, and continue to address this crisis in a forward-looking manner.

Five years ago, President Bush acted to meet a perceived emergency as the AIDS epidemic spread out of control. During that period, the United States has provided drug treatment to nearly 1.5 million people. We have given supportive care to another 6.6 million, including 2.7 million orphans and vulnerable children. And, our programs have prevented an estimated 150,000 infant infections. During this first 5-year phase of programming, U.S. bilateral programs to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria were expanded to 114 countries. Today, the U.S. now supports programs in 136 countries, including programs funded by the United States and administered through the Global Fund.

We can all be proud of this record of accomplishment, but there is so much more left to do. Now we must work on making these initial gains sustainable, our programs even more effective, and expanding them to reach an even greater number of HIV/AIDS affected communities.

Specifically, over the next 5-year period, H.R. 5501 aims to:

Prevent 12 million new infections;
Provide anti-retroviral treatment for 3 million people, including 450,000 children;

Provide medical and other care for 12 million people, including 5 million orphans;

And, train over 140,000 health care workers in the developing world.

Mr. Speaker, addressing global HIV/AIDS is one of the moral imperatives of our time. And while history will no doubt judge our response, it is more important that each of us recognizes that we can truly make a difference in the lives of millions of people right here and right now.

H.R. 5501 represents a genuine bipartisan compromise. I urge my colleagues to adopt this rule and to support the underlying legislation, H.R. 5501.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During his 2003 State of the Union address, President Bush outlined a bold new plan to confront and combat the scourge of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. Congress followed through and passed the U.S. Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Act, known as the President's Emergency Plan For Aids Relief, PEPFAR, authorizing \$15 billion in assistance to combat these diseases for fiscal years 2004 through 2008. That was the largest commitment ever by any nation for an international health initiative fighting a single disease.

Since its enactment in 2003, the programs created by this landmark legislation have made admirable progress in combating those horrible diseases.

□ 1045

So far more than 1.4 million people have received life-preserving antiretroviral treatment, over 2.7 million HIV/AIDS-affected orphans have received care, and many millions more have received instruction on how to protect themselves from infection. Tens of millions of people have received malaria and tuberculosis prevention or treatment services.

Even though this program has achieved remarkable successes, there is more that we can do. Tuberculosis still kills an estimated 2 million people each year and is the leading cause of death for people with AIDS. One million people die from malaria each year. AIDS is the world's fourth leading cause of death.

The devastating consequences of these diseases are plaguing sub-Saharan Africa. Over 22.5 million people are living with HIV, and approximately 1.7 million additional sub-Saharan Africans were infected with HIV last year. Just last year this horrible AIDS epidemic claimed the lives of an estimated 1.6 million people in that region. More than 11 million children have been orphaned by AIDS. Many families are losing their income earners. Health services are overburdened. Life expect-

ancy in sub-Saharan Africa is now 47 years. Economic activity and social progress is impeded.

We must do all we can to prevent these tragedies.

The underlying legislation, justly and appropriately named the Tom Lantos and Henry Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008, will dramatically augment our commitment to fight these horrible diseases with an increase of approximately \$35 billion in funding for a total of \$50 billion over 5 years.

Some of my constituents are immigrants from Haiti and have family and friends in their land of origin. I often hear about the disastrous effects that HIV/AIDS is having on that country. As of 2007, Haiti had an HIV rate of almost 4 percent. Thankfully, since Congress passed PEPFAR we have invested over \$300 million to help Haiti combat the AIDS pandemic by building on existing clinic and community-based health resources; expanding a network of satellite connections to the Centers of Excellence to permit instant review of difficult cases; training staff members of health care facilities that provide prenatal, gynecological and maternity care in provision of prevention of mother-to-child HIV transmission; and enhancing the lab network for clinical sites to support the diagnosis and treatment of HIV and other associated infections. I am pleased the legislation will also now cover several other countries that were previously not part of PEPFAR.

As I said yesterday in the Rules Committee, when we look upon our work in Congress many years from now, I can think of nothing that we or anyone else will be able to point to that is of more importance than this admirable effort by the great and generous American people, this massive effort proposed by President Bush here in the United States House of Representatives during his State of the Union Address of 2003, the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief.

I would like to thank Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROSLEHTINEN and Chairman PAYNE and Ranking Member SMITH for their marvelous bipartisan, very hard work on this important issue. I also wish to thank them for naming this landmark program for two ultimately respected colleagues of ours who have recently left us, Henry Hyde and Tom Lantos. This is truly a fitting tribute for two remarkable human beings and public servants.

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

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who has had such an important role and hand in this legislation, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise also in support of the House's consideration of the Tom Lantos and Henry Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008.

This is an important measure which will ensure that our efforts to save the lives of so many people afflicted with the scourge of AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria continue in a rigorous, holistic way.

The continued success of the program that was brought to life 5 years ago by our late colleagues, Henry Hyde and Tom Lantos, is a matter of vital importance to us here in the United States.

As President Bush said in his recent trip to Africa: "I want the American people to understand that when it comes to saving lives, it is in our national interest. It is in our security interest to help alleviate areas of the world from hopelessness. It is in our moral interest to save the lives of others."

So, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what the bill before us is about. The program that we are authorizing today, commonly known as PEPFAR, is now recognized as perhaps the most successful foreign assistance program of the United States of America since the Marshall Plan.

Just as the Marshall Plan protected American lives then by helping to stabilize a continent ravaged by war, PEPFAR is protecting Americans lives today by helping to stabilize a continent ravaged by disease. PEPFAR does more than just express American compassion, it supports American security.

As an illustration of this important point, I would like to quote from a letter that I received from our former House colleague from Wisconsin, the Honorable Mark Green, who is now serving as the United States ambassador to the United Republic of Tanzania. Ambassador Green said the following: "We are approaching the 10th anniversary of the terrorist bombings of Embassy Dar es Salaam and Embassy Nairobi. And I can't help but note that General Wald, the former deputy commander of the U.S. European Command, has called HIV/AIDS the third greatest threat to U.S. national security."

Yes, this bill is less than perfect in some aspects. All compromises are, Mr. Speaker. But it is a good bill, one that will save millions of lives around the world and help to maintain stability in a key region.

As Chairman Hyde said during the markup of the original Leadership Act in 2003: "Congress is so equally balanced that it is very difficult on controversial matters, on expensive matters, on matters that have different blocks who have different points of view to reach an agreement. In a situation like this, compromise is the heart and soul of the process."

He added: "We cannot please the left and the right and the center. We can't please the libertarians and the arch-conservatives and the Republicans and the Democrats with legislation that would have done all of these magic properties, but we can do our best and we have done our best."

In 2003, Mr. Speaker, we did do our best and created a program that demonstrated compassion to so many since its enactment.

Today, the House has an opportunity to do its best again.

Today, for the sake of the fathers, the mothers, and the children who are victims of HIV/AIDS, as well as tuberculosis and malaria, today we can follow in the steps of Henry Hyde and Tom Lantos, demonstrating that American compassion that distinguishes our Nation and our people above all others.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a balanced bill. I believe that this is a bill that will save many lives and protect American security.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to again commend the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her incredible work on this bill. And for the RECORD, there is bipartisan appreciation for her strong and passionate commitment to ending the scourge of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), a physician who does so much on issues of health day in and day out throughout the United States, and, as on this issue, throughout the world.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being labeled the skunk at the annual fragrance picnic, I do rise today in opposition to this structured rule.

I know compromises have been made to improve the underlying legislation, but I think there is plenty of room for additional improvement. Just because we have a good program, to increase the spending from \$15 billion to \$50 billion, I wonder if there is justification for that.

But here we are again, Mr. Speaker, considering a rule that restricts debate on another Republican-created program for which the Democratic majority is now proposing a massive expansion.

We already have more than our share of entitlement programs right here in the United States. And to me, it now appears the majority is on the verge of using taxpayer dollars to create a global entitlement program. Remember, Mr. Speaker, PEPFAR, the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, was created back in 2003 to provide emergency relief for AIDS.

I will certainly say as a physician, that of course I am encouraged by the increased desire in the bill to also help

fight against tuberculosis and malaria. However, Mr. Speaker, we should not devise a plan to treat these diseases without defining how to actually buy sufficient medications to provide the necessary care. The majority said that a treatment floor was not included in this bill as it was in the original legislation because the cost of medications have decreased. That may be true, yet while it has more than tripled the price tag for the PEPFAR expansion as I said in this bill, it has not tripled the number of people that it plans to reach with medication. So if the cost of medications have gone down, I think they have and the majority states they have, shouldn't the massive increase in the cost of this program be matched by a proportionate increase in the people that we target through the program?

Mr. Speaker, I was at the Rules Committee yesterday. I offered an amendment to just simply say keep that floor of 55 percent of the money going to treat the patient. The Rules Committee, unfortunately, did not make that in order.

Since the majority is not allowing adequate input on this legislation, particularly from the minority, I would urge my fellow Members to vote against this rule, give us a chance to go back and make some of the needed changes in an otherwise good bill.

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

□ 1100

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to yield 4½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, also a physician, Dr. WELDON.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in strong opposition to this rule, and very strong opposition to the underlying bill.

And let me just say from the outset that I used to take care of AIDS patients before I came to this Congress back in 1994. I was one of only two physicians in a county of 400,000 people that was seeing AIDS patients. And I have announced my retirement, my intent to leave the House of Representatives at the conclusion of this Congress, and I will most likely go back to seeing patients in January. And I may, indeed, be seeing AIDS patients again.

Let me additionally say that I'm very concerned about the situation in Africa. Indeed, I have gone to Africa twice in my term of service here in the Congress specifically to look at the issue of helping in Africa with the issues of AIDS and malaria and TB, and so I think I have credibility to be able to say I care, I'm concerned. But this underlying bill and this rule that restricts any cutting amendments, in my opinion, is just excessive.

Years ago, when the President originally came up with PEPFAR, he came to me and asked me to help him with his plan, and I did. And I actually thought his plan was very, very generous, \$3 billion a year. And when he

gave his State of the Union message just a few months ago indicating that he wanted to double the size of this from \$3 billion to \$6 billion a year, I personally thought that was excessive. When you look at all the problems we have with health care access for Americans, the problems that we have with transportation infrastructure, the problems that we have in fighting the war in Iraq, Afghanistan, the homeland security issues, I thought to take this program from \$3 billion a year to \$6 billion a year was excessive and over the top.

But now we have before us today an underlying bill to not increase it by 100 percent, which is what the President was asking for, but to increase it by over 200 percent. That's the underlying bill. And the Democrat leadership of the House under the Democratic Rules Committee is saying, well, no, we don't want any cutting amendments.

Now, let me tell you a little bit of why I am so passionately upset about it. Yesterday, NASA announced that, with the retirement of the space shuttle, they are going to be laying off over 6,500 people in east central Florida, my congressional district. That is a huge amount of people. It has a huge economic impact on the State of Florida. And for us to be putting our astronauts on Russian rockets, we're going to have to sign a contract with the Russians for the construction of these rockets, we're essentially going to be laying off people in Florida and hiring people in Russia with U.S. taxpayers.

Now, this Congress, under this Democratic leadership, is saying that we have no choice, we cannot afford to continue to fly the shuttle in 2011, 2012, 2013. We cannot afford to bring the new rocket system online any sooner than 2005 or 2006, we don't have the money, while we have all this money to send \$50 billion to Africa for AIDS. Now, again, let me just say, I understand this is a terrible problem. I don't even mind increasing the Africa AIDS account. And what, to me, is insult on top of injury, my staff has informed me that they have \$1 billion in this account unspent that they are working to try to spend. So, they can't even spend all the money that we're sending them over there, and we want to send them a 240 percent increase?

Now, I know every Member of this House can get up and give a speech like this; they have water projects in their district, they have health care clinics in their district. In my particular case, it's pretty significant. We've got over 6,000 people who are going to get a pink slip. So, for us to say we can't fly the shuttle beyond 2010 because we can't afford it, but that we can somehow find \$50 billion to send to Africa, to me is just way over the top. I can't justify that back home.

I'm opposing this rule. I'm going to vote against the underlying bill. And I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I appreciate it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind my colleagues that the

underlying debate is not about the space program, it's about whether we're going to end the terrible scourge of HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis that has cost the lives of countless individuals across this planet. This is a moral imperative. And I am proud of the bipartisan work done by Democrats and Republicans working together to accomplish this bill.

At this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of the rule and of H.R. 5501, a bipartisan bill to reauthorize and expand the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief.

I want to particularly applaud the increase in funding from \$15 to \$50 billion over 5 years, and the inclusion of the Caribbean countries in this reauthorization.

In this regard, I want to especially thank and applaud my colleagues, Mr. Fortuno, who introduced the Caribbean amendment, Congresswoman Yvette Clarke, who cosponsored it, as did I, Chairman Donald Payne, who included the increased funding and whose work with Congresswoman Barbara Lee ensured that these provisions were included, as well as Chairman RANGEL, who began the Caribbean effort 4 years ago.

The expansion to include all Caribbean nations as focus countries was greatly aided by the hard work of Caribbean Health Ministers whose collective and tireless efforts raised awareness about the impact of HIV/AIDS in the Caribbean. I also want to thank the Pan Caribbean Partnership Against HIV/AIDS (PANCAP) not only for their support of this bill, but for the important leadership role that they have and continue to take to address HIV/AIDS in the Caribbean region.

Over the past 5 years, PEPFAR has literally saved the lives of more than one million people and has had a significant positive impact on those most affected by and most at risk for HIV infection, women and girls.

Congresswoman LEE and I had the opportunity to visit several PEPFAR sites and partners in South Africa late last year and saw the great work that they are doing. It was also clearly evident, though, that more was needed.

The additional funding will help to expand the number of focused countries under PEPFAR. It will help to ensure that the innovative and effective efforts that have been launched not only continue, but help other hard-hit nations get access to the resources they desperately need to address HIV/AIDS within their borders.

While two Caribbean nations, Haiti and Guyana, are, as they should be, currently prioritized as focus countries under PEPFAR, there are 14 other nations in this region, which is second only to sub-Saharan Africa in terms of HIV/AIDS prevalence, in need of help.

In the Caribbean today, AIDS is one of the leading causes of death in the 15–44 age group.

Many Caribbean nations not currently receiving PEPFAR assistance absorb millions of dollars in debt every year. Leaders in the Caribbean maintain that high HIV/AIDS prevalence rates can overwhelm the region's health care capacity, destabilize economies, and compromise Caribbean nations' sociopolitical infrastructure. In fact, Assistant Secretary General of the Organization of American States, the Honorable Albert Ramdin, stated in January of last year that "HIV/AIDS, if not effectively and urgently tackled, poses a clear threat to the sustainable development, social stability and human security of the Caribbean."

Making all Caribbean countries eligible is clearly the right thing to do. H.R. 5501, while it includes the region, lays the foundation to have the 14 Caribbean nations specifically listed in the bill that will be sent to the President for his signature.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the rule and to support H.R. 5501, rightly named to honor the service of Chairman Hyde and Chairman Lantos.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of H.R. 5501—a bill which will reauthorize the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, PEPFAR. I want to thank and applaud my colleagues, Congressman FORTUÑO who introduced the Caribbean amendment, Congresswoman CLARKE who cosponsored it as did I, Chairman PAYNE and Congresswoman LEE who ushered it and many other parts of the bill through the committee.

Congresswoman LEE and I had the opportunity to travel to South Africa around World AIDS Day last year to visit PEPFAR sites and participate in and see the work they were doing first hand. There was great work being done, but the need for more was also clearly evident.

The success of PEPFAR is well documented. With the support offered through PEPFAR over the last 5 years, many of the world's hardest hit nations have been able to launch integrated HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment and care programs that have prevented new HIV infections, brought life-saving medications and other treatments and services to those living with HIV. As a direct result, PEPFAR has literally saved the lives of more than 1 million people and has had a noted and positive impact on those most affected by and most at risk for HIV infection: women and girls.

In fact, in the 15 focus countries, more than 6 in every 10 of the individuals with HIV currently on antiretroviral treatment as a result of direct PEPFAR support are women and girls.

Given the continued burden of HIV/AIDS in the world's most vulnerable nations, there is no doubt that this critically important bill not only should be reauthorized, but that it should be increased. We were pleased that the President indicated a willingness to increase it in his State of the Union message this year. And I want to especially recognize Chairman PAYNE for successfully increasing the fund to \$50 billion over the next 5 years.

This additional funding will help to expand the number of "focus countries" which cur-

rently are prioritized under PEPFAR. Additionally, it will help ensure that the forward-thinking and effective HIV/AIDS-related efforts that have been launched not only continue, but that other nations that are hard hit by this pandemic will have access to the resources they desperately need to address HIV/AIDS within their borders.

Mr. Speaker, despite the many successes associated with PEPFAR, we know that there is an entire region—the Caribbean—which has been and remains in desperate need of assistance in battling against HIV/AIDS. While two Caribbean nations—Haiti and Guyana—are, as they should be, currently prioritized as focus countries under PEPFAR, there are 14 other nations in the region that together comprise the second-hardest hit region in the world; second only to sub-Saharan Africa in terms of HIV/AIDS prevalence.

Mr. Speaker, in the Caribbean today, AIDS is one of the leading causes of death among adults aged 15–44 years of age. In some countries in the region, AIDS is the leading cause of death among individuals in this age group; a disturbing reality, because AIDS is taking its ultimate toll on Caribbean residents during their most productive life years, thus compromising many Caribbean nations' economic, social and political growth and stability.

Adding to the region's challenges with HIV/AIDS is the well-documented high population mobility. We know that many Caribbean nations—whose commitment to and effectiveness in addressing HIV/AIDS is stifled not because of the absence of political will, but because of the absence of resources—offer universal access to HIV/AIDS medications, care and other services.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, many Caribbean nations, not currently receiving PEPFAR assistance, absorb millions of dollars in debt every year providing treatment and care not only to their residents with HIV, but to all individuals on their shores seeking HIV/AIDS care and treatment.

These Caribbean nations have been doing what is right not only to address HIV/AIDS head on, but to lay the groundwork to beat this pandemic. And so, I rise today to encourage all of my colleagues—on both sides of the aisle—to support this legislation, which lists these 14 Caribbean nations as "focus nations," to support these nations' efforts to prevent new HIV infections and to expand access to life-saving AIDS medications to those living with HIV infection.

Mr. Speaker, because of all of the above, I want to especially single out Congressman FORTUÑO for his leadership on this issue and shepherding this amendment through the committee process and ensuring it became a part of the final bill. I also want to recognize Chairman RANGEL who was the first to begin this process 4 years ago.

This amendment might not have been possible without the hard work of nearly a dozen Health Ministers in the Caribbean and their collective and tireless efforts to raise awareness about the impact of HIV/AIDS in the Caribbean and to include 14 Caribbean nations as "focus countries" in this bill. I also want to thank the Pan Caribbean Partnership against HIV and AIDS, PANCAP, not only for their support of this bill, but for the important leadership role that they have and continue to take to address HIV/AIDS in the Caribbean region.

Mr. Speaker, as the only African-American physician in Congress and as the only representative from the English-speaking Caribbean, I can tell you—firsthand—that based on the surveillance data reported in the latest UNAIDS report, we know that the entire Caribbean region without adequate and targeted support from PEPFAR, is now and will continue to experience the same devastating impact from HIV/AIDS documented throughout nations in sub-Saharan Africa. Ambassador of and Health Ministers in Caribbean countries to the United States maintain that high HIV/AIDS prevalence rates can overwhelm the region's health care capacity, destabilize economies and compromise Caribbean nations' socio-political infrastructure.

In fact, Assistant Secretary General of the Organization of American States Albert Ramdin stated in January 2007 that, "HIV/AIDS, if not effectively and urgently tackled, poses a clear threat to the sustainable development, social stability, and human security of the Caribbean."

The time to act is now; now is when we should support a bill that not only will tackle on of our most pressing international public health challenges, but that will do so in a manner that is medically, epidemiologically, regionally and fiscally responsible today. I, therefore, urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 5501 so that it may pass in the House of Representatives and so that we may lay the path necessary to ensure that during conference, the 14 Caribbean nations listed in this bill are included in the bill that is sent to the President for enactment. It not only is the right thing to do, but it is the smart and responsible thing to do.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, there is no more noble endeavor that we can engage in than to cure human diseases. All of us in Congress I think have an obligation to be sure that we are, for example, doubling the investment we make in the National Institutes of Health, in the National Science Foundation, in the research work that they're doing to identify and cure human diseases at the earlier stages.

I represent the Texas Medical Center, and I'm proud to do so. Those institutions, the greatest in the world, the Andy Anderson Cancer Center, Texas Children's Hospital, Baylor University of Texas Health Science Center is doing research today, particularly on nano research, where we have the potential, within the next 10 to 15 years, of being able to identify in a child before she's born genetic predisposition to certain diseases, for example, like Lou Gehrig's disease, or diabetes, or cystic fibrosis. These genetically-based diseases can be identified before a child is born using nanotechnology, re-injecting, for example, nano sponges with a protein fix back into the mother's amniotic fluid. The child would then take up those nano sponges. And we can cure diseases in children before they are born.

We have the potential, if we will just invest in the National Institutes of

Health and their competitive peer reviewed grant process, if we will just invest the money that's needed right here in America for the National Science Foundation, we have the ability to detect cancer when it's only a few hundred cells in the body using nanotechnology and gold nano shells that will attach to the cancer cells and destroy them before they turn into a tumor.

We have not adequately invested in our own scientific and medical infrastructure in the United States, first and foremost, before you even begin to talk about curing disease globally. We have not secured our border. The southern border is essentially wide open and unprotected in areas other than Del Rio and Laredo. What are we doing to make sure that we've done all that we can do here at home first and foremost for our own folks?

But then finally, and most importantly, and the reason I'm so spun up about this, is the fact that this Democrat Thelma and Louise Congress, Obama-Hillary-Pelosi Democrat Congress, is managing this economy of the United States like Thelma and Louise, driving right off the cliff.

I urge you to go to gao.gov and look at the Fiscal Wake-Up Tour that David Walker has put up on the Web site. The Comptroller of the United States has notified us formally that we are spending money so irresponsibly, so rapidly that the Standard & Poor's and Moody's has already formally notified the Treasury that they are beginning the process of downgrading U.S. Treasury bonds.

The Comptroller has told us that by the year 2020, in 12 years, young people who are 18, if you're listening, by the time you turn 30, Medicare is bankrupt, Treasury bills will be graded as junk. Let me repeat that, Treasury bills are on a path to be graded as junk bonds if we don't stop spending money and focus on the bare essentials. Every American already owes \$175,000 a person.

This bill creates a worldwide entitlement to anyone in the world that has AIDS or malaria or tuberculosis at U.S. taxpayer expense. It's unaffordable. It's unacceptable. It is utterly irresponsible at a time of record national debt, record deficits, record Federal spending that we need to reign in, otherwise America is going to become Argentina. The dollar is rapidly becoming the peso. It's time for this Thelma and Louise Democrat Congress to quit spending money on things that are not absolutely essential to this Nation's survival.

Let us focus on protecting the United States of America and quit spending my daughter's money that she does not have and driving our kids and our grandchildren deeper into debt. It is irresponsible. It is, frankly, criminal, in my opinion, to drive up the national debt and the deficit to record levels.

It is a noble, good thing to try to cure disease in Africa. Why don't we

focus on clean drinking water, for example, if you really want to fix disease in Africa. Quit spending my children's money that they don't have.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to direct their comments to the Chair.

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

To be honest, Mr. Speaker, I find it stunning that a Member from the Republican Party would come up here and talk about the debt that our children have been forced to inherit. I will remind my colleagues that when Bill Clinton left office, we had a surplus. After the leadership of George Bush and the Republican Congresses, we are now in historic record debt. I now have inherited a debt tax.

I am all for investing more in medical research. I would much rather do that, quite frankly, than invest in tax cuts for Donald Trump or more subsidies to Big Oil companies or more tax giveaways to big corporations that are gouging the American taxpayer.

But what we have here, Mr. Speaker, is a bill to save lives. This is a moral imperative. It is a product of bipartisan collaboration. This is something that we can be proud of. This is something the American people, I think, support overwhelmingly.

And so, we don't need any lectures about the mess this economy is in. This President and the Republican Congresses have driven this economy into a ditch, and we're trying to get us out of that ditch.

So, I would urge my colleagues to focus on what is being debated here today, which is a bill to save lives, to end the scourge of HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis. This is a worthy goal. This is something that we should be committed to. And I think that the bipartisan collaboration that has produced this deserves to be praised and not ridiculed.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to Mr. CULBERSON of Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. I want to thank Mr. MCGOVERN for his thoughtful response and point out that over the last 60 years, the Republicans have been in control of the Congress for I think about 14 of that. We were in control about 12 years, and then I think there were 2 or maybe 4 years under Eisenhower that the Republicans were in control. So, Democrats have controlled the Congress for the overwhelming majority of the last 60 years.

I got here in 2001. And I can tell you, Mr. MCGOVERN, and you're a thoughtful, good man, I enjoy working with you, that I personally, on behalf of my constituents, have voted against every major spending initiative that the White House has pushed on us because I recognized this problem the comptroller has put out before us. I voted

against the farm bill. I voted against the Medicare Prescription Drug bill. I voted against the No Child Left Behind Act. I voted against the AIDS in Africa bill the last time it came up because we cannot continue to spend money that our children cannot afford to pay. The money we spend today will be paid by our kids and our grandchildren. And that's the fundamental message here, Mr. MCGOVERN.

I would encourage everyone in this Congress, and I know you're a thoughtful guy, why don't we focus on providing clean drinking water. Let's convert existing foreign aid in Africa to clean drinking water, which I've led the effort to provide \$500 million. Focus on clean drinking water and research here in America.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just yield myself 20 seconds.

I appreciate the gentleman's response. I would just remind the gentleman again, and everybody, that this is a bill about saving lives. And this is a bill that is supported by the head of the Republican Party, the President of the United States. And so, I am proud to join in support of this bipartisan collaboration.

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

□ 1115

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Puerto Rico, who is a leader on issues of health and has so much contributed to this important legislation, Mr. FORTUÑO.

Mr. FORTUÑO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5501. This bill reauthorizes critically important legislation. PEPFAR, which is a testament to the American people's generosity of spirit, has achieved remarkable success. Because of PEPFAR, millions of sick and vulnerable people beyond our borders have received an essential education, treatment and care. There are men in Nairobi, women in Hanoi and children in Port-au-Prince who are alive today because of PEPFAR. That knowledge should give us great pride. It should also fill us with a sense of humility, born of the understanding that we have helped create something larger than ourselves.

I am gratified that the bill we consider today, appropriately named after two beloved chairmen of the Foreign Affairs Committee who devoted themselves to the cause of fighting AIDS, preserves the careful compromises that gave life to this life-giving program.

I want to highlight an aspect of H.R. 5501 that has not received much attention. In February 2007 I introduced H.R. 848, which called for the addition of 14 Caribbean nations as so-called "focus countries" under PEPFAR.

As the representative of nearly 4 million U.S. citizens residing in Puerto Rico, I am particularly aware that the people of the Caribbean have always been good friends and neighbors of our

country. We share a unique and resilient bond. The sons and daughters of the Caribbean who have ventured north to our shores have enriched the life of this Nation.

H.R. 848 was cosponsored by Congresswomen DONNA CHRISTENSEN and YVETTE CLARKE, who have been tireless advocates of individuals living with HIV/AIDS, and I commend them for their work. We were heartened when the language of H.R. 848 was included in H.R. 5501.

H.R. 5501 reflects a bipartisan agreement forged through deliberations among Democrats and Republicans on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the White House, and the State Department's Office of the Global AIDS Coordinator. Each of these groups recognized that the United States can do more to help the people of the Caribbean fighting the AIDS pandemic that is ravaging their communities.

Adopting a regional approach to fighting AIDS in the Caribbean, as H.R. 5501 does, is the right thing and the smart thing to do. There are currently 15 focus countries targeted for increased assistance under PEPFAR. Only two, Haiti and Guyana, are in the Caribbean. But the AIDS pandemic has produced a humanitarian crisis that affects the region as a whole.

Along with sub-Saharan Africa, the Caribbean is the most severely impacted region in the world. In 2007 there were 230,000 adults and children living with HIV, 17,000 new HIV infections, a 1 percent prevalence rate, and 11,000 AIDS-related deaths. Statistics like this can have a mind-numbing effect. We must remember that behind each of these numbers lies a tragic story of human suffering.

In addition, the AIDS pandemic in the Caribbean poses a significant national security threat to the United States, because the disease undermines political stability and economic development in the region that President Bush has called our "third border."

Current spending by the United States to combat AIDS in the Caribbean is not sufficient to address the problem. Setting aside funding to Haiti and Guyana, U.S. assistance to the Caribbean has remained stagnant and, in fact, even decreased slightly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FORTUÑO. In closing, I want to emphasize this point. By adding these Caribbean nations, Congress does not seek to substitute its judgment for the judgment of the experts at the State Department in determining how PEPFAR money will be allocated. These fact-intensive decisions will and should ultimately be made by OGAC. But expanding the list of so-called focus countries in this manner does send a strong and clear message from this Congress that the broader Caribbean region should be considered for a

reasonable amount of additional funding. And I believe this is a message that we can all support.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reserve my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I just came from a meeting with local doctors from my district. They told me that there is a severe shortage of funds necessary to care for America's senior citizens. We are having trouble finding the money to even take care of our returning veterans. Millions of Americans are facing foreclosure on their homes.

And now, with all of these challenges that we're facing at home, we are being asked to spend \$50 billion to fight AIDS in Africa? This is as absurd and as irresponsible as it gets.

Where are we going to get the \$50 billion for Africa?

Well, we can lower spending for our own people. We can raise taxes, which would likely throw us into a recession and leave us even less money for our people at home. Or of course we can borrow it. Yes, if we borrow it, it will probably come from Communist China and make ourselves even more vulnerable to their pressure.

We have exported our manufacturing base to China already, and now we want to borrow even more from these dictators so we can give that money away to others?

It is terrible that millions of Africans are suffering AIDS. But we cannot afford such totally irrational generosity. This is benevolence gone wild.

We can't afford to shortchange our own people, to raise taxes, or to borrow it. Yet, we expect the American people to absorb another \$50 billion hit for someone else?

We can't take care of our own veterans when they come home from the war. We can't take care of our elderly. We have people who can't take care of their own health needs, and are at risk of losing their homes. And we are going to spend \$50 billion in Africa?

Mr. Speaker, we have big hearts, but we need to use our brains. We cannot afford this type of \$50 billion generosity. It's going to cost, this will cost the American people their way of life. It will cost them their health care, their education for their children. It'll cost our veterans.

Our economy is facing a catastrophic setback because of the irresponsible spending and taxing policies of the Federal Government. And now we're going to exacerbate that problem by making believe that we can still afford to save the world by funding every worthwhile cause out there.

I'm not in any way suggesting that helping people with AIDS in Africa is not a worthwhile endeavor. But the fact is, we've got to use our heads, or we will have serious negative consequences on our own people. \$50 billion is way out of line, is way out of line.

It would be wonderful to help the people of Africa through this AIDS crisis by transferring tons of cash into African accounts. But I suggest to you that, as experience shows, just sending that much money will not cure AIDS in Africa, and will have serious repercussions on our standard of living and the quality of life of our own people.

I ask my colleagues to vote against this type of nonsense. Watch out for the American people.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I find it somewhat ironic to listen to the gentleman's comments who has no problem supporting a \$3 trillion war in Iraq that has resulted in 4,000 American soldiers dead, tens of thousands wounded; and on top of all that, not even paying for the war, just putting it on the credit card so our kids and our grandkids have to pay for it. Many of my friends on the other side of the aisle who have supported tax cuts for the richest of the rich and decided that it wasn't important to pay for it; instead, put it on the credit card and on the backs of our kids; who have voted for budgets to cut veterans health and to cut money for health care in general. And what we have been trying to do is to make up for the indifference of so many years.

You know, the gentleman presents a false choice. What we're trying to do here is actually respond to a humanitarian crisis in a bipartisan way. I mean, I don't often stand with the President of the United States, but I do on this. He's right. We can't ignore the HIV/AIDS crisis or the crisis with regard to malaria and tuberculosis around the world.

This is a moral imperative. And I will tell you, in addition to being a moral imperative, it makes sense for the United States to take a leadership role and encourage the rest of the world to step up and to provide the resources to combat these scourges.

This is the right thing to do. I'm proud of this bipartisan collaboration of this bill. And I hope all my colleagues will support it.

I want to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida, my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my esteemed colleague on the Rules Committee for yielding 1 minute.

I regret very much my colleague, who is my friend from California, had to be about his business because I wanted to respond directly to him dealing specifically with his comments as if this legislation is directed only to Africa.

This legislation wisely expands to the Caribbean basin. And I urged yesterday in the Rules Committee that people understand that American tourists visit these places and, in many instances, it is in our best interest to make sure that these kinds of humanitarian concerns are taken care of.

Haiti is involved in this legislation. And I doubt seriously if there's any-

body that doesn't believe that we should be about the business of trying to help Haiti.

My colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) just said that it is the right thing to do. It is the humanitarian thing to do. It is the right thing to do. And lest we ignore the extraordinary problem we have here in the Nation's Capital on HIV/AIDS, lest we ignore the need to expand the Ryan White Act, failure to do these things causes us to do so at our peril. This is de minimis by comparison to what is needed or what is required.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I would ask my friend if he has any other speakers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am the final speaker on our side.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will be asking for a "no" vote on the previous question so that we can amend the rule and allow the House to consider a change to the rules of the House to restore accountability and enforceability to the earmark rule.

Under the current rule, so long as the chairman or the sponsor of a bill, joint resolution, conference report, or manager's amendment includes either a list of earmarks contained in a bill or a report, or a statement that there are no earmarks, no point of order lies against the bill. This is the same as the rule in the last Congress.

However, under the rule as it functioned under the Republican majority in the 109th Congress, even if the point of order was not available on the bill, it was always available on the rule as a "question of consideration." Because the Democratic Rules Committee specifically exempts earmarks from the waiver of all points of order, they deprive Members of the ability to raise the question of earmarks on the rule.

This amendment will restore the accountability and enforceability of the earmark rule to where it was at the end of the 109th Congress to provide Members with an opportunity to bring the question of earmarks before the House for a vote.

Last year the distinguished new Speaker said that if she were to become Speaker of the House, she would require all earmarks to be publicly disclosed and would "put it in writing." However, as we have seen, this Congress, the majority have not fulfilled their promise.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5501 is one of the most important foreign policy global health bills this Con-

gress will pass this year. We have literally gone from, 5 years ago from standing helplessly by and watching people die of HIV/AIDS, to watching people live and take up productive lives in their communities. The impact is far-reaching.

For example, Mr. Speaker, let me highlight just one sector of development that has broad bipartisan support in this Congress, basic education. We all know that education is key to lifting countries out of poverty. And HIV/AIDS creates barriers to education.

Teacher deaths and absenteeism due to HIV/AIDS compound problems of quality and access in education systems that already face teacher shortages.

Children are often pulled out of school to care for a family member with HIV/AIDS or, when a parent dies, they're forced to take care of younger siblings rather than attend school.

HIV/AIDS affected children who are able to attend school often face discrimination and are sometimes segregated from other children or denied admission entirely by teachers or school administrators.

Young people with little or no education are more than twice as likely to contract HIV as those who have completed primary education.

But under this bill, and as we continue to better integrate our HIV/AIDS programs with our other development priorities, schools can become hubs of care and support for orphans and vulnerable children by providing psychological support, nutrition and basic health care and support to OVC caregivers.

In a 32-country demographic and health survey, women with post primary education were four times more likely than illiterate women to know the basic facts about HIV/AIDS, and three times more likely to know that HIV can be transmitted from mother to child.

Oxfam estimates that if all children completed primary education, 700,000 new cases of HIV/AIDS in young people could be prevented each year, totaling 7 million cases in one decade.

Mr. Speaker, for these and so many other reasons, this bipartisan bill deserves our support. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the underlying bill, H.R. 5501.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1065 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall, without intervention of any point of order, consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 263) to establish the Joint Select Committee on Earmark Reform, and for other purposes. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for

division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1130

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on approval of the Journal will be followed by 5-minute votes on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 1065 and adoption of H. Res. 1065.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 177, answered "present" 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

YEAS—232

Abercrombie	Butterfield	DeGette
Ackerman	Capito	Delahunt
Allen	Capps	Dent
Andrews	Capuano	Dicks
Arcuri	Cardoza	Dingell
Baca	Carnahan	Doggett
Bachmann	Carney	Donnelly
Baird	Carson	Doyle
Baldwin	Castor	Edwards
Barton (TX)	Chandler	Ellison
Bean	Clarke	Ellsworth
Becerra	Clay	Emanuel
Berkley	Cleaver	Engel
Berman	Clyburn	English (PA)
Berry	Cohen	Eshoo
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Etheridge
Bishop (NY)	Cooper	Farr
Blumenauer	Costa	Filmer
Boren	Costello	Foster
Boswell	Courtney	Frank (MA)
Boucher	Cramer	Gillibrand
Boyd (FL)	Crowley	Gonzalez
Boyd (KS)	Cuellar	Goodlatte
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Gordon
Braleigh (IA)	Davis (AL)	Green, Al
Brown, Corrine	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Brown-Waite,	Davis (IL)	Grijalva
Ginny	Davis, Lincoln	Gutierrez
Buchanan	DeFazio	Hall (NY)

Hare	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta
Harman	McCarthy (NY)	Sarbanes
Hastings (FL)	McCollum (MN)	Schakowsky
Herseth Sandlin	McDermott	Schiff
Higgins	McGovern	Schwartz
Hill	McIntyre	Scott (GA)
Hinojosa	McNerney	Scott (VA)
Hirono	McNulty	Serrano
Hodes	Meek (FL)	Sestak
Holden	Meeks (NY)	Shea-Porter
Holt	Melancon	Sherman
Honda	Mica	Shuster
Hooley	Michaud	Sires
Hoyer	Miller (NC)	Skelton
Israel	Miller, George	Slaughter
Jackson (IL)	Mollohan	Smith (WA)
Jackson-Lee	Moore (KS)	Snyder
(TX)	Moore (WI)	Solis
Johnson (GA)	Moran (VA)	Space
Johnson (IL)	Murphy (CT)	Spratt
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy, Patrick	Stark
Jones (OH)	Murtha	Sutton
Kagen	Nadler	Tanner
Kanjorski	Napolitano	Taylor
Kaptur	Neal (MA)	Thompson (MS)
Kennedy	Obey	Tierney
Kildee	Oliver	Towns
Kilpatrick	Ortiz	Tsongas
Kind	Pallone	Van Hollen
Klein (FL)	Pascrell	Velázquez
Kucinich	Pastor	Vislosky
Kuhl (NY)	Paul	Walberg
Lampson	Payne	Walsh (NY)
Langevin	Perlmutter	Walz (MN)
Larsen (WA)	Peterson (MN)	Wasserman
Larson (CT)	Pomeroy	Schultz
Latham	Price (NC)	Waters
Lee	Rahall	Watson
Levin	Rangel	Watt
Lewis (GA)	Reyes	Waxman
Lipinski	Richardson	Weiner
Loeback	Rodriguez	Welch (VT)
Lofgren, Zoe	Ross	Wexler
Lowey	Rothman	Whitfield (KY)
Lungren, Daniel	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (NM)
E.	Ruppersberger	Wilson (OH)
Lynch	Ryan (OH)	Woolsey
Mahoney (FL)	Salazar	Wu
Markey	Sánchez, Linda	Wynn
Matheson	T.	Yarmuth

NAYS—177

Aderholt	Drake	Knollenberg
Akin	Dreier	LaHood
Alexander	Duncan	Lamborn
Altmire	Ehlers	LaTourrette
Bachus	Everett	Latta
Barrett (SC)	Fallin	Lewis (CA)
Barrow	Feeney	Lewis (KY)
Bartlett (MD)	Ferguson	Linder
Biggart	Flake	LoBiondo
Bilbray	Forbes	Lucas
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	Mack
Bishop (UT)	Fossella	Manzullo
Blackburn	Fox	Marchant
Blunt	Franks (AZ)	Marshall
Boehner	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)
Bonner	Gallely	McCaul (TX)
Bono Mack	Garrett (NJ)	McCotter
Boozman	Gerlach	McCreery
Boustany	Gilchrest	McHenry
Brady (TX)	Gingrey	McHugh
Broun (GA)	Goode	McKeon
Brown (SC)	Graves	McMorris
Burgess	Hall (TX)	Rodgers
Burton (IN)	Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)
Buyer	Hayes	Miller, Gary
Calvert	Heller	Mitchell
Camp (MI)	Hensarling	Moran (KS)
Campbell (CA)	Herger	Murphy, Tim
Cannon	Hobson	Musgrave
Carter	Hoekstra	Myrick
Castle	Hulshof	Neugebauer
Chabot	Hunter	Nunes
Coble	Inglis (SC)	Pearce
Cole (OK)	Inslee	Pence
Conaway	Issa	Peterson (PA)
Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Petri
Culberson	Jones (NC)	Pickering
Davis (KY)	Jordan	Pitts
Davis, David	Keller	Platts
Davis, Tom	King (IA)	Poe
Deal (GA)	King (NY)	Porter
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston	Price (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Pryce (OH)
Doolittle	Kline (MN)	Putnam

Radanovich	Schmidt	Tiaht
Ramstad	Sensenbrenner	Tiberi
Regula	Sessions	Turner
Rehberg	Shadegg	Upton
Reichert	Shays	Walden (OR)
Renzi	Shimkus	Wamp
Reynolds	Shuler	Weldon (FL)
Rogers (AL)	Simpson	Weller
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Westmoreland
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Wittman (VA)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns	Wolf
Roskam	Stupak	Young (AK)
Royce	Terry	Young (FL)
Ryan (WI)	Thompson (CA)	
Sali	Thornberry	

Grijalva	McCollum (MN)	Sarbanes
Gutierrez	McDermott	Schakowsky
Hall (NY)	McGovern	Schiff
Hare	McIntyre	Schwartz
Harman	McNerney	Scott (GA)
Hastings (FL)	McNulty	Scott (VA)
Herseth Sandlin	Meek (FL)	Serrano
Higgins	Meeke (NY)	Sestak
Hinojosa	Melancon	Shea-Porter
Hirono	Michaud	Sherman
Hodes	Miller (NC)	Shuler
Holden	Miller, George	Sires
Holt	Mitchell	Skelton
Honda	Mollohan	Slaughter
Hooley	Moore (KS)	Smith (WA)
Hoyer	Moore (WI)	Snyder
Inslee	Moran (VA)	Solis
Israel	Murphy (CT)	Space
Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Patrick	Spratt
Jackson-Lee	Murtha	Stark
(TX)	Nadler	Stupak
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Sutton
Johnson, E. B.	Neal (MA)	Tanner
Jones (OH)	Oberstar	Taylor
Kagen	Obey	Thompson (CA)
Kanjorski	Oliver	Thompson (MS)
Kaptur	Ortiz	Tierney
Kennedy	Pallone	Towns
Kildee	Pascrell	Tsongas
Kilpatrick	Pastor	Udall (NM)
Kind	Payne	Van Hollen
Klein (FL)	Perlmutter	Velázquez
Kucinich	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
Langevin	Pomeroy	Walz (MN)
Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Wasserman
Larson (CT)	Rahall	Schultz
Lee	Rangel	Waters
Levin	Reyes	Watson
Lewis (GA)	Richardson	Watt
Lipinski	Rodriguez	Waxman
Loeb sack	Ross	Weiner
Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman	Welch (VT)
Lowe y	Roybal-Allard	Wexler
Lynch	Ruppersberger	Wilson (OH)
Mahoney (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Woolsey
Markey	Salazar	Wu
Matheson	Sánchez, Linda	Wynn
Matsui	T.	Yarmuth
McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta	

Petri	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry
Pickering	Roskam	Tiaht
Pitts	Royce	Tiberi
Platts	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Poe	Sali	Upton
Porter	Schmidt	Walberg
Price (GA)	Sensenbrenner	Walden (OR)
Pryce (OH)	Sessions	Wamp
Putnam	Shadegg	Weldon (FL)
Radanovich	Shays	Weller
Ramstad	Shimkus	Westmoreland
Regula	Shuster	Whitfield (KY)
Rehberg	Simpson	Wilson (NM)
Reichert	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Renzi	Smith (NJ)	Wittman (VA)
Reynolds	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Rogers (AL)	Stearns	Young (AK)
Rogers (KY)	Sullivan	Young (FL)
Rogers (MI)	Tancred o	
Rohrabacher	Terry	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancred o

NOT VOTING—20

Cantor	Granger	Saxton
Cubin	Hinche y	Souder
DeLauro	Jefferson	Sullivan
Emerson	Maloney (NY)	Tauscher
Fattah	Miller (FL)	Udall (CO)
Giffords	Oberstar	Udall (NM)
Gohmert	Rush	

□ 1154

Messrs. JORDAN of Ohio and SHAYS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KUCINICH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5501, TOM LANTOS AND HENRY J. HYDE UNITED STATES GLOBAL LEADERSHIP AGAINST HIV/AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS, AND MALARIA REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1065, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 199, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

YEAS—215

Abercrombie	Cardoza	DeFazio
Ackerman	Carnahan	DeGette
Allen	Carney	Delahunt
Arcuri	Carson	DeLauro
Baca	Castor	Dicks
Baird	Chandler	Dingell
Baldwin	Clarke	Doggett
Becerra	Clay	Doyle
Berkley	Cleaver	Edwards
Berman	Clyburn	Ellison
Berry	Cohen	Emanuel
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Engel
Bishop (NY)	Cooper	Eshoo
Blumenauer	Costa	Etheridge
Boren	Costello	Farr
Boswell	Courtney	Filner
Boucher	Cramer	Foster
Boyd (FL)	Crowley	Frank (MA)
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Giffords
Braley (IA)	Cummings	Gillibrand
Brown, Corrine	Davis (AL)	Gonzalez
Butterfield	Davis (CA)	Gordon
Capps	Davis (IL)	Green, Al
Capuano	Davis, Lincoln	Green, Gene

Jackson (IL)	Murphy (CT)
Jackson-Lee	Murphy, Patrick
(TX)	Murtha
Johnson (GA)	Nadler
Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano
Jones (OH)	Neal (MA)
Kagen	Oberstar
Kanjorski	Obey
Kaptur	Oliver
Kennedy	Ortiz
Kildee	Pallone
Kilpatrick	Pascrell
Kind	Pastor
Klein (FL)	Payne
Kucinich	Perlmutter
Langevin	Peterson (MN)
Larsen (WA)	Pomeroy
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)
Lee	Rahall
Levin	Rangel
Lewis (GA)	Reyes
Lipinski	Richardson
Loeb sack	Rodriguez
Lofgren, Zoe	Ross
Lowe y	Rothman
Lynch	Roybal-Allard
Mahoney (FL)	Ruppersberger
Markey	Ryan (OH)
Matheson	Salazar
Matsui	Sánchez, Linda
McCarthy (NY)	T.
	Sanchez, Loretta

NAYS—199

Aderholt	Davis, Tom	Jones (NC)
Akin	Deal (GA)	Jordan
Alexander	Dent	Keller
Altmire	Diaz-Balart, L.	King (IA)
Bachmann	Diaz-Balart, M.	King (NY)
Bachus	Donnelly	Kingston
Barrett (SC)	Doolittle	Kirk
Barrow	Drake	Kline (MN)
Bartlett (MD)	Dreier	Knollenberg
Barton (TX)	Duncan	Kuhl (NY)
Bean	Ehlers	LaHood
Biggert	Ellsworth	Lamborn
Bilbray	Emerson	Lampson
Bilirakis	English (PA)	Latham
Bishop (UT)	Everett	LaTourette
Blackburn	Fallin	Latta
Blunt	Feeney	Lewis (CA)
Boehner	Ferguson	Lewis (KY)
Bonner	Flake	Linder
Bono Mack	Forbes	LoBiondo
Boozman	Fortenberry	Lucas
Boustany	Fossella	Lungren, Daniel
Boyd (KS)	Fox x	E.
Brady (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Mack
Broun (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Manzullo
Brown (SC)	Gallegly	Marshall
Brown-Waite,	Garrett (NJ)	McCarthy (CA)
Ginny	Gerlach	McCaul (TX)
Buchanan	Gilchrest	McCotter
Burgess	Gingrey	McCrery
Burton (IN)	Goode	McHenry
Buyer	Goodlatte	McHugh
Calvert	Graves	McKeon
Camp (MI)	Hall (TX)	McMorris
Campbell (CA)	Hastings (WA)	Rodgers
Cannon	Hayes	Mica
Cantor	Heller	Miller (MI)
Capito	Hensarling	Miller, Gary
Carter	Herger	Moran (KS)
Castle	Hill	Murphy, Tim
Chabot	Hobson	Musgrave
Coble	Hoekstra	Myrick
Cole (OK)	Hulshof	Neugebauer
Conaway	Hunter	Nunes
Crenshaw	Inglis (SC)	Paul
Culberson	Issa	Pearce
Davis (KY)	Johnson (IL)	Pence
Davis, David	Johnson, Sam	Peterson (PA)

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews	Jefferson	Souder
Cubin	Maloney (NY)	Tauscher
Fattah	Marchant	Udall (CO)
Gohmert	Miller (FL)	Walsh (NY)
Granger	Rush	
Hinche y	Saxton	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is less than 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1203

Mr. MARSHALL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 192, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

YEAS—221

Abercrombie	Clay	Giffords
Ackerman	Cleaver	Gillibrand
Allen	Clyburn	Gonzalez
Altmire	Cohen	Gordon
Arcuri	Conyers	Green, Al
Baca	Cooper	Green, Gene
Baird	Costa	Grijalva
Baldwin	Costello	Gutierrez
Barrow	Courtney	Hall (NY)
Bean	Crowley	Hare
Becerra	Cuellar	Harman
Berkley	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Berman	Davis (AL)	Herseth Sandlin
Berry	Davis (CA)	Higgins
Bishop (GA)	Davis (IL)	Hinojosa
Bishop (NY)	Davis, Lincoln	Hirono
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Hodes
Boren	DeGette	Holden
Boswell	Delahunt	Holt
Boucher	DeLauro	Honda
Boyd (FL)	Dicks	Hooley
Boyd (KS)	Dingell	Hoyer
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Inslee
Braley (IA)	Donnelly	Israel
Brown, Corrine	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Butterfield	Edwards	Jackson-Lee
Capps	Ellsworth	(TX)
Capuano	Emanuel	Johnson (GA)
Cardoza	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Carnahan	Eshoo	Jones (OH)
Carney	Etheridge	Kagen
Carson	Farr	Kanjorski
Castor	Filner	Kaptur
Chandler	Foster	Kennedy
Clarke	Frank (MA)	Kildee

Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsock
Loifgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
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
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
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 (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
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—192

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Billbray
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
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
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
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
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack

Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCreery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson

Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt

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—17

Andrews
Cramer
Cubin
Ellison
Fattah
Granger

Hinchey
Jefferson
Maloney (NY)
Miller (FL)
Rangel
Rush

Saxton
Souder
Tauscher
Tiberi
Udall (CO)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is less than two minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1211

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1983

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1983.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1108

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 1108.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BERMAN. 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 H.R. 5501.

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

There was no objection.

TOM LANTOS AND HENRY J. HYDE
UNITED STATES GLOBAL LEADERSHIP AGAINST HIV/AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS, AND MALARIA RE-AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1065 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5501.

□ 1215

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the

consideration of the bill (H.R. 5501). To authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to provide assistance to foreign countries to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, and for other purposes, with Ms. NOR-TON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, on the President's request 5 years ago, Congress launched a global campaign to stop the spread of HIV/AIDS and to treat and care for those who are already afflicted. The United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Act was a bipartisan bill from its inception. Today, the Foreign Affairs Committee again brings a bipartisan global HIV/AIDS bill to the floor, and again this important reauthorization bill enjoys strong support from the White House.

The negotiations that brought forth this compromise bill were conducted in the same bipartisan spirit that guided the 2003 act into law, a spirit made possible by close cooperation between two former chairmen of the Foreign Affairs Committee, our late colleagues Tom Lantos and Henry Hyde, and I am pleased to note that this important reauthorization bill is named for these two foreign policy titans in recognition of their contributions to battling HIV/AIDS overseas.

As a direct result of the extraordinarily successful law we passed 5 years ago, the United States has provided lifesaving drugs to nearly 1.5 million men, women and children; supported care for nearly 7 million people, including 2.7 million orphans and vulnerable children; and prevented an estimated 150,000 infant infections around the world.

The 2003 legislation firmly established the United States as the leading provider in the world of HIV/AIDS assistance for prevention, treatment and care. It has reminded the global community that Americans are a compassionate and generous people, and so has helped to repair our Nation's badly-damaged image overseas. In many ways, that legislation has had great healing power.

Most importantly, with this initiative we have ensured that HIV/AIDS is no longer the certain death sentence it was just 5 short years ago. Hospital corridors that were jammed with AIDS patients waiting to die now brim with hope as lifesaving drugs are dispensed.

The reauthorization bill before the House today reaffirms our commitment to the programs and policies established 5 years ago. The 2003 legislation

worked well as an emergency intervention, but it must now be modified to reflect the constantly changing nature of the HIV/AIDS crisis. We also have 5 years of experience under our belts and we know what works and what does not.

The law we passed in 2003 was designed to deal with the emergency phase of the global HIV/AIDS crisis. The Lantos-Hyde bill will move our programs towards long-term sustainability that will keep the benefits of U.S. global HIV/AIDS programs flowing to those in need. With this reauthorization act, host governments will also gain the ability to plan, direct and manage prevention treatment and care programs that have been established with U.S. assistance.

The 2003 legislation authorized \$15 billion over 5 years. In response to the desperate need for lifesaving medicine and a greater number of trained health care workers in nations hard hit by HIV/AIDS, the bill before us authorizes \$50 billion over 5 years for these three pandemics.

The 2003 law relied upon the health care workforce already in place in the developing world, yet in many of the hardest hit areas of the world there are simply not enough doctors and other health care workers to meet the challenges of this pandemic. The Lantos-Hyde legislation invests new funds in training new professionals and paraprofessionals, as well as building existing capacity.

The 2003 law focused on creating new programs to tackle the HIV/AIDS crisis. The reauthorization bill increases the number of individuals receiving prevention, treatment and care services. It also builds stronger linkages between the global HIV/AIDS initiative and existing programs designed to alleviate hunger, improve health care, and bolster HIV education in schools, an approach endorsed by the President's Global AIDS Coordinator just a few short weeks ago.

The 2003 law gave inadequate attention to the needs of women and girls. The new legislation remedies this situation by strengthening prevention and treatment programs aimed at this especially vulnerable population.

The reauthorization legislation also eliminates the one-third abstinence-only earmark, but requires a balanced approach to HIV/AIDS sexual transmission prevention programs and a report regarding this approach in countries where the epidemic has become generalized.

The bill before you today is a compromise in the best sense of the word, and it is in the true spirit of the great leaders of this committee who guided the 2003 act into law, Chairmen Lantos and Hyde. This bill is the result of more than a year of preparatory work and weeks of discussions, concluding with a bipartisan agreement with the White House. President Bush has indicated his support and his intention to sign it into law as soon as Congress acts.

For all its strengths, the bill before the House today is not perfect. No compromise ever is. No one got everything they wanted in this compromise legislation. But with this agreement, we have maintained the strong, bipartisan coalition behind the global HIV/AIDS initiative which has been critical to winning rapidly increasing funding levels for this important initiative.

Madam Chairman, 20 million innocent men, women and children have perished from HIV/AIDS, and 40 million around the globe are HIV positive. Each and every day another 6,000 people become infected with HIV. We have a moral imperative to act, and to act decisively.

I will speak more lengthily about the subject, but I do want to initially extend my particular appreciation to our ranking member, ILEANA ROSLEHTINEN, who played a critical role in working with the majority to reach this compromise. A number of Members on her side from the committee were active. DON PAYNE, the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the Africa Subcommittee, was critically involved, as was Congresswoman BARBARA LEE from California, who played such a key role in the 2003 law, as well as a number of other people, such as Congressman CARNAHAN. I can't mention everyone who was involved, but this was truly a collaborative effort that started long before I became Chair of the committee, with great work by Chairman Lantos last year and with the staff of the committee.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROSLEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I thank my good friend, the new chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee, HOWARD BERMAN. He has got a tough act to follow, because we all loved Tom Lantos. The gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) had a hard act to follow, but, boy, did he fill those big shoes very well. So, thank you, Mr. Chairman. This has been your first trial by fire, and you came out looking so well because you accommodated the concerns and the anxieties and the worries that so many of our Members had.

I want to thank on a bipartisan level all of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, from the most conservative to the most liberal. We were able to forge a compromise that reached a broad consensus on this vital and complex legislation. We couldn't have done it without the leadership of Chairman BERMAN, but also without his very able staff and the staff on our Republican side of the aisle as well.

The foundation of this bill, as Chairman BERMAN has pointed out, is the 2003 Leadership Act, which was the first comprehensive U.S. emergency response to the HIV/AIDS pandemic and which stands as a noble legacy of our two former chairmen, Henry Hyde and Tom Lantos. They understood, as do

all of us, that millions of lives around the world depend on our country's willingness to battle this pandemic together. It does honor to our country that 5 years ago we undertook this true mission of mercy. We are fortunate to have the opportunity to reaffirm that commitment by our vote here today.

Since the passage of the original Leadership Act of 2003, extensive emergency treatment and prevention programs have begun to slow the advance of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. The success of these programs is well documented. I would like to cite some specifics.

According to the office of the Global AIDS Coordinator, more than 1.4 million people infected with the HIV virus are now being treated with the necessary drugs to fight this disease. PEPFAR has supported HIV testing and counseling for 30 million people, cared for million 6.7 million, and, as the chairman pointed out, including almost 3 million orphans and vulnerable children. We are on our way to achieving the 5-year goal of preventing the infection of 7 million people. PEPFAR has supplied medicines for approximately 800,000 expectant mothers, preventing an estimated 157,000 infant HIV infections. What a successful program.

The legislation before us keeps faith with the core principles of the Hyde-Lantos Act. We have modified the original blueprint by adding or adjusting a number of provisions based on 5 years of real-world experience regarding what works and what doesn't.

In addition to medicines and sophisticated methods of treatment, the 2003 act mandated that a more comprehensive approach be used that took into account local values and indigenous cultures, and the act before us does that.

With respect to this balanced approach, the wife of the President of Zambia said it best recently when she said, "There are several ways in which we can reach the young people. One of the effective ways is abstinence. It brings back dignity and self-responsibility to young people, because they know their bodies are not supposed to be abused and they learn to say no."

The compromise bill before us removes the specific directive in current law so that implementation, as the chairman has pointed out, can be better refined to reflect the varying circumstances in host countries. Nevertheless, the bill before us continues this comprehensive approach by requiring that the AIDS Coordinator provides a balanced approach for prevention activities for sexual transmission of HIV/AIDS and to ensure that abstinence and faithfulness programs are implemented and funded in a meaningful and equitable way.

The agreement that we have is carefully crafted and designed in the area of reproductive health and family planning to ensure that HIV funding for prevention is not misused to promote programs beyond the scope of this bill.

We can do that, if you wish, in other bills. But the bill ensures also that those working to fight these diseases are not required to choose between their conscience and receiving the assistance they need to carry out their work.

Also we worked a lot on the prostitution and the sex trafficking pledge. The bipartisan agreement maintains the existing certification requirement that any group or organization receiving PEPFAR funds explicitly oppose prostitution and sex trafficking. The U.S. Agency for International Development has implemented this prohibition by requiring that any group that receives funding sign a pledge affirming its opposition to these practices.

Let me be clear: Neither current law nor the pledge itself prevents organizations from working with prostitutes or other high risk groups, but it does mandate that that assistance to these individuals not be mistaken for approval or support of the activities that take their terrible toll on their bodies and that can only be described as destructive to human dignity.

We had issues with accountability and national security, and although this bill is absolutely motivated by the altruism of the American people, I believe that this legislation ensures that our interests are protected as well.

□ 1230

For example, U.S. contributions to the Global Fund will be subject to more stringent oversight than is currently provided by calling for the Fund to meet even higher benchmarks of transparency and accountability.

The legislation also includes a prohibition on taxation of our assistance by foreign governments to ensure that assistance intended to the afflicted not be siphoned off by unaccountable bureaucrats.

The bill also strengthens our national security. The HIV pandemic is first and foremost a health issue, but it also is one of the most significant global, economic, and security threats of our generation. General Charles Wald, the Former Deputy Commander of the US-European Command, has called HIV/AIDS the third greatest threat to our national security.

Together, HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria kill millions of people during their most productive years, between the ages of 16 and 50. And in the hardest hit countries, the AIDS epidemic alone is killing a generation of parents, of teachers, of health care workers, bread winners, peacekeepers, shattering the economic and the social life of villages, communities, and, indeed, nations.

Losses on this scale have staggered the economies of the hardest hit countries. Without further prevention, without further treatment, without further care efforts, the AIDS pandemic will continue to spread its mix of death, poverty, and despondency that is further destabilizing govern-

ments and societies and undermining the security of entire regions.

Our former House colleague from Wisconsin, Mark Green, who now serves as the United States Ambassador to Tanzania, wrote to me following the committee's passage of this bill highlighting this security aspect. He said, "In tearing apart the social fabric and leaving a generation of orphans, the scourge of HIV/AIDS could spread and create a long-term breeding ground of radicalism."

PEPFAR programs in turn help to counter these precursor conditions. As General Wald has said, "In addition to the obvious humanitarian efforts of PEPFAR, the program is one of our Nation's development activities that can help strengthen the social structure that keep communities and nations secure."

The threat is not just in faraway lands, but in our own back yard. Many countries in the Caribbean have been particularly hard hit. This bill places a new emphasis on assistance to this region. It adds 14 Caribbean countries to the existing list of nations in which the Global AIDS Coordinator is given explicit statutory authority over HIV/AIDS programs.

Let me add that, although all of us share the goal of reducing the further spread of this pandemic, this is also a personal issue for me both professionally and morally. South Florida, which falls within my congressional district, ranks first in the State of Florida in the number of AIDS cases. Roughly 19 percent of the State total for those living with HIV reside in my district. So, I am all too familiar with the human cost of this disease, and hope for the day when its ravages are safely confined to the past.

Although not all Members will fully agree with every aspect of this complex compromise, it does contain the bipartisan approach that we have maintained throughout the years of work on HIV/AIDS in our committee. We have an opportunity, indeed, a responsibility, to continue the lifesaving work that began 5 years ago. This legislation is a means by which that can happen.

But the dry text of the legislation, nor the posters behind me, cannot adequately capture the human drama for which we are trying to write the exit strategy.

The poster behind me shows where PEPFAR has worldwide activities, the number of countries where it has positively had an impact. The second poster shows the number of adults and children estimated to be living with HIV just this last year. And, the third poster shows some of the faces of the children whom this legislation has saved.

Let me read, to conclude, from a Washington Post op ed authored by our chairman, Henry Hyde, 5 years ago. Mr. Hyde wrote,

"Not since the bubonic plague swept across the world in the last millennium has our world confronted such a horrible curse as we are now witnessing with the growing HIV/AIDS pandemic.

"This pandemic is more than a humanitarian crisis.

"To those who suggest that the United States has no stake in this pandemic, let me observe that the specter of failed states across the world is certainly our concern.

"The AIDS virus is a mortal challenge to our civilization.

"It is my hope that each of us will be animated by the compassion, and, yes, the vision, that has always defined what it means to be an American."

Madam Chairman, endless numbers of children have already been orphaned and deprived of the protection and the love of their parents. We cannot make their world whole again, but there is much that we can do to comfort and care for them and to prevent others from suffering the same fate.

I ask my colleagues to join us in supporting this bill in a strong bipartisan manner, and thereby allow our country to continue our mission, our mission of mercy, for the waiting millions.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlelady for her wonderful statement, and I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the chairman, and I ask for time for the purpose of the gentlelady from Missouri and I entering into a colloquy with the chairman on the importance of integrating food and nutrition programs with the prevention, care, and treatment of HIV/AIDS-affected individuals, families, and communities.

Last year, I traveled to Africa and had the opportunity to see firsthand many of our programs related to food security. In Ethiopia and Kenya, I visited HIV/AIDS programs to look at how food and nutrition was included. At that time, I heard from local communities, NGO partners, and our embassy staff how restrictive guidance for global HIV/AIDS assistance often hindered their ability to design and carry out effective food and nutrition programs targeted at HIV/AIDS affected individuals, families, and communities. The lack of resources available for food and nutrition programs within the global HIV/AIDS assistance and from other sources also posed a significant barrier.

I very much appreciate and support the work of the committee in ensuring that this bill addresses these concerns throughout, and especially in the section entitled "Food Security and Nutrition Support." The bill recognizes that strengthening the linkages and enhancing coordination among HIV/AIDS programs and vital development programs, like food and nutrition programs, will significantly increase our effectiveness in the fight against HIV/AIDS while we advance other essential U.S. development priorities. I remain concerned, however, that the bill is less clear on where or how such funding will be provided for these purposes. It is not clear on how much funding will

come from the Global HIV/AIDS program versus other sources of funding. I am concerned that, without adequate resources through the Global HIV/AIDS program, or necessary increases for current food and nutrition services through programs like Food for Peace, that USAID will be faced with the possibility of having to divert funding from programs that address long-term chronic hunger and food insecurity to meet the enhanced mandates of H.R. 5501.

I know the chairman will agree that we want to avoid this scenario of robbing Peter to pay Paul so that we do not end up shortchanging other communities suffering from hunger, malnutrition, and food insecurity.

I want to yield to the gentlelady from Missouri in this regard.

Mrs. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Madam Chairman, I am also concerned that the situation will become even worse, because the cost of food, commodities, and transportation is skyrocketing. Just last month, on February 12, the USAID's Office of Food for Peace announced that the cost of wheat and other food the United States donates to poor countries jumped 41 percent, 41 percent, in the first half of fiscal year 2008. According to USAID, this means \$120 million in food assistance will not be available for people who are malnourished or food insecure.

I would ask the chairman to work on strengthening the language in the bill as it moves through the legislative process and into conference negotiations to clarify how the necessary level of funding for food security and nutrition will be provided, especially in light of rising food and transportation costs, so that funds won't be diverted from U.S. programs addressing chronic hunger and emergency operations.

I yield back to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. And I yield back to the chairman to express his views.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, before I respond with my views, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) to express his views on the subject of this colloquy.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the provision on food and nutrition security in the bill currently under consideration is drawn directly from a bill I introduced in December, H.R. 4914, the Global HIV/AIDS Food Security and Nutrition Support Act of 2007. I introduced the bill after chairing a hearing in the Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health to determine whether the Global HIV/AIDS program was adequately addressing the nutritional needs of its beneficiaries.

The hearing corroborated what I had already heard in the field on numerous visits to Africa over the past 5 years: PEPFAR is falling short in this critical area. I share the concerns of the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts and the gentlelady from Missouri about the increasing cost of food aid. Just last week, the World Food Program had to issue an appeal for an additional \$500 million to offset the increased costs of food and fuel.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PAYNE. Without the extra \$73 million, people who rely on WFP for their daily sustenance may have their rations cut. This is a truly alarming situation, and it is not my intent for the provision of this bill to exacerbate it. The language under consideration very clearly states that these activities are to be funded from amounts authorized under section 401 of this bill. I used this language deliberately, as I strongly believe that the food assistance and nutritional support we are providing under the Global AIDS program must be on top of the food aid we are already providing.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes to respond to the concerns raised during this colloquy. I thank my colleagues for raising these important concerns.

H.R. 5501 provides clear and specific instructions to the USAID Administrator and the Global AIDS Coordinator to address the food and nutrition needs of individuals with HIV/AIDS and other affected individuals, including orphans and vulnerable children; and to fully integrate food and nutrition support in HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care programs carried out under this act.

I would like to emphasize that the committee and I personally share our colleagues' concerns about the negative effect rising costs are having on our long-term and emergency food aid programs. This is a matter that has our most serious attention, because it affects a wide array of our food aid and development programs, including the effectiveness and success of this program.

I want to reassure my colleagues that I will be working over the coming weeks to strengthen and clarify in the bill that food security and nutrition programs, especially those referred to as wrap-around services, are not to be funded with monies diverted from other standing commitments to address food and security elsewhere in the world or in these countries.

I yield 30 seconds' additional time to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the chairman for that assurance. I know that many Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle stand ready to support him in these efforts.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. ROYCE. Many have described the crisis: HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, ma-

laria. These take countless lives every day, especially on the continent of Africa. These diseases devastate families, they devastate communities, and nations. This bill is titled the "Leadership Act," and it is titled that way because it honors two former Foreign Affairs Committee chairmen who indeed did show leadership in forging this legislation 5 years ago. And, with this act, the United States will continue to lead in tackling these killer diseases.

As others have said, this legislation did not come together easily; and the reason it is difficult is because many people have strong views on how best to fight these diseases. This bill is a compromise. It would have been far easier to hold onto positions, probably, but that would have gotten no bill. But, instead, those working on it did the hard work to craft a policy that most everyone could support.

□ 1245

Frankly, had it not been done, it would have been a sharp rebuke to the work Chairman Hyde and Mr. Lantos did 5 years ago. Tens of millions of people around the world would have lost, and America would have lost. That we are in this position now, to continue these two men's legacy, is due to the dedication of Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN. I particularly appreciate their inclusion of a provision I had recommended prohibiting foreign countries, foreign governments, from taxing our aid, and I thank them for that provision.

While endorsing the policy, the bill's authorization level is a great concern, as others have expressed. I have conferred with enough people working in the field and been in enough African countries to doubt the ability to productively absorb this very large funding level, which is well over the administration's request.

And while these are devastating diseases, these countries face many other public challenges, some deadly, which may be shortchanged. Our country has many public health needs, too. That leads me to believe that this would be a better bill if it conformed more closely with the level the administration, which has gotten real results, thinks it could best spend.

I believe this bill's authorization level will be addressed in our recom-mittal motion which will be offered for a vote before this House.

So again, I thank Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health, and a key architect of this legislation.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Chairman, let me begin by commending Chairman BERMAN of the committee for bringing forth this tremendous, important legislation, and for the support in this bipartisan effort from Ranking Member

ROS-LEHTINEN, and for her support of this very important legislation.

I rise in strong support of the legislation currently under consideration. I am very pleased to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 5501, the Tom Lantos and Henry Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008.

This bill is appropriately named because it was under the leadership of the late Henry Hyde, then chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, that the PEPFAR legislation was originally authorized. And under the leadership of the late Tom Lantos, reauthorization began. Both of these tireless giants who have left us should be remembered by this legislation. I might also note that under the leadership of the original authorization, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and the Congressional Black Caucus were very strong advocates to push the leadership of the House and the President to consider this very important legislation.

In the 5 years, there has certainly been a pandemic that the world is facing, and there has not been a pandemic similar to this since the plague during medieval days in Europe. So I am pleased that we are finally dealing with this pandemic in the way that it should be.

In the 5 years since Congress passed the original legislation authorizing the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, or PEPFAR, as it is well known, it has become an historic program. In my opinion, this will be remembered as the single most significant achievement of President Bush's two terms in office.

And from my recent conversations with the President, I know that he has worked very hard on this reauthorization, and it is with the support of the White House and the staff, they helped us craft this bipartisan legislation.

Prior to PEPFAR, the United States did very little in supporting AIDS treatment programs abroad. In fact, Members may recall a high-ranking USAID official said that treatment was not feasible in Africa, the most heavily AIDS-infected region of the world, because Africans cannot tell time and therefore would not be able to take the required medication properly. As we know, it was foolish to say that at the time; and as we have seen the results, it has proven once again to have been a foolish statement.

These officials advocated limiting our activities only to education and prevention, a position that would have in effect sentenced millions of HIV-infected men, women and children to die if it were only that program. And so I am very pleased we expanded it to where it is today.

Fortunately, the Congress and the President did not agree with that position. And because we were willing to find a way to provide treatment for over 800,000 people, today they are receiving antiretroviral medication to

prevent AIDS in the 15 focus countries, 12 of which are in sub-Saharan Africa.

We are also pleased that we are increasing the number of countries to the 14 Caribbean countries. And as cochair of the bipartisan Caribbean Caucus, and under the leadership of Representative DONNA CHRISTENSEN, at a meeting she convened in her district, we had health ministers admit that the Caribbean also needed substantial help.

Our progress, while significant, is not enough. Only 28 percent of Africans needing antiretrovirals are receiving them. Shockingly, over 85 percent of African children who need ARVs are going without them. A mere 11 percent of HIV-positive women who need drugs to prevent mother-to-child transmission of HIV during child birth are getting them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. PAYNE. In light of these troubling facts, we have taken steps in this legislation to transform PEPFAR from an emergency response to a sustainable program by expanding the program beyond a series of medical interventions. For example, the committee incorporated the provision that I discussed earlier about food security into the legislation in order to address the nutritional needs of HIV patients, their families, and communities heavily affected by the disease.

Lack of food and nutrition support has been, up to now, a major impediment to the adherence of HIV/AIDS treatment regimens.

H.R. 5501 also contains provisions to build and strengthen health systems in developing countries. The committee has given the Office of Global AIDS Coordinator the flexibility to do prevention, care and treatment programs tailored to the characteristics of the epidemic in the country in which they are operating by eliminating cumbersome earmarks that the GAO said were ineffective.

Finally, the bill authorizes significant funds, \$50 billion over the next 5 years, in order to accomplish the goals of the bill. I urge the House to pass this legislation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, I am proud to yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health, who has worked so long and so hard on this topic.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008, an admittedly long, but appropriate title for a bill that is long on substance, meaningful intervention, tangible compassion, and relief.

Aptly named for two of the giants of this institution who helped shepherd President George W. Bush's PEPFAR

initiative through the Congress in 2003, H.R. 5501 will literally mean the difference between life and death to millions, especially in sub-Saharan Africa.

The bill before us today is consensus legislation, a delicate balance that if kept intact, and only if kept intact, will be signed into law. So I want to thank Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN and other Members and staff for helping to forge today's PEPFAR consensus. I want to especially thank Sheri Rickert, Mary Noonan, Autumn Fredericks, Yleem Poblete, Peter Yeo, Pearl Alice Marsh, Dr. Bob King, Kristin Wells, and David Abramowitz for their extraordinary work in drafting this legislation.

Madam Chairman, as Members know, close to 70 percent of the estimated 33 million people with HIV live in sub-Saharan Africa. Of the 2.5 million children afflicted with this dreaded disease, 90 percent live in Africa as well.

When combined with opportunistic infections like tuberculosis—the number one killer of individuals with HIV—and malaria alone kills one million each year, again mostly in Africa—the HIV/AIDS pandemic compares among humanity's worst. Former Chairman Hyde frequently compared the sickness to the bubonic plague—the black death—an epidemic that claimed the lives of over 25 million people in Europe during the mid-1300s.

I know some Members are likely to wince at the cost of the bill—\$50 billion over 5 years for PEPFAR, the Global Fund, Tuberculosis, and Malaria—but that sum of money will be used to prevent 12 million new HIV infections worldwide, and support treatment for 3 million people, including an estimated 450,000 children. That sum of money will provide care to 12 million individuals with HIV/AIDS, including 5 million orphans and vulnerable children, and will help train and deploy at least 140,000 new health care professionals and workers for HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment and care.

On the prevention side, the legislation requires that the Global AIDS Coordinator provide balanced funding for sexual transmission prevention including abstinence, delay of sexual debut, monogamy, fidelity, and partner reduction. If less than 50 percent of the sexual transmission prevention moneys are spent on the Abstinence and the Be Faithful parts of the ABC model, the coordinator must provide a written justification. I note that currently, the coordinator exercises waiver authority in this regard without notifying Congress so this language ensures greater transparency and accountability.

Five years, Madam Chairman, after PEPFAR first began, the efficacy and importance of promoting abstinence and be faithful initiatives have been demonstrated beyond any reasonable doubt, and the evidence is compelling.

According to joint comments by the U.S. Department of State, USAID, and

HHS on PEPFAR, “Congressional directives have helped focus U.S. Government prevention strategies to be evidence based. Because of the data, ABC is now recognized as the most effective strategy to prevent HIV in generalized epidemics.

□ 1300

The original legislation’s emphasis on AB activities has been an important factor in the fundamental and needed shift in U.S. government prevention strategies from a primarily “C” approach prior to PEPFAR to a balanced ABC strategy. The Emergency Plan developed a more holistic and equitable strategy, one that reflects the growing body of data that validates ABC behavioral change.

The U.S. government report goes on to say that recent data from Zimbabwe and Kenya mirrors the earlier successes of Uganda’s ABC approach to preventing HIV. These three countries, with what is known as “generalized epidemics,” have demonstrated reductions in HIV prevalence. And in each country, the data point to significant AB, abstinence, be faithful; behavioral change; and modest, but important, changes to C.

So, I want to thank Mr. PITTS for writing the original AB earmark into the original law because it has instructed and has had a tremendously positive impact.

I would note to my colleagues that this past September the Foreign Affairs Committee heard from a world renowned expert, Dr. Norman Hearst, who said that 5 years ago he had been commissioned by U.N. AIDS to conduct a technical review of how well condoms had worked for AIDS prevention in the developing world. And he said, and I quote in part, “my associates and I collected mountains of data, and here is what we found: When we looked for evidence of public health impact for condoms in generalized epidemics, to our surprise we couldn’t find anything. No generalized HIV epidemic has ever been rolled back by a prevention strategy primarily based on condoms. Instead, a few successes in turning around generalized epidemics, such as Uganda, were achieved not through condoms, but by getting people to change their sexual behavior.”

He goes on to say that these are not just our conclusions. A recent consensus statement in the *Lancet* was endorsed by 150 AIDS experts, including Nobel Laureates, the President of Uganda, and officials of the most prominent international AIDS organizations. And it said, “the priority for adults should be, B, limiting one’s partners. The priority for young people should be A, not starting sexual activity too soon.” And this contrasted with other funders that often officially endorse ABC, but in practice continue to put their money in the same old strategies that have been unsuccessful in Africa for the past 15 years.

A Washington Post article by Craig Timberg noted that “men and women

in Botswana continued to contract HIV faster than almost anyone else on Earth. Researchers increasingly attribute the resilience of HIV in Botswana, and in southern Africa generally, to the high incidence of multiple sexual relationships.”

“Researchers increasingly agree,” and please, I ask my colleagues to take note of this, “that curbing behavior is key to slowing the spread of AIDS in Africa.” In a July report, southern African AIDS experts said that reducing multiple and concurrent partnerships was their first priority for stopping the spread.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chair, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you.

Madam Chairman, the legislation before us also leaves intact the anti-prostitution/sex trafficking pledge, a policy designed to ensure that pimps and brothel owners don’t become, via an NGO that supports such exploitation, U.S. government partners.

Last February, the U.S. Government Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia upheld the prostitution pledge and said, in pertinent part, “In this case, the government’s objective is to eradicate HIV/AIDS. One of the means of accomplishing this objective is for the U.S. to speak out against legalizing prostitution in other countries.”

The Court of Appeals goes on to say, “it would make little sense for the government to provide billions of dollars to encourage the reduction of HIV/AIDS behavioral risks, including prostitution and sex trafficking, and yet to engage as partners in this effort organizations that are neutral towards or even actively promote the same practices sought to be eradicated.”

Finally, we’ve come a long way, Madam Chairman, since 2003, when significant opposition materialized against an amendment that I had offered to ensure that faith-based providers, and others, are not excluded from participation. Worldwide, but especially in Africa, faith-based organizations are absolutely critical in the fight against AIDS. So, we welcome and are deeply grateful for their support and their work.

The conscience clause in H.R. 5501 restates, improves, and expands conscience protection in a way that ensures that organizations like the Catholic Relief Services, with its 250 plus projects in 52 countries, which has had a remarkable record on HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment and care, are not discriminated against or in any way precluded from receiving public funds.

Madam Chairman, this bill is carefully crafted, and again, I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the enormous amount of work that has been poured into its creation.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere. And remember, this is a bill about HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis. He played a major role in the tuberculosis section of the bill, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank our distinguished chairman for yielding to me.

Madam Chairman, I’m proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 5501, the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008, named after our dearly departed two great House Foreign Affairs Committee chairmen that I had the pleasure of serving under, Tom Lantos and Henry Hyde.

The HIV/AIDS pandemic continues to pose a major threat to the health of the global community, from the most severely affected regions of sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean, as the chairman mentioned, I’m the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Western Hemisphere, to the emerging epidemics of eastern Europe, central Asia, south and southeast Asia, and Latin America.

I also want to take this time to pay tribute to our colleague who is in the Chamber, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who has worked so hard in combating global AIDS, probably harder than anyone else in the Congress. I’m delighted that she’s here, and her hard work has not gone unnoticed.

While most widely recognized for reviewing our commitment to global AIDS relief, H.R. 5501 reauthorizes provisions on HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis, all deadly diseases of poverty. The Lantos-Hyde Act is a decisive step forward for global health, particularly for our efforts to control tuberculosis.

I want to take a moment to specifically address the tuberculosis provisions included, as the chairman mentioned, as my bill H.R. 1567, the Stop TB Now Act which passed the floor earlier this year, was largely incorporated into this bill, and I’m delighted about that.

The World Health Organization reports that 1.5 million people died of tuberculosis in 2006, with another 200,000 dying from HIV-associated tuberculosis. The multi-drug resistant and extensively drug resistant TB, known as MDR and XDR, poses a grave risk to global health. A contagious airborne disease, TB knows no barriers or borders and can only be successfully controlled in the United States by controlling it overseas.

This Lantos-Hyde Act declares TB control a major objective of U.S. foreign assistance programs. In support of WHO targets, the bill prioritizes halving TB deaths and disease, cutting them in half, and achieving a 70 percent detection rate and an 85 percent cure rate by 2015.

The Lantos-Hyde Act prioritizes the Stop TB Partnership's strategy, which includes expansion of the successful treatment regimen for standard TB, treatment for individuals infected with both TB and HIV, treatment for individuals with drug-resistant TB, and enabling research and development of new tools.

Recognizing the deadly synergy between TB, an opportunistic infection, and HIV, the Lantos-Hyde Act authorizes assistance to strengthen the coordination of HIV/AIDS and TB programs. TB is the leading killer of people with HIV/AIDS.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. May I ask for an additional minute?

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. ENGEL. And the explosion of drug-resistant TB in sub-Saharan Africa threatens to halt and roll back our progress in combating both diseases.

The legislation supports key TB-HIV activities, such as providing AIDS patients with TB screening and treatment, and providing TB patients with proper counseling, testing and treatment for HIV/AIDS.

Finally, the legislation authorizes assistance for the development of new vaccines for TB. The current TB vaccine is more than 85 years old and is unreliable against pulmonary TB, which accounts for most of the worldwide disease burden. New TB vaccines have the potential to save millions of lives and would lead to substantial cost savings.

Studies modelling the 10-year economic benefits of a vaccine that is 75 percent effective have estimated worldwide savings in medical costs of \$25 billion or more.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill. This is a very, very important bill.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, before yielding to my distinguished colleague from Illinois, I would like to recognize the efforts of Yleem Poblete, our staff director on the GOP side, Mark Gage, Joan Condon, Sarah Kiko of our committee staff, they have all been working so hard, and our detailee, a valuable addition to our PEPFAR team, Ben Snyder. Thank you to everyone who has worked so hard.

Madam Chairman, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), an esteemed member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support for the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Reauthorization Act. I want to commend the current leadership of the committee, the bipartisan leadership, Mr. BERMAN and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for their leadership in moving this legislation to the floor in a bipartisan way. And it's most appropriate that it be

named after Tom Lantos and Henry Hyde, two distinguished chairmen of the International and Foreign Relations Committees that changed names, but one thing that was in common between Tom Lantos and Henry Hyde was they always worked to ensure that foreign policy should be a bipartisan product and a team effort. So, it is so appropriate that they be recognized by naming this legislation after them, which reauthorizes President Bush's emergency plans for AIDS relief.

As noted by a number of my colleagues, almost 33 million citizens of this planet today suffer from the consequences of HIV/AIDS. We have a moral responsibility, and it's important that the United States exhibit and demonstrate moral leadership in addressing this crisis, which not only is a health issue, but it's a security issue for this globe.

I think we all watched the reception of President Bush when he traveled recently to Africa and the appreciation that was shown by the leadership in Africa for the President's initiative and the bipartisan support that we've seen in the effort against AIDS, and to help those who are victims of AIDS in Africa.

We often think of Africa when we talk about global AIDS, but of the 33 million, there are also many living in Latin America and the Caribbean who suffer from HIV/AIDS as well. In Latin America today there are 1,600,000 people living with HIV/AIDS, that's up from 1.3 million in 2001; and 58,000 citizens of Latin America have lost their lives to HIV/AIDS. In the Caribbean, 230,000 adults and children are currently known to be infected with HIV/AIDS. That's up from 190,000 in 2001. In the Caribbean, 11,000 citizens of the Caribbean have lost their lives.

I note we've made some progress as a result of the President's initiative for AIDS relief. In Haiti alone, a large recipient of aid as a result of this initiative, almost 4 percent of the population of Haiti is infected with HIV/AIDS. Think about that, 190,000 people. And since 2004, thanks to this initiative, the number of people receiving care and support has grown from 30,000 to 125,000, and an anticipated 150,000 people will be reached this year because of this initiative. Haiti received almost \$85 million from this program in the past year to address this crisis which affects many in the Caribbean.

The point is is that PEPFAR, as we know it, has allowed us to reach almost every person in Haiti struggling with HIV/AIDS. And, for example, the continued support is necessary to make sure we reach every person struggling with HIV/AIDS in the world, and that's why this extension is so important.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. May I ask for an additional 2 minutes?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. I would also like to share a couple other examples of the success of this initiative and how this funding is helping regular people and making a difference in Latin America.

Bolivia, a large nation the size of Texas with 9 million people, thanks to the PEPFAR initiative we're using data to combat HIV/AIDS. In fact, real-time data is helping Bolivian health officials carry out more HIV/AIDS prevention education, including HIV counseling and testing services. And according to the Joint United Nations Program on HIV/AIDS, prevalence rates in Bolivia's general population has remained at 1-10th of 1 percent, which is remarkable success compared to some of its neighbors.

In Central America, in the Republic of Honduras, beginning in February of 2005 the United States awarded its first set of grants through USAID to 10 local nongovernmental organizations working with 43 Honduran communities most impacted by HIV/AIDS.

□ 1315

In their first 7 months of implementation, the organization has reached over 27,000 at-risk individuals with behavioral change models. As part of the HIV prevention efforts, the group began offering HIV counseling and testing, and the counseling and testing programs were the first in Honduras to be offered by those trained in accordance working with the Ministry of Health standards as part of a larger national prevention effort. And this collaboration between the government of the Honduras, USAID, indigenous organizations and the Ministry of Health has set this standard expanding access to testing in the Nation of Honduras.

The bottom line is, this program is making a difference in combating what is clearly a terrible crisis throughout the world, currently impacting 33 million citizens of this planet.

We have a moral obligation, and it's important that the United States continue to exert the leadership and demonstrate the leadership we have over the last few years to address the global AIDS crisis.

I urge bipartisan support.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield to my friend from California, someone who has been heavily invested in getting our attention on this issue and passing the legislation, putting, fashioning and passing the legislation in 2003 and again this time, our gentledady from California, BARBARA LEE, for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5501.

And let me begin by thanking Chairman BERMAN, our ranking member, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, our subcommittee chair, Mr. PAYNE, also Chairman WAXMAN, Mr. SMITH, ranking member of the subcommittee, and all who have helped to make this legislation an amazing piece of legislation. And I know that Chairman Lantos and Chairman Hyde

want to thank us and are here with us honoring their legacy because they would want to see this move forward as it is today.

As one the five original co-authors of both the initial legislation establishing PEPFAR and of this new bill reauthorizing PEPFAR, I am pleased that we are moving forward. And again, I have to thank Chairman BERMAN and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for making sure that this legislation is really in the spirit of the bipartisan cooperation that we have moved forward with in the past.

There's no other piece of legislation that we will consider in Congress this year that will have the greatest impact on the lives of people around the world. Like many, I have witnessed firsthand many times the dramatic and positive impact of our AIDS programs on individuals and communities throughout the world, especially in sub-Saharan Africa. But it wasn't always this way.

Now, 10 years ago, actually, when I first came to Congress, I think it was 10 years in April, the world really had not recognized the devastating toll that HIV and AIDS were beginning to take on families and communities throughout Africa. Since that time, however, we have worked together on a bipartisan basis on a number of very important legislative initiatives that have put the United States on the right side of history when it comes to this global pandemic.

First, in 2000, we passed and President Clinton signed into law, H.R. 3519, the Global AIDS and Tuberculosis Relief Act. Now this important bill was a vision inspired by an idea by our former colleague and our friend, former Congressman, now Mayor Ron Dellums of Oakland, California to establish an AIDS Marshall plan in Africa, for Africa, funded through a World Bank AIDS Trust Fund.

With the help and leadership of our former colleague, Congressman Jim Leach of Iowa, we turned this idea into legislation which provided the founding contribution and the framework for what we know today as the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

In 2001, working with both former Chairmen Hyde and Lantos, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SMITH, we drafted H.R. 2069, which was called the Global Access to HIV/AIDS Prevention, Awareness, Education and Treatment Act. This was the first bill that dared to provide large scale antiretroviral therapy to people living in the developing world.

Although we made progress in advancing this legislation through Congress in 2001 and 2002, we weren't able to reach a conference agreement with the Senate before the 107th Congress. Thankfully, however, our discussions would lay the foundation for quick action in the next Congress.

So at the end of 2002, the Congressional Black Caucus, along with practically every advocacy group in the United States, sent a letter to Presi-

dent Bush urging him to set up and create a presidential initiative on AIDS especially for sub-Saharan Africa.

In January of 2003, the President took up our cause, understanding the growing sense of urgency that had been building for years. His promise of \$15 billion during his State of the Union address provided the impetus that we needed to pass H.R. 1298, the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Act of 2003, which created PEPFAR.

In 2005, we took yet another step forward when we recognized that our foreign assistance programs did not adequately address the needs of children orphaned or made vulnerable by AIDS. So, working again with former Chairman Hyde and Chairman Lantos, we passed, and the President signed H.R. 1409, the Assistance for Orphans and Vulnerable Children in Developing Countries Act.

So, Madam Chairman, I lay out some of the history of our work on this important issue because it speaks volumes about what is possible when we come together in the spirit of bipartisan compromise as we honor the great legacy of both Chairman Lantos and Chairman Hyde through this legislation. Chairman Lantos, I know, very much wanted to reach a bipartisan compromise on this bill, as did Chairman Hyde. I'm saddened that both of them are not with us to witness this moment. But I know that they are very pleased with what we have put together today.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Ms. LEE. May I have an additional minute, please?

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentlelady an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. LEE. As a former member of the staff here on Capitol Hill for 11 years, I have to mention some of our staff members' names particularly because they did a phenomenal job in this. Dr. Pearl Alice Marsh, of course, Kristin Wells, David Abramowitz, Peter Yeo, Bob King, Yleem Poblete, Mark Gage, Joan Condon, Heather Flynn, Sheri Rickert, Naomi Seiler, Jessica Boyer, and of course Christos Tsentas of my staff. These staff members and other members, they deserved, their work deserves really to be applauded because this was not just work as a professional on the Hill. This is part of their life's work and I have to thank them again for their diligence and their competence.

This is a bipartisan compromise, so there were things that we had to give up and things that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle had to give up, but that's what compromise is all about.

Let me just mention a few of the items that were included in this bill. Of course it included language taken from my bill, H.R. 1713, the PATHWAY Act, to strike the 33 percent abstinence-until-marriage and provide a com-

prehensive prevention strategy to address the needs of women and children.

It also includes language taken from my bill, H.R. 3812, the African Health Capacity and Investment Act, to build health capacity by recruiting, training and retaining health professionals and strengthen health systems.

Now, of course there's still some issues I think need to be addressed which aren't in this bill. I think we should eliminate the prostitution pledge, which violates the first amendment and poses an unnecessary barrier to organizations that work with sex workers.

I think we need to recognize the public health benefits of linking our HIV and AIDS programs with family planning services by eliminating ideological restrictions imposed by the global gag rule.

I think we need to end the unjust and discriminatory travel and immigration ban on people living with HIV and AIDS who wish to enter into the United States.

So these are not impossible goals. In addition, we should fully fund the recruitment, training and retention programs for health professionals with a focus on training doctors and nurses to build health capacity and strengthen health care systems. So I hope that we can do this as we move forward.

Let me again thank the chairman for his leadership in addressing the greatest humanitarian, national security and public health crisis of our time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman PENCE, the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Middle East and South Asia, who spoke so eloquently during the committee markup on the need for this bill. 5 minutes.

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

I rise in support of the Tom Lantos and Henry Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008.

The Bible tells us to whom much is given much is expected. And I believe the United States has a moral obligation to lead the world in confronting the pandemic of HIV/AIDS.

The dimensions of this crisis are truly staggering. The HIV/AIDS pandemic has infected more than 60 million people worldwide. It has killed more than 25 million, a number which grows grievously every day by more than 8,500. HIV/AIDS has orphaned some 14 million children. And today, 70 percent of the people in the world with HIV/AIDS reside in Africa. Within that continent, there are entire countries where more than one-third of the adult population is infected.

More startlingly, if current infection rates continue, new epicenters for the disease are likely to arise out of India,

China, Eastern Europe with numbers that could surpass Africa in a few short years.

And the threat this pandemic poses to our security is also real. Left unaddressed, this plague will continue to undermine the stability of nations throughout the two-thirds world, leaving behind collapsing economies and tragedy and desperation, a breeding ground for extremist violence. This is truly a global crisis. And because the United States can render timely assistance, I believe we must.

Originally titled the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, PEPFAR put the world on notice that America will not ignore despair, desperation and disease. I am proud to have supported the original passage of PEPFAR in 2003, and I'm proud to support it today.

You know, every so often, in this place, we have the opportunity to do something for humanity and serve the American people, and this is such a time.

I thank Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN for their strong leadership. I commend my colleague, CHRIS SMITH in particular for his yeoman's work on carefully preserving the delicate balance of this legislation.

And I also would like to publicly acknowledge the work of our President, George W. Bush. Mr. President, because of your moral leadership and compassion, Africa will never be the same, and history will record your work.

This Global AIDS bill seeks to address the crisis, not by providing medicine and health care to those in need, but also by providing resources for evidence based programs that have been successful in preventing infection. It's imperative, I believe, that we not only send our resources, but we also send them in a manner that is consistent with our values. We cannot send billions of dollars to Africa without sending value-based safeguards and techniques that work to fight the spread of HIV/AIDS by changing behavior.

Currently, within the Global AIDS bill, these pivotal provisions exist in the form of a requirement to "provide balanced funding for prevention activities" and to ensure that abstinence and faithfulness programs are "implemented and funded in a meaningful and equitable way."

It was essential that we preserve these prevention methods that focus on behavioral change, that we work with faith-based and nongovernmental organizations at the local level, particularly through the ABC model that has produced such undeniable results.

Also, it was absolutely critical that we administer this foreign aid under the historic pro-life guidelines that prevent our foreign aid from going in a direction that's antithetical to the values of millions of Americans. I'm pleased to say the Lantos/Hyde Global AIDS bill preserves all of these vital pro-family provisions.

As we tend to the suffering though, we always have to figure out how we're going to pay for it. The Federal budget, I believe, is packed with wasteful and bloated programs which could supply more than enough opportunities to cover the costs of the Lantos/Hyde Global AIDS bill.

□ 1330

This summer, Madam Chairman, when it comes time to fund this program during the appropriations process, I believe Congress should make the hard choices necessary to ensure that this global health crisis does not become a crisis of debt for our children and grandchildren. I believe it is possible to be responsible to our fiscal constraints while being obedient to our moral calling.

The greatest of all human rights is the right to live. America is a Nation of great wealth, wealth of resources, but more importantly, a wealth of compassion. The history of the world is filled with telling moments regarding the character of a people. Sometimes we are witness to mankind's great inhumanities; other times, we marvel at the beauty of mankind's selfless acts of compassion when we rise above politics and raise up those in dire need. Let this be such a day.

I urge my colleagues to support the Lantos/Hyde Global AIDS bill and its carefully crafted bipartisan compromise.

Mr. BERMAN, Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 liberal minute to the majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER, Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Congratulations to the chairman of the committee. He is an extraordinary individual whom I have known for four decades. He will do an excellent job. We lament the loss, however, of the two individuals for whom this bill is named.

I want to congratulate my good friend, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, as well for her leadership, and I want to associate myself generally with the remarks of the previous speaker. And I think it is emblematic of the partnership that we have, not only with the administration, but on both sides of the aisle as it relates to this moral, as well as health, issue, and I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Madam Chairman, 5 years ago, the United States made an unprecedented commitment to the people of the world who suffer from HIV and AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, and other diseases. We pledged \$15 billion, and with that funding, we have provided life-saving drugs to almost a million and a half people. We facilitated care for over 2 million orphans and vulnerable children and provided mother-to-child transmission prevention services during more than 6 million pregnancies.

We have played a very real role in helping to transform HIV from a death sentence to a manageable disease.

And, Madam Chairman, as I said 5 years ago when we first passed this leg-

islation, we must recognize that our Nation and each one of us has a moral obligation and a national security interest, as has been spoken of, in combating the HIV/AIDS pandemic, as well as malaria and tuberculosis.

Today, with this legislation, the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Reauthorization Act, we build on and increase our commitment to stop the spread of HIV/AIDS.

Through this legislation, we make a \$50 billion contribution to the fight to eradicate HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis. In addition to expanding our prior efforts, this carefully negotiated legislation will strengthen HIV-related healthcare delivery systems and increase health workforce capacities; foster stronger relationships between HIV/AIDS initiatives and other support programs, including those that promote better nutrition and education; allow HIV/AIDS testing and counseling to be provided in the United States bilateral family planning programs, and it finances prevention and treatment programs targeting women and girls.

This bill, Madam Chairman, also eliminates an ineffective requirement: that one-third of PEPFAR prevention funds be spent on abstinence. Instead, we have directed the administration to create a balanced approach requiring behavioral change programs to receive 50 percent of the funds devoted to the prevention of sexual transmission of HIV, and in addition, we require the administration to report to Congress if programs in nations where the epidemic has become generalized do not adhere to this balanced approach. This legislation represents both commitment and compromise.

It will not make everyone happy, but it does signal to the international community that the United States recognizes and accepts our moral obligation to act.

Last year alone, 2.5 million people contracted HIV, roughly 6,800 people per day. Last year alone, 2.1 million people died of HIV. Global AIDS is a problem too large to fall prey to political sport.

My very good friend, the late Chairman Lantos, noted 5 years ago that this health care crisis ruins families, communities, and indeed, whole nations, fueling violence and bloodshed across borders. And thus, it is a global challenge that demands a global humanitarian response with the United States in the lead.

Madam Chairman, this is a very good bill. It builds on proven outcomes, and it deserves the support of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

And again, I congratulate Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN on their leadership on this effort.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Madam Chairman, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for the

purpose of engaging in a colloquy with our chairman, Mr. BERMAN of California.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. BERMAN.

I would note there are two versions of the committee report for H.R. 5501 designated as part 1 and part 2. I wish to clarify that the definitive version that applies for purposes of the legislative history of this bill is part 2.

Is that the understanding of the chairman?

Mr. BERMAN. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and the gentleman is absolutely correct. Part 2 of the report is the definitive report on the legislation being considered by the House today.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Chair for that clarification.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), the chairman of the Education and Labor Subcommittee on Workforce Protections and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of 5501 and to congratulate our new chairman of the International Relations Committee and to thank our chairman and to thank our Ranking Member ROSLEHTINEN, and particularly congratulate the chairman of the Africa and Global Health Care Subcommittee for writing a bill that clearly reaffirms Congress' commitment to healthy communities, this time with the focus overseas.

As a member of the subcommittee, I'm especially pleased that this bill supports maternal health, orphans, and vulnerable children. Today, in Africa and throughout the world, children are losing their parents to the AIDS epidemic. These same kids will grow up too soon. They will be forced to become caregivers to their own siblings, leaving school, joining the underage workforce, praying that they are not the next in line for the graveyard.

In a world as prosperous as our own, Madam Chairman, it is absolutely unacceptable that this could be happening anywhere. But this bill actually continues our promise to rid the planet of this plague. This bill offers real hope. We invest in treatment, but most importantly, it works towards prevention.

Like many of my colleagues, I'm disappointed that conservative forces pushed to reduce the Reproductive Health Initiative, but the overall result will actually be remarkable. And most importantly, it will be life saving.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for H.R. 5501 to make this a better place to live in worldwide.

Mr. PAYNE. I recognize the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN) for 2 minutes.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Chairman, I am proud to rise in support of H.R. 5501, properly named after our former Chairmen Lantos and Hyde, both of whom I had the honor to serve under on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I also want to thank President Bush for reaffirming his commitment to Africa in his State of the Union but also to being open to improvements in how we deliver our support in Africa.

I want to also add my thanks to Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROSLEHTINEN for their leadership in bringing this to the floor, but especially to Chairman BERMAN for his great instincts to reach out and craft an achievable and better bill in this Congress in this way.

Today, we have an opportunity to improve the way the U.S. funds and administers these HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria programs around the world. I believe that it is important to make real changes and real progress in reauthorizing this vital life-saving program.

In February, I had the opportunity to travel to Ethiopia and study and investigate the effectiveness of many of these programs. The positive effect that PEPFAR has had over the last several years is quite obvious: countless lives have been saved and numerous infections have been prevented.

I visited health clinics in rural Ethiopia, including PMTCT, family planning, and government-supported clinics. This bill makes important steps to not just increase funding but to have a more balanced approach to integrate prevention programs.

While I would have liked to have seen even greater integration in these programs with family planning and prevention programs, I'm pleased with the steps the bill does take and steps that are being taken in a bipartisan way that can help this be done sooner.

Mr. PAYNE. We will now have the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for 2 minutes, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the bipartisan agreement that will reauthorize PEPFAR for an additional 5 years. I want to thank both the Chair of the committee, HOWARD BERMAN, the new and very capable chair of the committee, HOWARD BERMAN, as well as my long-time friend, the ranking member, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, for their crafting of the legislation and in naming it the Tom Lantos/Henry Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, the Reauthorization Act of 2008. And in so doing, I think it enhances the legacy of both of these fine gentlemen.

Let me say from the start, I support the strong program and will urge my colleagues to do the same. The first 5 years of PEPFAR have provided unprecedented prevention, care, and treatment of HIV/AIDS for millions

around the world. By passing this bill we can, and we will, do more.

Through PEPFAR, the United States has spearheaded the global fight against HIV/AIDS by supporting services to prevent mother-to-child HIV transmission. These services have helped women during more than 10 million pregnancies and led to the prevention of more than 150,000 infant infections. It has supported life-saving treatment for almost 1.5 million men, women, and children. In the focus countries, over 60 percent of those receiving treatment are women and girls.

It is my honor to say that I have supported this program when it was first introduced before this body, and I worked to ensure that PEPFAR was as effective and as efficient as possible. An example of this bipartisan effort was the inclusion of language, which I championed, to emphasize education on gender equality and respect for women and girls. The reauthorization act strengthens these provisions by calling for the empowerment of women and youth and by promoting changes in male behavior and attitudes that respect the human rights of women and youth and that support and foster gender equity.

□ 1345

However, let me be equally clear, this bill could do so much more and could prevent many more infections if it improved a critical partnership with these programs in the fields that have served women and their families for over four decades, and that is in the field of family planning providers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Chairman, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Chairman, the House version of the U.S. Global AIDS Act contains language suggesting that only family planning programs compliant with the global gag rule will be eligible to receive PEPFAR funds to provide HIV education, counseling, and testing. I believe that this would be a new restriction. No such requirement exists in current law or policy. And I believe if we are serious about preventing the most new infections, we need to put aside our political differences on the merits of the global gag rule and ensure that the very best in the field have the support of the U.S. to do what they need to do, and that is to prevent the spreading of HIV/AIDS.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the Ways and Means Committee, from the State of Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Chairman, we know what needs to be done. The PEPFAR reauthorization bill is it, and we're doing it.

This bipartisan bill not only reauthorizes PEPFAR but also dramatically strengthens the programs. H.R.

5501 elevates the fight against HIV/AIDS, TB, and malaria from an emergency to sustainability. In so doing, we declare that HIV is no longer the death sentence that it was only 5 short years ago. We can hope and strive for a generation free of HIV and AIDS.

I want to thank the chairman and the subcommittee chairman for including provisions in the legislation that Representative GRANGER and I introduced, which strengthens the prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV. We must ensure that women and children have access to early screening and lifesaving drug therapies. We can do this by providing greater training and education on effective prevention. We also must ensure that they integrate these services with other maternal health efforts.

Every day more than 1,000 children around the world are infected with HIV. An estimated 90 percent of those infections occur in Africa. But a single dose of an antiretroviral drug given once to the mother at the onset of labor and once to the newborn during the first 3 days of life reduces transmission by 50 percent. Fewer than 10 percent of pregnant women with HIV in resource-poor countries have access to these prevention services. But I'm proud that this bill includes prevention provisions to strengthen our commitment to prevention and save lives in the process.

Perhaps the most important provisions are those that recognize the importance of expanding access to screening and treatment of women and children. H.R. 5501 also provides my provisions to establish two 5-year targets that will bring us closer to a generation free of HIV/AIDS.

The first goal is to increase the percentage of children receiving treatment under PEPFAR from 9 to 15 percent. Treatment allows the greatest hope for giving a child infected with HIV the chance to an adulthood free of the disease.

The second goal is for 80 percent of pregnant women in the most affected countries to receive HIV counseling and testing and, where necessary, antiretroviral treatment to prevent mother-to-child transmission.

The biggest limitation on reaching these goals is the availability of trained personnel. This bill sets a goal of 140,000 people to be trained by 2015. In South Africa, where my wife is working on the ground in this epidemic, they are closing pediatric hospitals because there's no pediatrician to run them. Now, the 80 percent goal is a down payment on our hope of achieving 100 percent by the time this authorization expires.

We have a chance today to send a message that America cares enough to lead the world in fighting these deadly diseases. We should speak loud and clearly. The legislation gives more people the chance to be survivors instead of statistics.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill that strengthens our commitment to

fighting the global HIV/AIDS/TB and malaria epidemic.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield to a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN) for 2 minutes.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act.

This legislation represents the best in bipartisan compromise, and it demonstrates that, despite what divides us from time to time as Republicans and Democrats, we can and do come together to tackle issues that matter most. And the global HIV/AIDS crisis matters deeply to all of us. Some 40 million people around the world are living with this disease. We have a moral imperative to act and to act decisively.

Just 5 years ago, an HIV diagnosis for a poor villager in Africa was a death sentence. Thanks to lifesaving drugs provided by the American people, this is no longer the case. The global AIDS program works, and it works because it is an initiative not of one political party or another. It is truly a compassionate statement by the American people, and I am very proud to support its reauthorization and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Chairman, I yield to the vice chairperson of the Subcommittee on Africa, a member, of course, of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) for 2 minutes.

Ms. WATSON. Madam Chairman, I just returned from South Africa, and I did a single codel visiting the various clinics and hospices that are receiving PEPFAR funds. And I happily report that the small donations they do receive are stretched beyond imagination. They are finally realizing that the NGOs have really made great strides.

About 4 years ago, when we went offering them assistance and so on, most of our help was rejected. But I want you to know that one clinic, which is a hospice, gets \$70,000 a year. And what they do is reach out to the NGOs in the area. There are volunteers from America there. They run an excellent facility, and you can see gradual progress.

I was told by our appointed ambassador that he was going to reduce the amount of donation by \$50 million, and I cautioned him because that would be the wrong message to send for the small successes they have had and that what we can do is say to the government there that we will cap it at a certain amount and then you need to also kick in.

So I want to report to our committee and to Mr. PAYNE, the Chair, that the funds are working. They're improving our image, and they're helping to save lives in South Africa.

Thank you so much, Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Chairman, I thank Representative WATSON for her kind remarks.

Madam Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and Africa Subcommittee (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, there's a terminology that we use to describe joyous occasions. Sometimes it describes freedom. The Fisk Singers in Tennessee were called the Jubilee Singers, and it was because they organized around slavery and after slavery and the ability to be free with jubilation, and, therefore, they were called the Jubilee Singers.

I think today is a day of jubilation, and it certainly is a time to express the jubilation that we feel with the passage, or the intended passage, of this legislation.

Let me thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. PAYNE, for persistence and determination and wisdom. Let me also acknowledge his ranking member, Mr. SMITH; and, of course, our chairman, Mr. BERMAN; and the ranking member of the full committee, Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for working with us.

But I do want to spend some time acknowledging that we have named this bill after the late former Chairman Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde. That is a jubilation. It is something to express great excitement about because these two distinct figures, in many instances with common views but many instances different views, came together around this lifesaving legislation, Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. And it is particularly important because we have added malaria and tuberculosis as an element that is not a partner but results thereof and/or stands alone, but all of them kill.

I am reminded of the first mission to Zimbabwe, to Zambia, and to South Africa, where we went on a Presidential mission, three Members of Congress, to look closely at the devastation of HIV/AIDS. It was in 1996/1997. And it was there that I saw a 4 year old taking care of a dying grandparent, the last person surviving who had tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS. So this legislation is crucial, and it is particularly crucial because it recognizes the devastation of all of them.

It is likewise crucial because we have not won the war. The jubilation is that the bill is on the floor, but we have not won this war. And I might also say that we have not won the war in education, the ability to prevent all of these diseases.

So let me ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5501, the Global HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008. I believe that the legislation we are considering today makes vital improvements to

what is already a groundbreaking program. I would like to thank Chairman BERMAN for his ongoing leadership on this issue, and for bringing this legislation to the floor today. I would also like to thank the Committee's Ranking Member, Congresswoman ROSLEHTINEN, and my colleagues across the aisle, for working toward a compromise, to develop legislation of which we can all be proud. Today's legislation is a crucial step toward transforming PEPFAR from an emergency response to a sustainable program.

I would also like to thank both Chairman BERMAN and the Chairman of the Subcommittee on African and Global Health, Congressman PAYNE, for working with me to include important language in this legislation. My language, in Section 301 of this bill, addresses the necessity of making children a priority among individuals with HIV for proper food and nutritional support. Section 301, with my language included, states that it is the sense of Congress that "for the purposes of determining which individuals infected with HIV should be provided with nutrition and food support—

(i) children with moderate or severe malnutrition, according to WHO standards, shall be given priority for such nutrition and food support; and

(ii) adults with a body mass index, BMI of 18.5 or less, or at the prevailing WHO-approved measurement for BMI, should be considered 'malnourished' and should be given priority for such nutrition and food support;"

Madam Chairman, as Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I believe that this language is crucial, and I thank the Chairman for including it in the text of the bill. HIV-infected children have been underrepresented among beneficiaries of PEPFAR-supported programs. As this legislation cites in the findings section, "of those infected with HIV, 2.5 million are children under 15 who also account for 460,000 of the newly-infected individuals." And even these large numbers are deceiving, as children die much quicker from AIDS than do adults. UNICEF reports that every minute, a child dies from an AIDS-related illness, and only 1 child in 20 who needs HIV treatment receives it. I am pleased to see this language, which focuses attention on the plight of these children, and makes serving their needs a priority.

I am particularly pleased to support an amendment offered by my colleague Congressman CARSON. Representative CARSON's amendment would direct the Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to expand their plan for strengthening health systems of host countries by allowing for postsecondary educational institutions, particularly in Africa, to collaborate with United States postsecondary educational institutions and specifically historically black colleges and universities. I believe that such educational exchanges would be extremely beneficial for students both in our own Nation and in developing nations. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

In addition, I am also pleased to support the amendment offered by my colleague Congressman BLUMENAUER. This amendment adds safe drinking water to nutrition and income security on the list of programs for which direct linkages are encouraged. People

with HIV/AIDS are at increased risk for diarrheal diseases, and these illnesses leave HIV-infected patients with a reduced ability to absorb antiretroviral and other medications. The availability of safe drinking water must be part of any sustainable strategy of HIV prevention and treatment.

As this House is aware, it is estimated that HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, TB, and malaria together kill more than 6 million people each year. In January 2003, President Bush announced the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, or PEPFAR. As its name implies, PEPFAR was envisioned as an emergency response; the bill before us today represents a crucial first step in the process of transitioning to a sustainable program to address these global epidemics.

Seventeen years after the first cases were diagnosed, AIDS remains the most relentless and indiscriminate killer of our time, with 39.5 million people worldwide now living with HIV or AIDS. Despite pouring billions and billions of private and Federal dollars into drug research and development to treat and "manage" infections, HIV strains persist as a global health threat by virtue of their complex life cycle and mutation rates. Of those infected, 24.7 million, or about 63 percent, live in Sub-Saharan Africa, a region with just 11 percent of the world's population. 61 percent of those infected in this region are women. Though Africa, and even more specifically African women, bears the brunt of the AIDS pandemic, Americans should be reminded that HIV/AIDS does not discriminate, with well over a million people in our own country currently living with HIV or AIDS.

Tragically, 6 percent of the 39.5 million people currently infected with HIV/AIDS are children under 15 years of age. In 2006, the virus killed 380,000 children (13 percent of all HIV/AIDS deaths), and 90 percent of all children living with HIV reside in sub-Saharan Africa. According to UNAIDS statistics from 2005, 1,500 children worldwide became newly infected with HIV every single day, due largely to inadequate access to drugs that prevent the transmission of HIV from mother to child. Only 8 percent of pregnant women in low- and middle-income countries were offered services to prevent HIV transmission to their newborns.

Madam Chairman, HIV/AIDS continues to represent a serious and large-scale challenge throughout much of the world. It goes far beyond a simple health problem, and it hinders attempts to foster economic development and political stability. As we reauthorize PEPFAR, I believe it is crucial that we emphasize the long-term sustainability of our HIV efforts, and that we integrate AIDS prevention and treatment within our larger-scale development initiatives. I believe that the legislation before us today makes groundbreaking strides toward moving the Global HIV/AIDS program beyond emergency implementation and toward sustainability. It dramatically boosts HIV/AIDS programming related to women and girls, strengthens health systems in countries hardest-hit by the HIV virus, increases U.S. contributions to the Global Fund, and authorizes HIV/AIDS programs to include linkages to food, nutrition, education, and health care programs.

Though we have drugs that are effective in managing infections and reducing mortality by slowing the progression to AIDS in an individual, they do little to reduce disease preva-

lence and prevent new infections. For this reason, there is growing consensus among health experts that we must put greater emphasis on comprehensive prevention programs, which are perhaps the most critical aspect of any initiative to combat global HIV/AIDS. Even as increasing numbers of people have access to anti-retroviral drugs, ARVs, an estimated 5.1 million people who needed treatment did not receive it in 2006. In sub-Saharan Africa, the percentage of individuals needing treatment who actually received it rose substantially, from 2 percent in 2003 to 28 percent in 2006. This growth is impressive, and represents a significant step forward, but it also means that 72 percent of sub-Saharan Africans requiring treatment did not receive it.

Madam Chairman, despite our concerted efforts, we continue to face a serious and persistent health threat. I believe that it is imperative that we ensure that American taxpayer dollars are used to greatest effect, not to bolster ideology. This legislation makes important strides forward by removing elements of the original authorization that speak more to ideology than actual conditions in the field. Under the current law, one-third of all prevention funds under PEPFAR must be used on abstinence-only education, which neglects the real needs of populations both in America and abroad. These stipulations hurt the ability of PEPFAR to adapt its activities in accordance with local HIV transmission patterns, and they impair efforts to coordinate with national health plans. Though AIDS is clearly a global problem, it does not affect every nation equally or in the same manner.

Madam Chairman, I am extremely pleased that the legislation we are considering today removes these restrictive provisions, allowing PEPFAR to better address the requirements of each country, making more efficient and effective use of taxpayer dollars in serving the millions affected by this disease. According to studies by both the Government Accountability Office and the National Academy of Science's Institute of Medicine, the abstinence-only earmark has forced a reduction in mother-to-child transmission programs, reduced prevention efforts with high-risk groups, and undermined efforts to implement Abstinence, Faithfulness, and Condoms, ABC, prevention programs.

Under the provisions of today's compromise legislation, the administration will be directed to promote a "balanced" prevention program in target countries. This will include all elements of the ABC approach to HIV prevention. The legislation will require that the administration report to Congress if behavioral change programs do not receive 50 percent of funds devoted to the prevention of sexual transmission of HIV in countries in which there is a generalized epidemic. I believe this language is extremely important, as it not only recognizes that HIV is transmitted in other ways, besides sexual activity, but it also acknowledges that the epidemic is not the same in every country. By requiring a report, rather than earmarking the expenditure of funds, this legislation provides guidance while still affording organizations working in the field the flexibility to respond to nuanced circumstances.

I am proud to be part of this Democratic Congress, which will produce legislation reauthorizing a Global HIV/AIDS program driven by facts, rather than ideology. The removal of the abstinence-only earmark will make this reauthorization legislation stronger than the original

2003 legislation that it will replace, and I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose any efforts that might attempt to reinstate it.

In addition, I believe it is crucial that we dedicate greater attention to strengthening local health infrastructure. Health experts have expressed concern that the high amount of spending directed toward HIV/AIDS initiatives has drawn health workers away from public health facilities and other important programs. This merely compounds a chronic shortage of qualified health workers, which, according to WHO's 2006 World Health Report, is the single most important health issue facing countries today. This need is felt particularly sharply in Southeast Asia and sub-Saharan Africa.

Many health experts also continue to advocate greater integration between PEPFAR and other health programs, including those focused on nutrition, maternal and child health, and other infectious diseases. These experts note that HIV is intricately linked to these other areas of concern; for example, malnutrition and lack of food may heighten exposure to HIV, raise the likelihood of engaging in risky behavior, increase susceptibility to infection, and complicate efforts to provide antiretroviral, ARV, medication. Further, an HIV epidemic will likely worsen food insecurity, by depleting the agricultural workforce. I believe it is necessary, to ensure maximum effectiveness, that we integrate PEPFAR with other aspects of our international health outreach and development programs. The legislation before us today does that.

Madam Chairman, while I recognize the importance of compromise, and I am glad we were able to reach an accord with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I am disappointed that the compromise text does not include a repeal of the language, known as the pledge requirement, requiring that all funding recipients to "have a policy explicitly opposing prostitution and sex trafficking."

Madam Chairman, the removal of the prostitution pledge was a critical facet of the bill we are considering today. The pledge currently restricts recipients' privately funded HIV prevention programs. No funds may be used to provide assistance to any group or organization that does not have a policy explicitly opposing prostitution and sex trafficking. Funding recipients must refrain from speech or conduct that is inconsistent with the Government's views on prostitution, even when they use private funds. Organizations must refrain from some effective HIV prevention strategies, for fear that the Government will view it as "prostitution." A repeal of the prostitution pledge language would leave in place language ensuring that U.S. Government funds may not be used to "promote or advocate the legalization or practice of prostitution and sex trafficking."

Madam Chairman, the prostitution pledge undermines prevention efforts targeting one of the populations most vulnerable to HIV transmission. Because high-risk populations such as sex workers are extremely marginalized, it is crucial that any intervention promotes a level of trust between sex workers and service providers. Failure to provide sex workers with information and services that will help them protect themselves and their partners from HIV transmission and other sexually-transmitted diseases also puts the broader community at risk. I am disappointed that this legislation does not remove this vague and counterproductive requirement.

This legislation also contains crucial provisions with regards to malaria and tuberculosis prevention and treatment. It incorporates H.R. 1567, the Stop Tuberculosis, TB, Now Act of 2007 sponsored by Congressman ENGEL, important legislation which I am proud to co-sponsor. Today's legislation emphasizes the linkages between HIV/AIDS and TB, and it also creates new strategies for attacking MDR and XDR forms of drug-resistant TB. The bill also requires the President to develop a comprehensive 5-year strategy to combat malaria globally and strengthen United States leadership against this disease, and creates a new Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat Malaria Globally.

If we are to turn the tide of turmoil and tragedy that HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis cause to millions around the world, and hundreds of thousands right here in our backyard, it is imperative that we continue to fund and expand medical research and education and outreach programs. However, the only cure we currently have for HIV/AIDS is prevention. While we must continue efforts to develop advanced treatment options, it is crucial that those efforts are accompanied by dramatic increases in public health education and prevention measures. Investments in education, research and outreach programs continue to be a crucial part of tackling and eliminating this devastating disease.

As Americans, we have a strong history, through science and innovation, of detecting, conquering and defeating many illnesses. We must and we will continue to fight HIV/AIDS until the battle is won.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my colleague, my friend from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to sending \$50 billion, \$50 billion taken from the American people, to Africa to fight AIDS.

When it comes to this situation with AIDS in Africa, obviously, we have some people in crisis who are very deserving people. But where does that \$50 billion come from? Are we going to be helping people overseas at the expense of the well-being of our own people?

There are only three ways of getting the money: We can take it from domestic programs, take it from those programs to help our own elderly and the health care for our own people, our own veterans; or we can raise taxes, which would knock the legs out from under our economy and make our deficit even higher; or we can borrow the money. And if we borrow the money, we end up spending hundreds of millions of dollars a year on interest. We're going to borrow \$50 billion in order to help people overseas and then end up paying interest on it for the next umpteen years? This is benevolence gone wild.

Yes, we would like to help everybody in the world. But if we vote for this, it's the most irresponsible measure that I have ever seen in my term here in Congress for 20 years. We are taking directly from our veterans, from our el-

derly, and others to give \$50 billion to Africa.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much.

Thus what we have to decided to is, are we going to deprive our own people, our seniors? I just came from a meeting with doctors from my district. We can't afford to provide health care for our seniors, for our veterans. We can't afford all the educational things we want to do. How can we possibly, then, take \$50 billion and send it to Africa, even though it's a worthy cause?

We should not be doing this. It is not in the interests of the American people. And I would call on my colleagues to oppose this totally wasteful expenditure of money.

□ 1400

Mr. PAYNE. It is my pleasure to recognize the Speaker of the House for 1 minute, the gentlewoman from California, Speaker PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and recognize his extraordinary leadership on issues that relate to the alleviation of poverty and eradication of disease, which really are a national security interest for our country. They are about the health and well-being, the respect we command throughout the world.

I want to commend Chairman BERMAN. I think this is probably the first piece of legislation to come out of the committee under your leadership as chairman, and Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, the ranking member of the committee, for their leadership in bringing a bipartisan, strong initiative to the floor. This initiative is a continuation of the work that President Bush has as a priority in the eradication of AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis.

For those of us who have been involved in these issues over the years, whether on the committees of authorization, and Congresswoman BARBARA LEE has been on the authorizing committee, and now on the appropriating committee; Congresswoman WATERS, in many ways in the House; and you, Madam Chairman, all of us know that for our country to be healthy, for the eradication of these diseases to take place, we must have a global approach to it. Disease knows no borders and boundaries. So, again, while it is the compassionate thing to do, it is in our self-interest to do as well.

The distinguished chair, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, and I, and others, just had the opportunity to visit a PEPFAR site in India at the Salvation Army, where they were distributing these drugs through a regimen, an organized regimen related to hygiene and the rest to people with HIV and AIDS. We can tell you from firsthand experience; I visited these

sites in south Africa, this trip was to India, that wherever we go, there is great appreciation for what our country is doing, and President Bush's leadership on this subject.

I am so pleased that the bill is named for Congressman Chairman Lantos, our friend who left us earlier this year, and Congressman Hyde before that, because they were the original authors of the first historic President's emergency plan for AIDS relief legislation in 2003. That landmark bill authorized \$15 billion for 5 years. Working together with the Bush administration and Appropriations Committee, we succeeded in providing lifesaving antiretroviral treatment to almost 1.5 million people, supporting care for nearly 6.7 million people, including more than 2.7 million orphans and vulnerable children; and supporting prevention of more than 150,000 infected infants. We are talking about AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis. Now we must take the next step in fighting AIDS in the poorest countries of the world. The legislation before us will move us from the emergency phase to the sustainability phase in fighting AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria.

My colleagues have presented the provisions of the bill to you, so I will just submit mine for the RECORD, Madam Chairman, and just say in closing that the leadership against HIV/AIDS is our compact with developing nations across the globe. It says that America stands with them in this fight, that our commitment will not waver, and shows them America's true face of passion.

Since the AIDS epidemic began, 20 million men, women, and children have died from the disease. Twenty million. Forty million around the globe are HIV positive. That is what we know. We don't even know of those who have not come forth to be tested. Each and every day, another 6,000 people become infected with HIV. In addition, the number of orphans, vulnerable children with sick parents and adolescents at risk with HIV continues to grow, with an estimated 19 million needing assistance by 2010.

There is a moral imperative to combat this epidemic. If we have these drugs distributed in the manner in which they are under the President's program, this PEPFAR, then people will come forward to be tested, then we will have better success with our prevention initiatives. So it's all related. Care causes people to say there is a reason to be tested, and knowing the consequences of the disease contributes to the prevention effort.

Few crises have called out for more sustained constructive American leadership. This legislation before us makes that commitment. I urge our colleagues to support it. Once again, I salute you, Mr. PAYNE, for your leadership in so many ways that relate to, again, the eradication of disease and the alleviation of poverty and the strength of America related to that and how we are viewed in the world and

how that all contributes to a healthier America.

All of these, if we don't, we will have a fury of despair that springs from a lack of hope in the world that contributes to violence and, again, takes us back to the security of our country. So for that security, and out of compassion, I urge my colleagues to support this initiative, which is President's Bush's initiative, named for our colleagues, Mr. Lantos and Mr. Hyde, put forth by the chair, Mr. BERMAN, and Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN in a strong bipartisan way, and we salute that, and advocated by Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

INTRODUCTION/ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I rise today in strong support of the Tom Lantos and Henry Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act.

I congratulate Chairman HOWARD BERMAN and Ranking Member ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for their bipartisan efforts to fight HIV/AIDS and to help alleviate poverty and disease in the developing world.

PROGRESS IN THE FIGHT AGAINST AIDS

This legislation is appropriately named to honor the two authors of the first historic President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief legislation in 2003. That landmark bill authorized \$15 billion over 5 years.

Working together with the Bush administration and the Appropriations Committee we succeeded in: providing lifesaving antiretroviral treatment to almost 1.5 million people; supporting care for nearly 6.7 million including more than 2.7 orphans and vulnerable children; and supporting prevention of more than 150,000 infant infections.

NEXT STEPS

Now we must take the next step in fighting AIDS in the poorest countries of the world.

The legislation before us today will move us from the emergency phase to the sustainability phase in fighting AIDS, TB and Malaria.

The legislation will: authorize \$50 billion for the sustained commitment required to stop the global AIDS pandemic; dramatically strengthen health care delivery systems; encourage new and innovative ways to deliver the ABC prevention message; improve relationships with governments and NGOs; eliminate the requirement that one third of the funding be used for abstinence programs; improve services for women and girls and prevent violence against them; and build stronger linkages to health care and hunger initiatives.

CLOSE

The Leadership Against HIV/AIDS Act is our compact with developing nations across the globe. It says that America stands with them in this fight, that our commitment will not waver, and shows them America's true face of compassion.

Since the HIV/AIDS epidemic began, 20 million men, women, and children have died from the disease. Forty million around the globe are HIV-positive. Each and every day, another 6,000 people become infected with HIV.

In addition, the number of orphans, vulnerable children with sick parents, and adolescents at risk for HIV continues to grow, with an estimated 19 million needing assistance by 2010. There is a moral imperative to combat this epidemic.

Few crises have called out more for sustained, constructive America leadership. The legislation before us makes that commitment and I urge its adoption.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, I would like to yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, sometimes when we are negotiating legislative text or debating the merits of an important bill, such as the one before us today, we can lose sight of the extent of the impact that our decisions here can have on the lives of so many.

I would like to quote from some of the African leaders whose people and societies have been rescued from certain death by our PEPFAR programs. The President of Tanzania has said the following, "There would have been so many orphans to date. Had it not been for PEPFAR, the care and treatment, so many parents now who would have been infected can now live. And some of them can live as many years as possible. So can you imagine if this program is discontinued or disrupted? There would be so many people who would lose hope, and certainly there would be death. You create more orphans. So my passionate appeal is for PEPFAR to continue."

Or listen to the words of the President of Botswana when he said, "PEPFAR is now a critical partner in the historic and heroic battle to save lives. PEPFAR has turned despair into hope. PEPFAR has galvanized donor countries and agencies alike to act in concert in the interest of humanity. If the fund is not renewed and if it is not replenished, the momentum generated by PEPFAR thus far will no doubt be lost, and the hope rekindled by the generosity of the American people will be extinguished. I say this to you," said the President of Botswana, "and that's what I said to the congressional committees recently."

So, Madam Chairman, these and so many other statements reflect the human contribution of this critical United States program. But they also demonstrate that PEPFAR programs are helping to win hearts and minds throughout the world. They are building and strengthening the bonds between the governments and the people of these countries and the United States of America. They are building good will toward our Nation and toward the American people.

Madam Chairman, after the deplorable attacks on our Nation on that fateful day almost 7 years ago, we in this Chamber committed ourselves to using the range of U.S. foreign policy tools, including soft power, to counter the conditions that breed hatred, intolerance and radicalism; radicalism that targets the United States, our interests and our allies, and seeks to undermine our freedom and democracy everywhere. The bill before us is a vital tool in that effort.

Again, as our former colleague, our Ambassador to Tanzania has said, "I

want you to know that PEPFAR is crucial to my current mission as Ambassador to the United Republic of Tanzania. It is a tremendous public diplomacy tool that shows America at her best, a compassionate partner who is committed to helping Tanzania meet its enormous HIV/AIDS challenges."

"I was asked to present remarks to the National Consultive Meeting of Islamic Leaders and Scholars here in Dar es Salaam," continues the Ambassador. "This was a historic gathering, as it was the first time that the most esteemed Muslim leaders of Tanzania had gathered together to discuss their role in the fight against HIV/AIDS. They invited me to speak alongside the President because of their concern about HIV/AIDS and their awareness of America's historic contribution to HIV prevention, treatment and care programs." Why? Because of PEPFAR. "So as we help to save lives and restore hope," the Ambassador ends, "we are leaving a lasting impression on the people of this country."

Madam Chairman, I hope that our colleagues will see the great merit of this program and that we will continue to build upon it to save many more lives.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague from California, the gentlelady, MAXINE WATERS.

MS. WATERS. Madam Chairman and Members, I am pleased and proud to be here today to commend not only Chairman BERMAN but the late Tom Lantos and Henry Hyde for their wisdom and their foresight in putting together this most important legislation.

Ladies and gentlemen, I just returned from south Africa and I am pleased to announce that while I was there, I was recognized and given the Order of the Companions of Oliver Tombo Award for my work to help dismantle apartheid in South Africa, and basically for being a friend of south Africa's. I was very proud.

But as I sat there talking with President Umbeke and others, I was reminded that in south Africa there is an estimated 5.5 million people living with HIV and AIDS. That is more than any other country in the world. Over 18 percent of the adult population of south Africa is infected by HIV. Infected persons include thousands of well-educated professionals, such as doctors, nurses, civil servants, and teachers.

In recognizing that we have done a great job in helping to promote democracy and get rid of apartheid, the enemy now is HIV and AIDS and tuberculosis. They are losing all of their professionals. They don't have the personnel to carry out the plan that they have put together to continue to move south Africa to where south Africa needs to be.

I was very proud that they had built 2.3 million new houses over the last 10 years. But, again, tuberculosis, HIV

and AIDS is destroying this population. This legislation will help this country and other countries. These are our friends. They love us. And they love us for having been involved in the struggle to help save them. These are countries that we will be able to count on in the world because we have come to their aid.

Let me also recognize that there were many Americans traveling in South Africa. Those Americans who were there are being served by people who live in areas where tuberculosis and HIV is rampant.

So we need this for protection and security of all peoples.

Mr. BERMAN. Might I inquire of the remaining time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 9 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Florida has 18 minutes remaining.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

We have no further requests for time. I would like to yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, we have no further requests for time. I would like to make a few closing comments, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is an accident of fate and hanging around a long time that put me in the position of managing this bill today, and it is the first bill not on the Suspension Calendar that has come out of the committee since I have become Chair. But the fact is the work on this legislation began a very long time before I became the Chair.

They have been mentioned before, but there are so many new initiatives and so much thoughtful logic underlying this legislation that I thought it would pay to once again mention a group of staff people who, working under the leadership of our staff director, Dr. Bob King, spent a huge amount of time working for Chairman Lantos, working with the minority staff, to craft what became a strong, bipartisan piece of legislation:

Peter Yeo; Pearl Alice Marsh; Kristin Wells; David Abramowitz; Macani Toungara; Heather Flynn from Chairman PAYNE's Africa Subcommittee; Christos Tsentas from Congresswoman BARBARA LEE's staff; Naomi Seiler and Jessica Boyer from the Government Oversight Committee staff, all played important roles on our side in working on this legislation. Yleem Poblette on the minority staff made major contributions.

The result is a bipartisan product where in a way we have internalized on our side the logic of efforts to change behavior and recognized the validity of abstinence programs in the context of a comprehensive approach to this problem and accepted the value of faith-based organizations, and the minority has accepted the logic that this is a fundamental, moral and humanitarian

concern that we should address and be willing to put a lot of value to, because we know it works.

We know there is a direct relationship between the resources we put into this program and the lives saved, the people who can avoid and prevent it, and that it has implications beyond just the moral and humanitarian dimension, as Speaker PELOSI and Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN said, in terms of security and economic welfare and economic growth in so many parts of the world, which ultimately all inure to our benefit and our national interest.

So, once again, I am very pleased to be part of this process with my partner, the ranking member.

Mr. SIRES. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 5501, the Tom Lantos Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008. The passage of this bipartisan bill will continue Congress' commitment to the fight against HIV, tuberculosis and malaria around the world. Currently, 95 percent of people with HIV live in the developing world, and I believe we must be leaders in combating the global AIDS crisis. H.R. 5501 would: dramatically boost HIV/AIDS programs for women and girls, strengthen health and education systems in nations hard-hit by the HIV virus, and provide funding for orphans and vulnerable children, as well as food and nutrition programs.

The World Health Organization estimates that over 38 million people are living with HIV/AIDS.

I believe H.R. 5501 provides needed funding and support to transition the very successful PEPFAR program, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill. Finally, I can think of no better way to honor our late chairman, Tom Lantos, and his predecessor, Henry Hyde, by naming this bill after them. Chairman Lantos was an inspiration to so many and spent his entire life fighting for those around the world that were less fortunate. His memory will live on through his wife, family, and the lives of those who are saved with this vital legislation.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Chairman, I want to commend the chairman and ranking member of the committee for their work in bringing such a strong reauthorization before us today.

In an op-ed that appeared in the Washington Post a few weeks ago, Michael Gerson wrote that in voting for this bill, members of Congress can participate in "something extraordinary—a true miracle of science and conscience, and politics at its noblest."

When the emergency plan for aids was first announced, there were approximately 50,000 people on AIDS drugs in sub-Saharan Africa. Today there are roughly 1.4 million, so I share Mr. Gerson's enthusiasm for this bill, and I am proud of the statement we will make as a Congress by passing it.

I am also extremely encouraged by provisions in the Senate bill that will play a key role in the development of safe and effective microbicides. I hope that in conference, the Committee will look at these microbicides provisions, which hold great promise to save the lives of millions of women as part of a comprehensive program to stem the spread of global AIDS.

I am so pleased to be able to lend my voice in support of this critical and imperative bill. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise today to show my support for H.R. 5501, the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008. This important bill will aim to address the devastating effects of AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis on our global community.

Numbers from the Joint United Nations Program on HIV/AIDS show that since AIDS was identified in 1981, about 65 million people have been infected with HIV and more than 30 million have died from AIDS. These numbers include the figures from 2005 that show more than 2 million of those living with HIV/AIDS were children and the daily infection of an estimated 1,500 children worldwide was due in large part to inadequate access to drugs that prevent the transmission from mother to child.

Additionally, programs within the Department of Health and Human Services account for 71 percent of the total amount spent, with the U.S. as the largest single contributor to the Global Fund, an independent foundation dedicated to disbursing new resources in developing countries aimed at combating AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria.

This bill will further these efforts that we started 5 years ago by raising the United States' contribution to \$50 billion over the next 5 years. I am also encouraged that this bill will encourage the development of a TB vaccine.

The TB germ is constantly changing and drug resistant strains have been found in 28 countries on 6 continents, including right here in the United States, where it is estimated that 10 to 15 million people in the U.S. have latent TB. These drug resistant forms of TB have severe implications both internationally and domestically.

The World Health Organization recently released its new tuberculosis drug resistance surveillance report. The WHO found that the MDR and XDR strains of TB are at their highest levels ever. Both of these strains are far deadlier than normal TB, and are much more difficult and expensive to treat.

In fact, the Department of Homeland Security recently identified XDR-TB as an "emerging threat to the homeland." For this reason, we need to devote resources to stopping this disease and developing a new vaccine is the first step. This is not a partisan issue.

Some of my colleagues might ask why an AIDS reauthorization bill should be the vehicle for doing this; there is a very simple reason. TB is the number one infectious killer among people living with HIV/AIDS, and accounts for up to half of HIV/AIDS deaths in some parts of Africa. If we do not address TB in a systematic way and work to develop a vaccine, then much of the progress that we have made on addressing HIV/AIDS globally will be undone.

Studies also show that the 10-year economic benefits of a TB vaccine that was only 75 percent effective could result in an estimated savings of \$25 billion dollars. There is no denying that this is a significant amount. Our current TB vaccine, BCG, is more than 85 years old and is not compatible against pulmonary TB, which accounts for most TB cases.

This legislation is a good start in our critical battle against TB. Finally, I am happy to see

that this bill will encourage public-private partnerships in combating these diseases. The Baylor Pediatric AIDS Initiative has been working in Africa for several years, and the government should work with this and similar programs to leverage the expertise that they can provide.

I support these strong health initiatives across the globe and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 5501, the Lantos-Hyde U.S. Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008.

The world has achieved more in the fight against HIV/AIDS in the past decade than it has since this deadly epidemic began nearly 30 years ago, due in no small part to the efforts of the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), combined with Congressional enactment of the U.S. Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2003.

As a nation, we have provided care for more than 6 million HIV-infected individuals, including nearly 3 million orphans. We have prevented 150,000 infant infections by providing mother-to-child HIV transmission prevention services for more than 10 million pregnancies. And we have provided anti-retroviral drugs for nearly 1.5 million men, women, and children.

Yet in an era where 40 million men, women, and children are infected with HIV worldwide, and where infections continue at a rate of nearly 6,000 per day, U.S. global leadership on HIV/AIDS—as well as the associated diseases of TB and malaria—remains as important as ever.

I quote Stephen Lewis, the former United Nations Special Envoy for HIV/AIDS in Africa: "the international community must now finally keep its word and mobilize for global AIDS treatment delivery . . . it is a moral imperative that global leaders and institutions keep their promises to scale up AIDS services with urgency and increased resources."

I believe passage of H.R. 5501 displays our commitment to doing just that.

This legislation authorizes \$50 billion over the next 5 years, including \$41 billion for HIV/AIDS, \$4 billion for tuberculosis, and \$5 billion for malaria, and is designed to move these programs from the "emergency" phase, towards greater sustainability.

In particular, I am pleased to see a strengthened focus on the needs of women and girls, and prevention and treatment programs targeted towards this population—including, for the first time, the provision of HIV/AIDS testing and counseling services in family planning programs. I would note that concerns have been raised that the bill's language would block HIV testing and counseling services from being offered by family planning providers that are not compliant with the misguided "global gag rule" policy, and I hope that Congressional intent can be clarified that this is not the case.

I am also supportive of provisions that remove the requirement targeting one-third of prevention funding towards abstinence-only programs. Prevention programs must be evidence-based, rather than ideologically-based.

This legislation doubles, to \$2 billion per year, the U.S. contribution to the multilateral Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and

Malaria. The Global Fund, with its emphasis on stimulating a global commitment under an umbrella organization with a truly international AIDS budget, is the best chance the world has of combating this epidemic. I urge my colleagues and the President to ensure that these new authorization levels are fully funded.

Madam Chairman, I applaud the bipartisan work of the Foreign Affairs Committee, including its new Chairman, HOWARD BERMAN, and Ranking Member ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN. I also want to recognize and commemorate the leadership of our dear friend, Congressman Tom Lantos, whose commitment to the most vulnerable people worldwide continues to be felt through our work on HIV/AIDS. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5501.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, as one of the original cosponsors of this bill, I am proud of what it represents, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it. This five-year reauthorization tells the world that the United States is truly committed to a sustainable global response to HIV, TB, and malaria.

The bill raises our financial commitment. It authorizes the strengthening of local health systems and the training of workers, including the doctors and nurses on whom the sustainability of this program will rely.

The bill also eliminates the onerous abstinence-only spending requirement. It replaces it with a provision directing country teams to tell Congress if they spend less than half of their funds for sexual transmission on behavior change programs. This is merely a reporting requirement, and should not be understood as a restriction on country spending.

I do want to acknowledge some concerns about the bill. Many would have liked to see stronger and more inclusive language encouraging linkages to reproductive health services. I would have liked to see such language too.

There is also concern about the current requirement that recipients sign an "anti-prostitution pledge." People involved in sex work are very vulnerable to HIV infection, along with many other health and social risks. But what we hear from the field is that the pledge has had the unintended consequence of making groups shy away from effective outreach programs for sex workers. They are scared of running afoul of this broad oath requirement. I'm disappointed that we weren't able to eliminate it.

While I think we've got more work to do in certain areas, I'd like to take this opportunity to comment on several elements of the bill which I believe are vitally important.

First, despite the prostitution pledge, it is unambiguous that the intent of Congress is to direct close attention to the needs of sex workers and other marginalized groups. The bill specifically directs the provision of care, treatment, and prevention services to sex workers, injection drug users, and men who have sex with men. And it requires the development of strategies for providing evidence-based prevention services to each of these populations.

This bill also makes some important refinements to the treatment program. The expansion of antiretroviral services has been a huge success. But many people still lack needed treatment. Others require more expensive second-line therapy. And while significant progress has been made in the utilization of generic drugs, some U.S. dollars are still being used to buy brand-name drugs when lower-cost generics are available.

In light of these challenges, this bill instructs the AIDS coordinator to develop mechanisms for encouraging and facilitating the purchase of safe and effective drugs at the lowest possible price. The bill also requires the coordinator to report annually on the amounts paid for generic and branded antiretroviral drugs. And it requires that information on drug pricing be shared and updated routinely, so our partners can make purchases based on the best available information.

Finally, I'd like to note that this bill puts an important new emphasis on research. While we've learned much through this program, we haven't seen a coordinated research agenda to address questions about what works and what doesn't, especially in the area of prevention. This bill mandates a detailed strategic plan for program monitoring, operational research and impact evaluation research. It also requires a strategy for maximizing the capacity of host countries to conduct their own research.

But we should not let these developments make us complacent. The most basic, but often most pressing, health needs of the world's poor aren't being met. Children are still dying for lack of clean drinking water. Women face staggering rates of morbidity and death related to pregnancy and childbirth. And people across the world succumb to disability and death from treatable, and often preventable, illnesses.

As we pass this bill today, let's not forget these other pressing health problems. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 5501. And I hope that the lessons and successes of our global AIDS program inspire us to reinvigorate our commitment to a broader global health agenda.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the critical bipartisan Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008.

We have a moral obligation to address the global pandemics of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. It was 5 years ago that Congress took leadership to address this crisis. Today, because of Congress's actions, the United States has become the leading provider in the world of HIV/AIDS assistance, treatment, prevention and care.

AIDS continues to be the leading cause of death in sub-Saharan Africa. The United Nations estimates that 33 million people are infected with HIV worldwide, with an estimated 22 million HIV-infected people in sub-Saharan Africa. Approximately 1.6 million deaths in sub-Saharan Africa resulted from AIDS in 2007. This legislation reaffirms our commitment to combating this deadly epidemic by reauthorizing the 2003 law and will give more flexibility to host governments in planning, directing, and managing prevention, treatment and care programs that have been established with our assistance.

I am pleased that the bill also includes a provision that authorizes funding for U.S. contributions to research and development of a tuberculosis vaccine. Tuberculosis is a deadly epidemic that faces our planet today. Nearly 2 million people die from it each year and approximately 9 million are diagnosed with tuberculosis annually. It is the largest killer of people with HIV/AIDS, accounting for one-third of AIDS deaths alone. The current tuberculosis vaccine is more than 85 years old and is unre-

liable against pulmonary tuberculosis. New tuberculosis vaccines have the potential to save millions of lives and would lead to substantial cost savings.

Madam Chairman, let us honor the spirit of the two men—Chairmen Lantos and Hyde—who guided the 2003 law through this body in bipartisan manner by passing this much needed legislation to combat these deadly diseases.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of this important bill. PEPFAR-funded programs have provided life-saving assistance in the fight against HIV/AIDS, and I welcome any expansion of this assistance. Additionally, I am pleased that we have removed the "hard earmark" requiring 33% of all prevention funds be spent on abstinence-only until marriage programs. Studies by GAO and the Institutes of Medicine found that the one-third earmark undermines successful HIV prevention efforts by limiting flexibility in developing countries. However, I continue to be concerned about any funds being directed towards unproven, ineffective programs using the "abstinence-only" approach. I worry that the new "balanced funding" requirement may cause mission directors and public health officials to be anxious about doing what they think Congress wants, instead of what is needed in the field. Public health experts on the ground are the ones who can best determine the mix of prevention activities, especially since what works for one culture may be disastrous for another. Even in our own country, young people who take part in abstinence-only education are less likely to use condoms. With 15,000 new HIV infections every day, the need for additional resources is clearly tremendous, and I'm extremely supportive of the goals of this important legislation, and I continue to believe that our highest priority should be funding science-based, comprehensive efforts to prevent HIV.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 5501, the Tom Lantos and Henry Hyde Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008. This bill authorizes \$50 billion over the next five years for international health programs, including \$41 billion for HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention, \$4 billion for tuberculosis programs, and \$5 billion for malaria programs.

I just returned from South Africa, where I received the "OR Tambo Award," from South African President Thabo Mbeki. I received this award because of my efforts to end the brutal system of apartheid in South Africa and to obtain the release of South African anti-apartheid activist Nelson Mandela from prison. Apartheid was dismantled and Nelson Mandela was elected President of South Africa in 1994, when South Africa held its first democratic elections.

I was very proud to receive the OR Tambo Award because I have always been and continue to be a friend to South Africa. However, in South Africa today, the enemy is HIV/AIDS. It is estimated that 5.5 million people are living with HIV/AIDS in South Africa. That is more than any other country in the world. Over 18 percent of the adult population of South Africa is infected by HIV. Infected persons include thousands of well-educated professionals, such as doctors, nurses, civil servants and teachers.

Everywhere I went in South Africa, people told me about the terrible problem they have

trying to fill professional positions. The shortage of educated professionals is a result of the fact that so many South African professionals have died of AIDS or are too sick to work.

The involvement of doctors, nurses, teachers, and other professionals is critical to stopping the spread of HIV and AIDS. That is why I am pleased that this bill includes provisions to strengthen the health care infrastructure in countries like South Africa and train at least 140,000 new health care professionals and workers for HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment and care. The bill also includes prevention funds to stop the spread of HIV and treatment funds to allow infected individuals to live productive lives and continue to serve their communities.

It is impossible to address HIV without also addressing tuberculosis. Almost 9 million people develop tuberculosis every year. At least 2.4 million are killed by the disease. According to the World Health Organization, HIV and tuberculosis form a lethal combination, each speeding the progress of the other. In the past 15 years, tuberculosis rates have doubled in Africa overall and tripled in areas with high HIV concentrations. In some areas of Africa, up to 80 percent of tuberculosis patients also test positive for HIV. This makes tuberculosis clinics an ideal location for HIV prevention, treatment, and care.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill and help stop the spread of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria in South Africa and around the world.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008, H.R. 5501.

This important legislation reauthorizes and expands the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR). I have long supported this bold initiative that has made the U.S. a leader in this critical health and moral issue of our time. PEPFAR has shown to the world our nation's vision and compassion in addressing this healthcare crisis.

Five years ago, an estimated 31 million people were living with HIV/AIDS worldwide, anti-retroviral drug treatments were expensive, and approximately 8,200 people were infected with HIV/AIDS every day.

I have heard from a number of my constituents about their support for continued U.S. efforts to combat AIDS and the spread of HIV around the globe. It is obvious that Americans care. In the absence of a cure for AIDS, this worldwide epidemic continues to spread at an alarming rate.

That is why I am pleased that H.R. 5501 makes an important transition from emergency relief to the establishment of long-term and sustainable AIDS relief programs. The legislation also works to better integrate the tuberculosis and malaria programs with the HIV/AIDS programs. This is essential because in sub-Saharan Africa tuberculosis is the leading killer of individuals with HIV/AIDS.

Since the creation of this program, the United States has invested more than \$19 billion to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. The results have been striking. By the end of 2007, the United States had helped provide anti-retroviral drug treatments to approximately 1.5 million people with AIDS, supported care for 6.6 million—including 2.7 million orphans and vulnerable children—and

helped to prevent more than 157,000 infant infections.

H.R. 5501 greatly expands our efforts abroad by authorizing a total of \$50 billion over five years. This total includes \$41 billion for HIV/AIDS programs, \$5 billion for malaria programs, and \$4 billion for tuberculosis programs. This dramatic increase in funding will help partner countries continue to identify and meet targets for treatment and prevention. Additionally, the funding will help build and strengthen the existing health systems in host countries.

While I support the underlying bill, I do have some concern about one specific issue. I have long been concerned by the restrictions placed on how PEPFAR funds can be spent. I have opposed the requirement that one-third of the funds be spent on abstinence-only education because it has not proven to be a successful way to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS. A report by the Government Accountability Office found that this restriction tied the local hands of public health workers.

I believe that PEPFAR funds should be spent on the most effective HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention strategies available. That is why I am pleased that H.R. 5501 removes the requirement that one-third of the funds be spent on abstinence education. As this bill works through the legislative process, I hope that any language in the bill that might be interpreted to limit funding to programs that are compliant with the global gag rule be removed.

Madam Chairman, our country has done more to end the spread of HIV/AIDS in the last five years than any nation in the history of the world. We must continue. This bill represents a reasonable expansion of our efforts and makes the important transition to permanent HIV/AIDS relief. I urge my colleagues to support this investment in the health of our global community and in the fight against HIV/AIDS.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5501

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Findings.
- Sec. 3. Definitions.
- Sec. 4. Purpose.

TITLE I—POLICY PLANNING AND COORDINATION

- Sec. 101. Development of a comprehensive, five-year, global strategy.
- Sec. 102. HIV/AIDS Response Coordinator.

TITLE II—SUPPORT FOR MULTILATERAL FUNDS, PROGRAMS, AND PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

- Sec. 201. Sense of Congress on public-private partnerships.

- Sec. 202. Participation in the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.
- Sec. 203. Voluntary contributions to international vaccine funds.
- Sec. 204. Program to facilitate availability of microbicides to prevent transmission of HIV and other diseases.
- Sec. 205. Plan to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria by strengthening health policies and health systems of host countries.

TITLE III—BILATERAL EFFORTS
Subtitle A—General Assistance and Programs

- Sec. 301. Assistance to combat HIV/AIDS.
- Sec. 302. Assistance to combat tuberculosis.
- Sec. 303. Assistance to combat malaria.
- Sec. 304. Health care partnerships to combat HIV/AIDS.

Subtitle B—Assistance for Women, Children, and Families

- Sec. 311. Policy and requirements.
- Sec. 312. Annual reports on prevention of mother-to-child transmission of the HIV infection.
- Sec. 313. Strategy to prevent HIV infections among women and youth.
- Sec. 314. Clerical amendment.

TITLE IV—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

- Sec. 401. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 402. Sense of Congress.
- Sec. 403. Allocation of funds.
- Sec. 404. Prohibition on taxation by foreign governments.

TITLE V—SUSTAINABILITY AND STRENGTHENING OF HEALTH CARE SYSTEMS

- Sec. 501. Sustainability and strengthening of health care systems.
- Sec. 502. Clerical amendment.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Section 2 of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7601) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(29) The HIV/AIDS pandemic continues to pose a major threat to the health of the global community, from the most severely-affected regions of sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean, to the emerging epidemics of Eastern Europe, Central Asia, South and Southeast Asia, and Latin America.

“(30) According to UNAIDS’ 2007 global estimates, there are 33.2 million individuals with HIV/AIDS worldwide, including 2.5 million people newly-infected with HIV. Of those infected with HIV, 2.5 million are children under 15 who also account for 460,000 of the newly-infected individuals.

“(31) Sub-Saharan Africa continues to be the region most affected by the HIV/AIDS pandemic. More than 68 percent of adults and nearly 90 percent of children with HIV/AIDS live in sub-Saharan Africa, and more than 76 percent of AIDS deaths in 2007 occurred in sub-Saharan Africa.

“(32) Although sub-Saharan Africa carries the heaviest disease burden of HIV/AIDS, the HIV/AIDS pandemic continues to affect virtually every world region. While prevalence rates are relatively low in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, South and Southeast Asia, and Latin America, without effective prevention strategies, HIV prevalence rates could rise quickly in these regions.

“(33) By world region, according to UNAIDS’ 2007 global estimates—

“(A) in sub-Saharan Africa, there were 22.5 million adults and children infected with HIV, up from 20.9 million in 2001, with 1.7 million new HIV infections, a 5 percent prevalence rate, and 1.6 million deaths;

“(B) in South and Southeast Asia, there were 4 million adults and children infected with HIV, up from 3.5 million in 2001, with 340,000 new HIV infections, a 0.3 percent prevalence rate, and 270,000 deaths;

“(C) in East Asia, there were 800,000 adults and children infected with HIV, up from 420,000 in 2001, with 92,000 new HIV infections, a 0.1 percent prevalence rate, and 32,000 deaths;

“(D) in Eastern and Central Europe, there were 1.6 million adults and children infected with HIV, up from 630,000 in 2001, with 150,000 new HIV infections, a 0.9 percent prevalence rate, and 55,000 deaths; and

“(E) in the Caribbean, there were 230,000 adults and children infected with HIV, up from 190,000 in 2001, with 17,000 new HIV infections, a 1 percent prevalence rate, and 11,000 deaths.

“(34) Tuberculosis is the number one killer of individuals with HIV/AIDS and is responsible for up to one-half of HIV/AIDS deaths in Africa.

“(35) The wide extent of drug resistant tuberculosis, including both multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) and extensively drug resistant tuberculosis (XDR-TB), driven by the HIV/AIDS pandemic in sub-Saharan Africa, has hampered both HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis treatment services. The World Health Organization (WHO) has declared the prevalence of tuberculosis to be at emergency levels in sub-Saharan Africa.

“(36) Forty percent of the world’s population, mostly poor, live in malarial zones, and malaria, which is highly preventable, kills more than 1 million individuals worldwide each year. Ninety percent of malaria’s victims are in sub-Saharan Africa and 70 percent of malaria’s victims are children under the age of 5. Additionally, hunger and malnutrition kill another 6 million individuals worldwide each year.

“(37) Assistance to combat HIV/AIDS must address the nutritional factors associated with the disease in order to be effective and sustainable. The World Food Program estimates that 6.4 million individuals affected by HIV will need nutritional support by 2008.

“(38) Women and girls continue to be vulnerable to HIV, in large part, due to gender-based cultural norms that leave many women and girls powerless to negotiate social relationships.

“(39) Women make up 50 percent of individuals infected with HIV worldwide. In sub-Saharan Africa, where the HIV/AIDS epidemic is most severe, women make up 57 percent of individuals infected with HIV, and 75 percent of young people infected with HIV in sub-Saharan Africa are young women ages 15 to 24.

“(40) Women and girls are biologically, socially, and economically more vulnerable to HIV infection. Gender disparities in the rate of HIV infection are the result of a number of factors, including the following:

“(A) Cross-generational sex with older men who are more likely to be infected with HIV, and a lack of choice regarding when and whom to marry, leading to early marriages and high rates of child marriages with older men. About one-half of all adolescent females in sub-Saharan Africa and two-thirds of adolescent females in Asia are married by age 18.

“(B) Studies show that married women and married and unmarried girls often are unable or find it difficult to negotiate the frequency and timing of sexual intercourse, ensure their partner’s faithfulness, or insist on condom use. Under these circumstances, women often run the risk of being infected by husbands or male partners in societies where men in relationships have more than one partner. Behavior change is particularly important in societies in which this is a common practice.

“(C) Because young married women and girls are more likely to have unprotected sex and have more frequent sex than their unmarried peers, and women and girls who are faithful to their spouses can be placed at risk of HIV/AIDS through a husband’s infidelity or prior infection, marriage is not always a guarantee against HIV infection, although it is a protective factor overall.

“(D) Social and economic inequalities based largely on gender limit access for women and girls to education and employment opportunities and prevent them from asserting their inheritance and property rights. For many women, a lack of independent economic means combines with socio-cultural practices to sustain and exacerbate their fear of abandonment, eviction, or ostracism from their homes and communities and can leave many more women trapped within relationships where they are vulnerable to HIV infection.

“(E) A lack of educational opportunities for women and girls is linked to younger sexual debut, earlier childhood marriage, earlier childbearing, decreased child survival, worsening nutrition, and increased risk of HIV infection.

“(F) High rates of gender-based violence, rape, and sexual coercion within and outside marriage contribute to high rates of HIV infection. According to the World Health Organization, between one-sixth and three-quarters of women in various countries and settings have experienced some form of physical or sexual violence since the age of 15 within or outside of marriage. Women who are unable to protect themselves from such violence are often unable to protect themselves from being infected with HIV through forced sexual contact.

“(G) Fear of domestic violence and the continuing stigma and discrimination associated with HIV/AIDS prevent many women from accessing information about HIV/AIDS, getting tested, disclosing their HIV status, accessing services to prevent mother-to-child transmission of HIV, or receiving treatment and counseling even when they already know they have been infected with HIV.

“(H) According to UNAIDS, the vulnerability of individuals involved in commercial sex acts to HIV infection is heightened by stigmatization and marginalization, limited economic options, limited access to health, social, and legal services, limited access to information and prevention means, gender-related differences and inequalities, sexual exploitation and trafficking, harmful or non-protective laws and policies, and exposure to risks associated with commercial sex acts, such as violence, substance abuse, and increased mobility.

“(I) Lack of access to basic HIV prevention information and education and lack of coordination with existing primary health care to reduce stigma and maximize coverage.

“(J) Lack of access to currently available female-controlled HIV prevention methods, such as the female condom, and lack of training on proper use of either male or female condoms.

“(K) High rates of other sexually transmitted infections and complications during pregnancies and childbirth.

“(L) An absence of functioning legal frameworks to protect women and girls and, where such frameworks exist, the lack of accountable and effective enforcement of such frameworks.

“(41) In addition to vulnerabilities to HIV infection, women in sub-Saharan Africa face a 1-in-13 chance of dying in childbirth compared to a 1-in-16 chance in least-developed countries worldwide, a 1-in-60 chance in developing countries, and a 1-in-4,100 chance in developed countries.

“(42) Due to these high maternal mortality rates and high HIV prevalence rates in certain countries, special attention is needed in these countries to help HIV-positive women safely deliver healthy babies and save women’s lives.

“(43) Unprotected sex within or outside of marriage is the single greatest factor in the transmission of HIV worldwide and is responsible for 80 percent of new HIV infections in sub-Saharan Africa.

“(44) Multiple randomized controlled trials have established that male circumcision reduces a man’s risk of contracting HIV by 60 percent or more. Twelve acceptability studies have found that in regions of sub-Saharan Africa where circumcision is not traditionally practiced, a majority of men want the procedure. Broader availability of male circumcision services could prevent millions of HIV infections not only in men but also in their female partners.

“(45)(A) Youth also face particular challenges in receiving services for HIV/AIDS.

“(B) Nearly one-half of all orphans who have lost one parent and two-thirds of those who have lost both parents are ages 12 to 17. These orphans are in particular need of services to protect themselves against sexually-transmitted infections, including HIV.

“(C) Research indicates that many youth benefit from full disclosure of medically accurate, age-appropriate information about abstinence, partner reduction, and condoms. Providing comprehensive information about HIV, including delay of sexual debut and the ABC model: ‘Abstain, Be faithful, use Condoms’, and linking such information to health care can help improve awareness of safe sex practices and address the fact that only 1 in 3 young men and 1 in 5 young women ages 15 to 24 can correctly identify ways to prevent HIV infection.

“(D) Surveys indicate that no country has succeeded in fully educating more than one-half of its youth about the prevention and transmission of HIV.

“(46) According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), HIV/AIDS prevalence rates among refugees are generally lower than the HIV/AIDS prevalence rates for their host communities, though perceptions run counter to this fact. However, peacekeeping operations that no longer deploy HIV/AIDS-positive troops still face vulnerabilities to sexual transmission of HIV with HIV-positive individuals in refugee camps. Host countries generally do not provide HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care services for refugees.

“(47) Continuing progress to reach the millions of impoverished individuals who need voluntary testing, counseling, treatment, and care for HIV/AIDS requires increased efforts to strengthen health care delivery systems and infrastructure, rebuild and expand the health care workforce, and strengthen allied and support services in countries receiving United States global HIV/AIDS assistance.

“(48) While HIV/AIDS poses the greatest health threat of modern times, it also poses the greatest development challenge for developing countries with fragile economies and weak public financial management systems that are ill equipped to shoulder the burden of this disease. International donors will have to play a critical role in providing resources for HIV/AIDS programs far into the future.

“(49) The emerging partnerships between countries most affected by HIV/AIDS and the United States must include stronger coordination between HIV/AIDS programs and other United States foreign assistance programs, and stronger collaboration with other donors in the areas of economic development and growth strategies.

“(50) The future control of HIV/AIDS demands coordination between international organizations such as the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, UNAIDS, the World Health Organization (WHO), the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the international donor community, national governments, and private sector organizations, including community and faith-based organizations.

“(51) The future control of HIV/AIDS further requires effective and transparent public finance management systems in developing countries to advance the ability of such countries to manage public revenues and donor funds aimed at combating HIV/AIDS and other diseases.

“(52) The HIV/AIDS pandemic contributes to the shortage of health care personnel through loss of life and illness, unsafe working conditions, increased workloads for diminished staff, and resulting stress and burnout, while the shortage of health care personnel undermines efforts to prevent and provide care and treatment for individuals with HIV/AIDS.

“(53) The shortage of health care personnel, including doctors, nurses, pharmacists, counselors, laboratory staff, paraprofessionals, trained lay workers, and researchers is one of the leading obstacles to combating HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa.

“(54) Since 2003, important progress has been made in combating HIV/AIDS, yet there is more to be done. The number of new HIV infections is still increasing at an alarming rate. According to the United States National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, globally, for every 1 individual put on antiretroviral therapy, 6 individuals are newly infected with HIV.

“(55) The United States Government continues to be the world’s leader in the fight against HIV/AIDS and the unsurpassed partner with developing countries in their efforts to control this disease.

“(56) By September 2007, the United States, through the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7601 et seq.), had provided services to prevent mother-to-child transmission of HIV to women during 10 million pregnancies; provided antiretroviral prophylaxis for women during over 827,300 pregnancies; prevented an estimated 157,240 HIV infections in infants; cared for over 6.6 million individuals, including over 2.7 million orphans and vulnerable children; supported lifesaving antiretroviral therapies for approximately 1.4 million men, women, and children in sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, and the Caribbean; and provided counseling and testing to over 33.7 million men, women, and children in developing countries.

“(57) These numbers were achieved because of the commitment of substantial resources and support of the United States Government to our partners on the front lines—the dedicated and committed women and men, communities, and nations who are taking control of the HIV/AIDS epidemics in their own countries.”

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

Section 3(2) of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7602(2)) is amended by striking “Committee on International Relations” and inserting “Committee on Foreign Affairs”.

SEC. 4. PURPOSE.

Section 4 of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7603) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 4. PURPOSE.

“The purpose of this Act is to strengthen and enhance United States global leadership

and the effectiveness of the United States response to the HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria pandemics and other related and preventable infectious diseases in developing countries by—

“(1) establishing a comprehensive, integrated five-year, global strategy to fight HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria that encompasses a plan for continued expansion and coordination of critical programs and improved coordination among relevant executive branch agencies and between the United States and foreign governments and international organizations;

“(2) providing increased resources for United States bilateral efforts to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, particularly for prevention, treatment, and care (including nutritional support), technical assistance and training, the strengthening of health care systems, health care workforce development, monitoring and evaluations systems, and operations research;

“(3) providing increased resources for multilateral efforts to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria;

“(4) encouraging the expansion of private sector efforts and expanding public-private sector partnerships to combat HIV/AIDS; and

“(5) intensifying efforts to support the development of vaccines, microbicides, and other prevention technologies and improved diagnostics treatment for HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria.”

TITLE I—POLICY PLANNING AND COORDINATION

SEC. 101. DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE, FIVE-YEAR, GLOBAL STRATEGY.

(a) STRATEGY.—Subsection (a) of section 101 of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7611) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “to combat” and inserting “to develop efforts further to combat”;

(2) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) provide that the reduction of HIV/AIDS behavioral risks shall be a priority of all prevention efforts in terms of funding, scientifically-accurate educational services, and activities by—

“(A) designing prevention strategies and programs based on sound epidemiological evidence, tailored to the unique needs of each country and community, and reaching those populations found to be most at risk for acquiring HIV infection;

“(B) promoting abstinence from sexual activity and substance abuse;

“(C) encouraging delay of sexual debut, monogamy, fidelity, and partner reduction;

“(D) promoting the effective use of male and female condoms;

“(E) promoting the use of measures to reduce the risk of HIV transmission for discordant couples (where one individual has HIV/AIDS and the other individual does not have HIV/AIDS or whose status is unknown);

“(F) educating men and boys about the risks of procuring sex commercially and about the need to end violent behavior toward women and girls;

“(G) promoting the rapid expansion of safe and voluntary male circumcision services;

“(H) promoting life skills training and development for children and youth;

“(I) supporting advocacy for child and youth community-based protective social services;

“(J) eradicating trafficking in persons and creating alternatives to prostitution;

“(K) promoting cooperation with law enforcement to prosecute offenders of trafficking, rape, and sexual assault crimes with the goal of eliminating such crimes;

“(L) promoting services demonstrated to be effective in reducing the transmission of HIV infection among injection drug users without increasing illicit drug use;

“(M) promoting policies and programs to end the sexual exploitation of and violence against women and children; and

“(N) promoting prevention and treatment services for men who have sex with men;”;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (10) as paragraphs (6) through (11), respectively;

(4) by inserting after paragraph (4) (as amended by paragraph (2) of this subsection) the following:

“(5) include specific plans for linkage to, and referral systems for nongovernmental organizations that implement multisectoral approaches, including faith-based and community-based organizations, for—

“(A) nutrition and food support for individuals with HIV/AIDS and affected communities;

“(B) child health services and development programs;

“(C) HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment services for injection drug users;

“(D) access to HIV/AIDS education and testing in family planning and maternal health programs supported by the United States Government; and

“(E) medical, social, and legal services for victims of violence;”;

(5) by redesignating paragraphs (10) and (11) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection) as paragraphs (11) and (12), respectively; and

(6) by inserting after paragraph (9) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection) the following:

“(10) maximize host country capacities in training and research, particularly operations research;”

(b) REPORT.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “this Act” and inserting “the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

“(C) A description of the manner in which the strategy will address the following:

“(i) The fundamental elements of prevention and education, care and treatment, including increasing access to pharmaceuticals, vaccines, and microbicides, as they become available, screening, prophylaxis, and treatment of major opportunistic infections, including tuberculosis, and increasing access to nutrition and food for individuals on antiretroviral therapies.

“(ii) The promotion of delay of sexual debut, abstinence, monogamy, fidelity, and partner reduction.

“(iii) The promotion of correct and consistent use of male and female condoms and other strategies and skills development to reduce the risk of HIV transmission.

“(iv) Increasing voluntary access to safe male circumcision services.

“(v) Life-skills training.

“(vi) The provision of information and services to encourage young people to delay sexual debut and ensure access to HIV/AIDS prevention information and services.

“(vii) Prevention of sexual violence leading to transmission of HIV and assistance for victims of violence who are at risk of HIV transmission.

“(viii) HIV/AIDS prevention, care, and treatment services for injection drug users.

“(ix) Research, including incentives for HIV vaccine development and new protocols.

“(x) Advocacy for community-based child and youth protective services.

“(xi) Training of health care workers.

“(xii) The development of health care infrastructure and delivery systems.

“(xiii) Prevention efforts for substance abusers.

“(xiv) Prevention, treatment, care, and outreach efforts for men who have sex with men.”;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by adding at the end before the period the following: “, including through faith-based and other nongovernmental organizations”;

(C) in subparagraph (E), by inserting “access to HIV/AIDS education and testing in family planning and maternal and child health programs supported by the United States Government and” after “the unique needs of women, including”;

(D) in subparagraph (F), by inserting “(including by accessing voluntary clinical circumcision services)” after “in their sexual behavior”;

(E) in subparagraph (G), by inserting “and men’s” after “women’s”;

(F) by redesignating subparagraphs (M) through (W) as subparagraphs (N) through (X);

(G) by inserting after subparagraph (L) the following:

“(M) A description of efforts to be undertaken to strengthen the public finance management systems of selected host countries to ensure transparent, efficient, and effective management of national and donor financial investments in health.”;

(H) in subparagraph (O) (as redesignated by subparagraph (F) of this paragraph), by striking “evaluating programs,” and inserting “evaluating programs to ensure medical accuracy, operations research,”;

(I) in subparagraph (Q) (as redesignated by subparagraph (F) of this paragraph), by inserting “, strengthen national health care delivery systems, and increase national health workforce capacities,” after “HIV/AIDS pandemic”;

(J) in subparagraph (R) (as redesignated by subparagraph (F) of this paragraph), by inserting “, including strategies relating to agricultural development, trade and economic growth, and education”;

(K) in subparagraph (T) (as redesignated by subparagraph (F) of this paragraph), by inserting “efforts of intergenerational caregivers and” after “, including”;

(L) by redesignating subparagraphs (V) through (X) (as redesignated by subparagraph (F) of this paragraph), as subparagraphs (W) through (Y), respectively;

(M) by inserting after subparagraph (U) (as redesignated by subparagraph (F) of this paragraph) the following:

“(V) A plan to strengthen and implement health care workforce strategies to enable countries to increase the supply and retention of all cadres of trained professional and paraprofessional health care workers by numbers that move toward global health program needs and toward targets established by the World Health Organization, while enabling health systems to expand coverage consistent with national and international targets and goals.”; and

(N) by striking subparagraph (F) (as redesignated by subparagraphs (F) and (L) of this paragraph) and inserting the following:

“(Y) A description of the specific strategies, developed in coordination with existing health programs, to prevent mother-to-child transmission of HIV, including the extent to which HIV-positive women and men in treatment, care, and support programs and HIV-negative women and men are counseled

about methods of preventing HIV transmission and the extent to which HIV prevention methods are provided on-site or by referral in treatment, care, and support programs.

“(Z) A description of the specific strategies developed to maximize the capacity of health care providers, including faith-based and other nongovernmental organizations, and family planning providers supported by the United States Government to ensure access to necessary and comprehensive information about reducing sexual transmission of HIV among women, men, and young people, including strategies to ensure HIV/AIDS prevention training for such providers.

“(AA) A strategy to work with international and host country partners toward universal access to HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care programs.”

(c) STRATEGIC PLAN FOR PROGRAM MONITORING, OPERATIONS RESEARCH, AND IMPACT EVALUATION RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally shall develop a 5-year strategic plan for program monitoring, operations research, and impact evaluation research of United States HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria programs.

(2) ELEMENTS OF PLAN.—The strategic plan developed under this subsection shall include—

(A) the amount of funding provided for program monitoring, operations research, and impact evaluation research under sections 104A, 104B, and 104C of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b-2, 2151b-3, and 2151b-4) and the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7601 et seq.) available through fiscal year 2009;

(B) strategies to—

(i) improve the efficiency, effectiveness, quality, and accessibility of services provided under the provisions of law described in subparagraph (A);

(ii) establish the cost-effectiveness of program models;

(iii) ensure the transparency and accountability of services provided under the provisions of law described in subparagraph (A);

(iv) disseminate and promote the utilization of evaluation findings, lessons, and best practices in services provided under the provisions of law described in subparagraph (A); and

(v) encourage and evaluate innovative service models and strategies to optimize the delivery of care, treatment, and prevention programs financed by the United States Government;

(C) priorities for program monitoring, operations research, and impact evaluation research and a time line for completion of activities associated with such priorities; and

(D) other information that the Coordinator determines to be necessary.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In developing the strategic plan under this subsection and implementing, disseminating, and promoting the use of program monitoring, operations research, and impact evaluation research, the Coordinator shall consult with representatives of relevant executive branch agencies, other appropriate executive branch agencies, multilateral institutions involved in providing HIV/AIDS assistance, nongovernmental organizations involved in implementing HIV/AIDS programs, and the governments of host countries.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the terms “program monitoring”, “operations research”, and “impact evaluation research”, have the meanings given such terms in section 104A(d)(4)(B) of the Foreign

Assistance Act of 1961 (as added by section 301(a)(4)(C) of this Act); and

(B) the term “relevant executive branch agencies” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7602).

SEC. 102. HIV/AIDS RESPONSE COORDINATOR.

Section 1(f)(2) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(f)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “, host country finance, health, and other relevant ministries” after “community-based organizations”;

(B) in clause (iii), by inserting “and host country finance, health, and other relevant ministries” after “community-based organizations”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)(ii)—

(A) by striking subclauses (IV) and (V) and inserting the following:

“(IV) Establishing an interagency working group on HIV/AIDS that is comprised of, but not limited to, representatives from the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of Health and Human Services (including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institutes of Health, and the Health Resources and Services Administration), the Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the Department of Defense, and the Office of the Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat Malaria Globally, for the purposes of coordination of activities relating to HIV/AIDS. The interagency working group shall—

“(aa) meet regularly to review progress in host countries toward HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care objectives;

“(bb) participate in the process of identifying countries in need of increased assistance based on the epidemiology of HIV/AIDS in those countries; and

“(cc) review policies that may be obstacles to reaching objectives set forth for HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care.

“(V) Coordinating overall United States HIV/AIDS policy and programs with efforts led by host countries and with the assistance provided by other relevant bilateral and multilateral aid agencies and other donor institutions to achieve complementarity with other programs aimed at improving child and maternal health, and food security, promoting education, and strengthening health care systems.”;

(B) by redesignating subclauses (VII) and (VIII) as subclauses (IX) and (X), respectively;

(C) by inserting after subclause (VI) the following:

“(VII) Holding annual consultations with host country nongovernmental organizations providing services to improve health, and advocating on behalf of the individuals with HIV/AIDS and those at particular risk of contracting HIV/AIDS.

“(VIII) Ensuring, through interagency and international coordination, that United States HIV/AIDS programs are coordinated with and complementary to the delivery of related global health, food security, and education services, including—

“(aa) maternal and child health care;

“(bb) services for other neglected and easily preventable and treatable infectious diseases, such as tuberculosis;

“(cc) treatment and care services for injection drug users; and

“(dd) programs and services to improve legal, social, and economic status of women and girls.”;

(D) in subclause (IX) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph)—

(i) by inserting “Vietnam, Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Jamaica, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saint Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, the Dominican Republic” after “Zambia.”;

(ii) by adding at the end before the period the following: “and other countries in which the United States is implementing HIV/AIDS programs”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following: “In designating countries under this subclause, the President shall give priority to those countries in which there is a high prevalence of HIV/AIDS and countries with large populations that have a concentrated HIV/AIDS epidemic.”;

(E) by redesignating subclause (X) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph) as subclause (XII);

(F) by inserting after subclause (IX) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B) and amended by subparagraph (D) of this paragraph) the following:

“(X) Working, in partnership with host countries in which the HIV/AIDS epidemic is prevalent among injection drug users, to establish, as a national priority, national HIV/AIDS prevention programs, including education, and services demonstrated to be effective in reducing the transmission of HIV infection among injection drug users without increasing drug use.

“(XI) Working, in partnership with host countries in which the HIV/AIDS epidemic is prevalent among individuals involved in commercial sex acts, to establish, as a national priority, national prevention programs, including education, voluntary testing, and counseling, and referral systems that link HIV/AIDS programs with programs to eradicate trafficking in persons and create alternatives to prostitution.”;

(G) in subclause (XII) (as redesignated by subparagraphs (B) and (E) of this paragraph), by striking “funds section” and inserting “funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under section 401 of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 for HIV/AIDS assistance”;

(H) by adding at the end the following: “(XIII) Publicizing updated drug pricing data to inform pharmaceutical procurement partners’ purchasing decisions.

“(XIV) Working in partnership with host countries in which the HIV/AIDS epidemic is prevalent among men who have sex with men, to establish, as a national priority, national HIV/AIDS prevention programs, including education and services demonstrated to be effective in reducing the transmission of HIV among men who have sex with men.”.

TITLE II—SUPPORT FOR MULTILATERAL FUNDS, PROGRAMS, AND PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

SEC. 201. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.

Section 201(a) of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7621(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “infectious diseases” and inserting “easily preventable and treatable infectious diseases”;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “infectious diseases” and inserting “easily preventable and treatable infectious diseases”.

SEC. 202. PARTICIPATION IN THE GLOBAL FUND TO FIGHT AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS AND MALARIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Subsection (a) of section 202 of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7622) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as paragraphs (7) through (9), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (7) (as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection) the following:

“(1) The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria is the multilateral component of this Act, extending United States efforts to a total of 136 countries around the world.

“(2) Created in 2002, the Global Fund has played a leading role in the fight against HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria around the world and has grown into an organization that currently provides nearly a quarter of all international financing to combat HIV/AIDS and two-thirds of all international financing to combat tuberculosis and malaria.

“(3) By 2010, it is estimated that the demand for funding by the Global Fund will grow in size to between \$6 and \$8 billion annually, requiring significant contributions from donors around the world, including at least \$2 billion annually from the United States.

“(4) The Global Fund is an innovative financing mechanism to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, and has made progress in many areas.

“(5) The United States Government is the largest supporter of the Global Fund, both in terms of resources and technical support.

“(6) The United States made the initial contribution to the Global Fund and is fully committed to its success.”.

(b) UNITED STATES FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Subsection (d)(1) of such section is amended—

(A) by striking “\$1,000,000,000” and inserting “\$2,000,000,000”;

(B) by striking “for the period of fiscal year 2004 beginning on January 1, 2004,” and inserting “for each of the fiscal years 2009 and 2010,”; and

(C) by striking “the fiscal years 2005–2008” and inserting “each of the fiscal years 2011 through 2013”.

(2) LIMITATION.—Subsection (d)(4) of such section is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “fiscal years 2004 through 2008” and inserting “fiscal years 2009 through 2013”;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “fiscal years 2004 through 2008” and inserting “fiscal years 2009 through 2013”;

(iii) in clause (vi)—

(I) by striking “for the purposes” and inserting “For the purposes”;

(II) by striking “fiscal years 2004 through 2008” and inserting “fiscal years 2009 through 2013”;

(III) by striking “fiscal year 2004” and inserting “fiscal year 2009”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(iv)—

(i) by striking “fiscal years 2004 through 2008” and inserting “fiscal years 2009 through 2013”;

(ii) by adding at the end before the period the following: “, unless such amount is made available for more than one fiscal year, in which case such amount is authorized to be made available for such purposes after December 31 of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which such funds first became available.”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)(ii) by striking “Committee on International Relations” and inserting “Committee on Foreign Affairs”.

(3) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—The following shall be the policy of the United States:

(A) Support for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria should be based upon achievement of the following

benchmarks related to transparency and accountability:

(i) As recommended by the Government Accountability Office, the Fund Secretariat has established standardized expectations for the performance of Local Fund Agents (LFAs), is undertaking a systematic assessment of the performance of LFAs, and is making available for public review, according to the Fund Board’s policies and practices on disclosure of information, a regular collection and analysis of performance data of Fund grants, which shall cover both Principal Recipients and sub-recipients.

(ii) A well-staffed, independent Office of the Inspector General reports directly to the Board and is responsible for regular, publicly published audits of both financial and programmatic and reporting aspects of the Fund, its grantees, and LFAs.

(iii) The Fund Secretariat has established and is reporting publicly on standard indicators for all program areas.

(iv) The Fund Secretariat has established a database that tracks all subrecipients and the amounts of funds disbursed to each, as well as the distribution of resources, by grant and Principal Recipient, for prevention, care, treatment, the purchases of drugs and commodities, and other purposes.

(v) The Fund Board has established a penalty to offset tariffs imposed by national governments on all goods and services provided by the Fund.

(vi) The Fund Board has successfully terminated its Administrative Services Agreement with the World Health Organization and completed the Fund Secretariat’s transition to a fully independent status under the Headquarters Agreement the Fund has established with the Government of Switzerland.

(B) Support for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria should be based upon achievement of the following benchmarks related to the founding principles of the Fund:

(i) The Fund must maintain its status as a financing institution.

(ii) The Fund must remain focused on programs directly related to HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis.

(iii) The Fund must maintain its Comprehensive Funding Policy, which requires confirmed pledges to cover the full amount of new grants before the Board approves them.

(iv) The Fund must maintain and make progress on sustaining its multisectoral approach, through Country Coordinating Mechanisms (CCMs) and in the implementation of grants, as reflected in percent and resources allocated to different sectors, including governments, civil society, and faith- and community-based organizations.

(4) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(A) notes that section 625 of Public Law 110–161 establishes a requirement to withhold 20 percent of funds appropriated for the Global Fund if the Global Fund fails to meet certain benchmarks; and

(B) will continue to review the implementation of the benchmarks to ensure accountability and transparency of the Global Fund.

SEC. 203. VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL VACCINE FUNDS.

(a) VACCINE FUND.—Subsection (k) of section 302 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2222) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2004 through 2008” and inserting “fiscal years 2009 through 2013”.

(b) INTERNATIONAL AIDS VACCINE INITIATIVE.—Subsection (l) of such section is amended by striking “fiscal years 2004 through 2008” and inserting “fiscal years 2009 through 2013”.

(c) MALARIA VACCINE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.—Subsection (m) of such section is amended by striking “fiscal years 2004

through 2008” and inserting “fiscal years 2009 through 2013”.

(d) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF A TUBERCULOSIS VACCINE.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) In addition to amounts otherwise available under this section, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to be available for United States contributions to research and development of a tuberculosis vaccine.”.

SEC. 204. PROGRAM TO FACILITATE AVAILABILITY OF MICROBICIDES TO PREVENT TRANSMISSION OF HIV AND OTHER DISEASES.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Congress recognizes the need and urgency to expand the range of interventions for preventing the transmission of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), including nonvaccine prevention methods that can be controlled by women.

(b) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in coordination with the Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally, shall develop and implement a program to facilitate wide-scale availability of microbicides that prevent the transmission of HIV after such microbicides are proven safe and effective.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 401 of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7671) for HIV/AIDS assistance, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to carry out this section.

SEC. 205. PLAN TO COMBAT HIV/AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS, AND MALARIA BY STRENGTHENING HEALTH POLICIES AND HEALTH SYSTEMS OF HOST COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7621 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“**SEC. 204. PLAN TO COMBAT HIV/AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS, AND MALARIA BY STRENGTHENING HEALTH POLICIES AND HEALTH SYSTEMS OF HOST COUNTRIES.**

“(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

“(1) One of the most significant barriers to achieving universal access to HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention in developing countries is the lack of health infrastructure, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa.

“(2) In addition to HIV/AIDS programs, other treatable and preventable infectious diseases could be treated concurrently and easily if health care delivery systems in developing countries were significantly improved.

“(3) More public investment in basic primary health care should be a priority in public spending in developing countries.

“(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States Government—

“(1) to invest appropriate resources authorized under this Act and the amendments made by this Act to carry out activities to strengthen HIV/AIDS health policies and health systems and provide workforce training and capacity-building consistent with the goals and objectives of this Act and the amendments made by this Act; and

“(2) to support the development of a sound policy environment in host countries to increase the ability of such countries to maximize utilization of health care resources

from donor countries, deliver services to the people of such host countries in an effective and efficient manner, and reduce barriers that prevent recipients of services from achieving maximum benefit from such services.

“(C) PLAN REQUIRED.—The Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally, in collaboration with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall develop and implement a plan to combat HIV/AIDS by strengthening health policies and health systems of host countries as part of the United States Agency for International Development’s ‘Health Systems 2020’ project.

“(d) ASSISTANCE TO IMPROVE PUBLIC FINANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury, acting through the head of the Office of Technical Assistance, is authorized to provide assistance for advisors and host country finance, health, and other relevant ministries to improve the effectiveness of public finance management systems in host countries to enable such countries to receive funding to carry out programs to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria and to manage such programs.

“(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 401 for HIV/AIDS assistance, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to carry out this subsection.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7601 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 203 the following:

“Sec. 204. Plan to combat HIV/AIDS by strengthening health policies and health systems of host countries.”.

TITLE III—BILATERAL EFFORTS

Subtitle A—General Assistance and Programs SEC. 301. ASSISTANCE TO COMBAT HIV/AIDS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—

(1) FINDING.—Subsection (a) of section 104A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b-2) is amended by inserting “, South and Southeast Asia, Central and Eastern Europe” after “the Caribbean”.

(2) POLICY.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(A) in the first sentence—

(i) by striking “It is a major” and inserting the following:

“(1) GENERAL POLICY.—It is a major”;

(ii) by striking “control” and inserting “care”; and

(iii) by adding at the end before the period the following: “and to fulfill United States commitments to move toward the goal of universal access to prevention, treatment, and care of HIV/AIDS”;

(B) by adding at the end the following: “The United States and other developed countries should provide assistance for the prevention, treatment, and care of HIV/AIDS to countries in sub-Saharan Africa, the Caribbean, South and Southeast Asia and Central and Eastern Europe, addressing both generalized epidemics and epidemics concentrated among populations at high risk of infection.”; and

(C) by further adding at the end the following:

“(2) SPECIFIC POLICY.—It is therefore the policy of the United States, by 2013, to—

“(A) prevent 12,000,000 new HIV infections worldwide;

“(B) support treatment of at least 3,000,000 individuals with HIV/AIDS with the goal of treating 450,000 children;

“(C) provide care for 12,000,000 individuals affected by HIV/AIDS, including 5,000,000 orphans and vulnerable children in communities affected by HIV/AIDS, including orphans with HIV/AIDS; and

“(D) train at least 140,000 new health care professionals and workers for HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment and care.”.

(3) AUTHORIZATION.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “, South and Southeast Asia, Central and Eastern Europe” after “the Caribbean”; and

(ii) by adding at the end before the period the following: “, and particularly with respect to refugee populations in such countries and areas”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “, South and Southeast Asia, Central and Eastern Europe” after “the Caribbean”; and

(ii) by adding at the end before the period the following: “, and particularly with respect to refugee populations in such countries and areas”;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) ROLE OF PUBLIC HEALTH CARE DELIVERY SYSTEMS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

“(A) the President should provide an appropriate level of assistance under paragraph (1) to help strengthen public health care delivery systems financed by host countries; and

“(B) the President, acting through the Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally, should support the development of a policy framework in such host countries for the long-term sustainability of HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care programs, and for strengthening health care delivery systems and increasing health workforces through recruitment, training, and policies that allows the devolution of clinical responsibilities to increase the work force able to deliver prevention, treatment, and care services, as necessary, with clearly identified objectives and reporting strategies for such services.”;

(E) in paragraph (4) (as redesignated by subparagraph (C) of this paragraph), by striking “foreign countries” and inserting “host countries and donor countries”; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that the Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally and the heads of relevant executive branch agencies (as such term is defined in section 3 of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003) should operate in a manner consistent with the ‘Three Ones’ goals of UNAIDS.

“(B) ‘THREE ONES’ GOALS OF UNAIDS DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “‘Three Ones’” goals of UNAIDS’ means—

“(i) the goal of one agreed HIV/AIDS action framework that provides the basis for coordinating the work of all partners in host countries;

“(ii) the goal of one national HIV/AIDS coordinating authority, with a broad-based multisectoral mandate; and

“(iii) the goal of one agreed country-level data-collection, monitoring, and evaluation system.”.

(4) ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.—

(A) PREVENTION.—Subsection (d)(1) of such section is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting “efforts by faith-based and other nongovernmental organizations and” after “infection, including”;

(II) by inserting “, including access to such programs and efforts in family planning programs supported by the United States Government,” after “health programs”; and

(III) by inserting “male and female” before “condoms”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by inserting “relevant and” after “culturally”;

(II) by inserting “and programs” after “those organizations”; and

(III) by inserting “, level of scientific and fact-based knowledge” after “experience”;

(iii) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “and nonjudgmental approaches” after “protections”;

(iv) by amending subparagraph (E) to read as follows:

“(E) assistance to achieve the target of reaching 80 percent of pregnant women for prevention and treatment of mother-to-child transmission of HIV in countries in which the United States is implementing HIV/AIDS programs by 2013, as described in section 312(b)(1) of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003, and to promote infant feeding options that meet the criteria described in the World Health Organization’s Global Strategy for Infant and Young Child Feeding”;

(v) in subparagraph (G)—

(I) by adding at the end before the semicolon the following: “, including education and services demonstrated to be effective in reducing the transmission of HIV infection without increasing illicit drug use”; and

(II) by striking “and” at the end;

(vi) in subparagraph (H), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(vii) by adding at the end the following:

“(I)(i) assistance for counseling, testing, treatment, care, and support programs for prevention of re-infection of individuals with HIV/AIDS;

“(ii) counseling to prevent sexual transmission of HIV, including skill development for practicing abstinence, reducing the number of sexual partners, and providing information on correct and consistent use of male and female condoms;

“(iii) assistance to provide male and female condoms;

“(iv) diagnosis and treatment of other sexually-transmitted infections;

“(v) strategies that address the stigma and discrimination that impede HIV/AIDS prevention efforts; and

“(vi) assistance to facilitate widespread access to microbicides for HIV prevention, as safe and effective products become available, including financial and technical support for culturally appropriate introductory programs, procurement, distribution, logistics management, program delivery, acceptability studies, provider training, demand generation, and post-introduction monitoring; and

“(J) assistance for HIV/AIDS education targeted to reach and prevent the spread of HIV among men who have sex with men.”.

(B) TREATMENT.—Subsection (d)(2) of such section is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; and” at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) assistance specifically to address barriers that might limit the start of and adherence to treatment services, especially in

rural areas, through such measures as mobile and decentralized distribution of treatment services, and where feasible and necessary, direct linkages with nutrition and income security programs, referrals to services for victims of violence, support groups for individuals with HIV/AIDS, and efforts to combat stigma and discrimination against all such individuals;

“(E) assistance to support comprehensive HIV/AIDS treatment (including free prophylaxis and treatment for common HIV/AIDS-related opportunistic infections) for at least one-third of individuals with HIV/AIDS in the poorest countries worldwide who are in clinical need of antiretroviral treatment; and

“(F) assistance to improve access to psychosocial support systems and other necessary services for youth who are infected with HIV to ensure the start of and adherence to treatment services.”.

(C) MONITORING.—Subsection (d)(4) of such section is amended—

(i) by striking “The monitoring” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The monitoring”;

(ii) by inserting “and paragraph (8)” after “paragraphs (1) through (3)”;

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as clauses (i) through (iv), respectively;

(iv) in clause (iii) (as redesignated by clause (iii) of this subparagraph), by striking “and” at the end;

(v) in clause (iv) (as redesignated by clause (iii) of this subparagraph), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(vi) by adding at the end the following:

“(v) carrying out and expanding program monitoring, impact evaluation research, and operations research (including research and evaluations of gender-responsive interventions, disaggregated by age and sex, in order to identify and replicate effective models, develop gender indicators to measure both outcomes and impacts of interventions, especially interventions designed to reduce gender inequalities, and collect lessons learned for dissemination among different countries) in order to—

“(I) improve the coverage, efficiency, effectiveness, quality and accessibility of services provided under this section;

“(II) establish the cost-effectiveness of program models;

“(III) assess the population-level impact of programs, projects, and activities implemented;

“(IV) ensure the transparency and accountability of services provided under this section;

“(V) disseminate and promote the utilization of evaluation findings, lessons, and best practices in the implementation of programs, projects, and activities supported under this section; and

“(VI) encourage and evaluate innovative service models and strategies to optimize functionality of programs, projects, and activities.”; and

(vii) by further adding at the end the following:

“(B) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(v)—

“(i) the term ‘impact evaluation research’ means the application of research methods and statistical analysis to measure the extent to which a change in a population-based outcome can be attributed to a program, project, or activity as opposed to other factors in the environment;

“(ii) the term ‘program monitoring’ means the collection, analysis, and use of routine data with respect to a program, project, or activity to determine how well the program, project, or activity is carried out and at what cost; and

“(iii) the term ‘operations research’ means the application of social science research methods and statistical analysis to judge, compare, and improve policy outcomes and outcomes of a program, project, or activity, from the earliest stages of defining and designing the program, project, or activity through the development and implementation of the program, project, or activity.”.

(D) PHARMACEUTICALS.—Subsection (d)(5) of such section is amended—

(i) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) MECHANISMS TO ENSURE COST-EFFECTIVE DRUG PURCHASING.—Mechanisms to ensure that pharmaceuticals, including antiretrovirals and medicines to treat opportunistic infections, are purchased at the lowest possible price at which such pharmaceuticals may be obtained in sufficient quantity on the world market.”.

(E) REFERRAL SYSTEMS AND COORDINATION WITH OTHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—

(i) FINDING.—The effectiveness of all HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care programs and the survival of individuals with HIV/AIDS would be enhanced by ensuring that such individuals are referred to appropriate support programs, including education, income generation, HIV/AIDS support group and food and nutrition programs, and by providing assistance directly to such programs to the extent such programs would further the purposes of expanding access to and the success of HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care.

(ii) AMENDMENT.—Subsection (d) of such section is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) REFERRAL SYSTEMS AND COORDINATION WITH OTHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—

“(A) REFERRAL SYSTEMS.—Assistance to ensure that a continuum of care is available to individuals participating in HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care programs through the development of referral systems for such individuals to community-based programs that, where practicable, are co-located with such HIV/AIDS programs, and that provide support activities for such individuals, including HIV/AIDS treatment adherence, HIV/AIDS support groups, food and nutrition support, maternal health services, substance abuse prevention and treatment services, income-generation programs, legal services, and other program support.

“(B) COORDINATION WITH OTHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—

“(i)(I) Assistance to integrate HIV/AIDS testing with testing for other easily detectable and treatable infectious diseases, such as malaria, tuberculosis, and respiratory infections, and to provide treatment if possible or referral to appropriate treatment programs.

“(II) Assistance to provide, whenever possible, as a component of HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care services, and co-treatment of curable diseases, such as other sexually transmitted diseases.

“(III) Assistance and other activities to ensure, through interagency and international coordination, that United States global HIV/AIDS programs are integrated and complementary to delivering related health services.

“(ii) Assistance to support schools and related programs for children and youth that increase the effectiveness of programs described in this subsection by providing the infrastructure, teachers, and other support to such programs.

“(iii) Assistance and other activities to provide access to HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care programs in family planning and maternal and child health pro-

grams supported by the United States Government.

“(iv) Assistance to United States and host country nonprofit development organizations that directly support livelihood initiatives in HIV/AIDS-affected countries that provide opportunities for direct lending to microentrepreneurs by United States citizens or opportunities for United States citizens to purchase livestock and plants for families to provide nutrition and generate income for individual households and communities.

“(v) Assistance to coordinate and provide linkages between HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care programs with efforts to improve the economic and legal status of women and girls.

“(vi) Technical assistance coordinated across implementing agencies, offered on a regular basis, and made available upon request, for faith-based and community-based organizations, especially indigenous organizations and new partners who do not have extensive experience managing United States foreign assistance programs, including for training and logistical support to establish financial mechanisms to track program receipts and expenditures and data management systems to ensure data quality and strengthen reporting.

“(vii) In accordance with the World Health Organization’s Interim Policy on TB/HIV Activities (2004), assistance to individuals with or symptomatic of tuberculosis, and assistance to implement the following:

“(I) Provide opt-out HIV/AIDS counseling and testing and appropriate referral for treatment and care to individuals with or symptomatic of tuberculosis, and work with host countries to ensure that such individuals in host countries are provided such services.

“(II) Ensure, in coordination with host countries, that individuals with HIV/AIDS receive tuberculosis screening and other appropriate treatment.

“(III) Provide increased funding for HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis activities, by increasing total resources for such activities, including lab strengthening and infection control.

“(IV) Improve the management and dissemination of knowledge gained from HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis activities to increase the replication of best practices.”.

(5) ANNUAL REPORT.—Subsection (e) of such section is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “Committee on International Relations” and inserting “Committee on Foreign Affairs”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “including” and inserting “including—”;

(II) by striking clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting the following:

“(i)(I) the effectiveness of such programs in reducing the transmission of HIV, particularly in women and girls, in reducing mother-to-child transmission of HIV, including through drug treatment and therapies, either directly or by referral, and in reducing mortality rates from HIV/AIDS, including through drug treatment, and addiction therapies;

“(II) a description of strategies, goals, programs, and interventions to address the specific needs and vulnerabilities of young women and young men; the progress toward expanding access among young women and young men to evidence-based, comprehensive

HIV/AIDS health care services and HIV prevention and sexuality and abstinence education programs at the individual, community, and national levels; and clear targets for integrating adolescents who are orphans, including adolescents who are infected with HIV, into programs for orphans and vulnerable children; and

“(III) the amount of United States funding provided under the authorities of this Act to procure drugs for HIV/AIDS programs in countries described in section 1(f)(2)(B)(IX) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(f)(2)(B)(VIII)), including a detailed description of antiretroviral drugs procured, including—

“(aa) the total amount expended for each generic and name brand drug;

“(bb) the price paid per unit of each drug; and

“(cc) the vendor from which each drug was purchased; and

“(ii) the progress made toward improving health care delivery systems (including the training of adequate numbers of health care professionals) and infrastructure to ensure increased access to care and treatment, including a description of progress toward—

“(I)(aa) the training and retention of adequate numbers of health care professionals in order to meet a nationally-determined ratio of doctors, nurses, and midwives to patients, based on the target of the 2.3 per-thousand ratio established by the World Health Organization (WHO);

“(bb) increases in the number of other health care professions, such as pharmacists and lab technicians, as necessary; and

“(cc) the improvement of infrastructure needed to ensure universal access to HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care by 2015;

“(II) national health care workforce strategy benchmarks, as required by section 202(d)(5)(B) of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003, United States contributions to developing and implementing the benchmarks, and main challenges to implementing the benchmarks;

“(III) ensuring, to the extent practicable, that health care workers providing services under this Act have safe working conditions and are receiving health care services, including services relating to HIV/AIDS;

“(IV) activities to strengthen health care systems in order to overcome obstacles and barriers to the provision of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria services;

“(V) improving integration and coordination of HIV/AIDS programs with related health care services and supporting the capacity of health care programs to refer individuals to community-based services; and

“(VI) strengthening procurement and supply chain management systems of host countries;”;

(III) in clause (iii), by adding at the end before the semicolon the following: “, including the percentage of such United States foreign assistance provided for diagnosis and treatment of individuals with tuberculosis in countries with the highest burden of tuberculosis, as determined by the World Health Organization (WHO)”;

(IV) in clause (iv), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) a description of efforts to integrate HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis prevention, treatment, and care programs, including—

“(i) the number and percentage of HIV-infected individuals receiving HIV/AIDS treatment or care services who are also receiving screening and subsequent treatment for tuberculosis;

“(ii) the number and percentage of individuals with tuberculosis who are receiving

HIV/AIDS counseling and testing, and appropriate referral to HIV/AIDS services;

“(iii) the number and location of laboratories with the capacity to perform tuberculosis culture tests and tuberculosis drug susceptibility tests;

“(iv) the number and location of laboratories with the capacity to perform appropriate tests for multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) and extensively drug resistant tuberculosis (XDR-TB); and

“(v) the number of HIV-infected individuals suspected of having tuberculosis who are provided tuberculosis culture diagnosis or tuberculosis drug susceptibility testing;

“(E) a description of coordination efforts with relevant executive branch agencies (as such term is defined in section 3 of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003) and at the global level in the effort to link HIV/AIDS services with non-HIV/AIDS services;

“(F) a description of programs serving women and girls, including—

“(i) a description of HIV/AIDS prevention programs that address the vulnerabilities of girls and women to HIV/AIDS; and

“(ii) information on the number of individuals served by programs aimed at reducing the vulnerabilities of women and girls to HIV/AIDS;

“(G) a description of the specific strategies funded to ensure the reduction of HIV infection among injection drug users, and the number of injection drug users, by country, reached by such strategies, including medication-assisted drug treatment for individuals with HIV or at risk of HIV, and HIV prevention programs demonstrated to be effective in reducing HIV transmission without increasing drug use; and

“(H) a detailed description of monitoring, impact evaluation research, and operations research of programs, projects, and activities carried out pursuant to subsection (d)(4)(A)(v).”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally shall make publicly available on the Internet website of the Office of the Coordinator the information contained in paragraph (2)(H) of each report and, in addition, the individual evaluations and other reports that were the basis of such information, including lessons learned and collected in such evaluations and reports.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 301 of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7631) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “fiscal years 2004 through 2008” and inserting “fiscal years 2009 through 2013”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “fiscal years 2004 through 2008” and inserting “fiscal years 2009 through 2013”.

(c) FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION SUPPORT.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows:

“(c) FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION SUPPORT.—

“(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

“(A) The United States provides more than 60 percent of all food assistance worldwide.

“(B) According to the United Nations World Food Program and other United Nations agencies, food insecurity of individuals with HIV/AIDS is a major problem in countries with large populations of such individuals, particularly in sub-Saharan African countries.

“(C) Individuals infected with HIV have higher nutritional requirements than individuals who are not infected with HIV, par-

ticularly with respect to the need for protein. Also, there is evidence to suggest that the full benefit of therapy to treat HIV/AIDS may not be achieved in individuals who are malnourished, particularly in pregnant and lactating women.

“(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

“(A) malnutrition, especially for individuals with HIV/AIDS, is a clinical health issue with wider nutrition, health, and social implications for such individuals, their families, and their communities that must be addressed by United States HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care programs;

“(B) food security and nutrition directly impact an individual’s vulnerability to HIV infection, the progression of HIV to AIDS, an individual’s ability to begin an antiretroviral medication treatment regimen, the efficacy of an antiretroviral medication treatment regimen once an individual begins such a regimen, and the ability of communities to effectively cope with the HIV/AIDS epidemic and its impacts;

“(C) international guidelines established by the World Health Organization (WHO) should serve as the reference standard for HIV/AIDS food and nutrition activities supported by this Act and the amendments made by this Act;

“(D) the Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development should make it a priority to work together and with other United States Government agencies, donors, and multilateral institutions to increase the integration of food and nutrition support and livelihood activities into HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care activities funded by the United States and other governments and organizations;

“(E) for purposes of determining which individuals infected with HIV should be provided with nutrition and food support—

“(i) children with moderate or severe malnutrition, according to WHO standards, shall be given priority for such nutrition and food support; and

“(ii) adults with a body mass index (BMI) of 18.5 or less, or at the prevailing WHO-approved measurement for BMI, should be considered ‘malnourished’ and should be given priority for such nutrition and food support;

“(F) programs funded by the United States should include therapeutic and supplementary feeding, food, and nutrition support and should include strong links to development programs that provide support for livelihoods; and

“(G) the inability of individuals with HIV/AIDS to access food for themselves or their families should not be allowed to impair or erode the therapeutic status of such individuals with respect to HIV/AIDS or related comorbidities.

“(3) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to—

“(A) address the food and nutrition needs of individuals with HIV/AIDS and affected individuals, including orphans and vulnerable children;

“(B) fully integrate food and nutrition support into HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care programs carried out under this Act and the amendments made by this Act;

“(C) ensure, to the extent practicable, that—

“(i) HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care providers and health care workers are adequately trained so that such providers and workers can provide accurate and informed information regarding food and nutrition support to individuals enrolled in treatment and care programs and individuals affected by HIV/AIDS; and

“(ii) individuals with HIV/AIDS who, with their households, are identified as food insecure are provided with adequate food and nutrition support; and

“(D) effectively link food and nutrition support provided under this Act and the amendments made by this Act to individuals with HIV/AIDS, their households, and their communities, to other food security and livelihood programs funded by the United States and other donors and multilateral agencies.

“(4) INTEGRATION OF FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION ACTIVITIES INTO HIV/AIDS PREVENTION, TREATMENT, AND CARE ACTIVITIES.—

“(A) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO GLOBAL AIDS COORDINATOR.—Consistent with the statement of policy described in paragraph (3), the Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally shall—

“(i) ensure, to the extent practicable, that—

“(I) an assessment, using validated criteria, of the food security and nutritional status of each individual enrolled in antiretroviral medication treatment programs supported with funds authorized under this Act or any amendment made by this Act is carried out; and

“(II) appropriate nutritional counseling is provided to each individual described in subclause (I);

“(ii) coordinate with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the heads of other relevant executive branch agencies to—

“(I) ensure, to the extent practicable, that, in communities in which a significant proportion of individuals with HIV/AIDS are in need of food and nutrition support, a status and needs assessment for such support employing validated criteria is conducted and a plan to provide such support is developed and implemented;

“(II) improve and enhance coordination between food security and livelihood programs for individuals infected with HIV in host countries and food security and livelihood programs that may already exist in such countries;

“(III) establish effective linkages between the health and agricultural development and livelihoods sectors in order to enhance food security; and

“(IV) ensure, by providing increased resources if necessary, effective coordination between activities authorized under this Act and the amendments made by this Act and activities carried out under other provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 when establishing new HIV/AIDS treatment sites;

“(iii) develop effective, validated indicators that measure outcomes of nutrition and food security interventions carried out under this section and use such indicators to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of such interventions; and

“(iv) evaluate the role of and, to the extent appropriate, support and expand partnerships and linkages between United States postsecondary educational institutions with postsecondary educational institutions in host countries in order to provide training and build indigenous human and institutional capacity and expertise to respond to HIV/AIDS, and to improve capacity to address nutrition, food security, and livelihood needs of HIV/AIDS-affected and impoverished communities.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO USAID ADMINISTRATOR.—Consistent with the statement of policy described in paragraph (3), the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in coordination with the Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally and the Secretary of Agriculture,

shall provide, to the extent practicable, as an essential component of antiretroviral medication treatment programs supported with funds authorized under this Act and the amendments made by this Act, food and nutrition support to each individual with HIV/AIDS who is determined to need such support by the assessing health professional, based on a body mass index (BMI) of 18.5 or less, or at the prevailing WHO-approved measurement for BMI, and the individual's household, for a period of not less than 180 days, either directly or through referral to an assistance program or organization with demonstrable ability to provide such support.

“(C) REPORT.—Not later than October 31, 2010, and annually thereafter, the Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the implementation of this subsection for the prior fiscal year. The report shall include a description of—

“(i) the effectiveness of interventions carried out to improve the nutritional status of individuals with HIV/AIDS;

“(ii) the amount of funds provided for food and nutrition support for individuals with HIV/AIDS and affected individuals in the prior fiscal year and the projected amount of funds to be provided for such purpose for next fiscal year; and

“(iii) a strategy for improving the linkage between assistance provided with funds authorized under this subsection and food security and livelihood programs under other provisions of law as well as activities funded by other donors and multilateral organizations.

“(D) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 401 for HIV/AIDS assistance, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to carry out this subsection.”

(d) ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

“(d) ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE.—An organization, including a faith-based organization, that is otherwise eligible to receive assistance under section 104A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as added by subsection (a)) or under any other provision of this Act (or any amendment made by this Act or the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008) to prevent, treat, or monitor HIV/AIDS—

“(1) shall not be required, as a condition of receiving the assistance, to endorse or utilize a multisectoral approach to combating HIV/AIDS, or to endorse, utilize, make a referral to, become integrated with or otherwise participate in any program or activity to which the organization has a religious or moral objection; and

“(2) shall not be discriminated against in the solicitation or issuance of grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under such provisions of law for refusing to do so.”

(e) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Such section is further amended by striking subsection (g).

(f) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report identifying a target for the number of additional health professionals and workers needed in host coun-

tries to provide HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care and the training needs of such health professionals and workers. The target should reflect available data and should identify the need for United States Government contributions to meet the target.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7602).

SEC. 302. ASSISTANCE TO COMBAT TUBERCULOSIS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Subsection (a) of section 104B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b-3) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(1) Tuberculosis is one of the greatest infectious causes of death of adults worldwide, killing 1.6 million individuals per year—one person every 20 seconds.

“(2) Tuberculosis is the leading infectious cause of death among individuals who are infected with HIV due to their weakened immune systems, and it is estimated that one-third of such individuals have tuberculosis. Tuberculosis is also a leading killer of women of reproductive age.

“(3) Driven by the HIV/AIDS pandemic, incidence rates of tuberculosis in sub-Saharan Africa have more than doubled on average since 1990. The problem is so pervasive that in August 2005, African health ministers and the World Health Organization (WHO) declared tuberculosis to be an emergency in sub-Saharan Africa.

“(4)(A) The wide extent of drug resistance, including both multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) and extensively drug resistant tuberculosis (XDR-TB), represents both a critical challenge to the global control of tuberculosis and a serious worldwide public health threat.

“(B) XDR-TB, which is a form of MDR-TB with additional resistance to multiple second-line anti-tuberculosis drugs, is associated with worst treatment outcomes of any form of tuberculosis.

“(C) XDR-TB is converging with the HIV/AIDS epidemic, undermining gains in HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment programs and requires urgent interventions.

“(D) Drug resistance surveillance reports have confirmed the serious scale and spread of tuberculosis, with XDR-TB strains confirmed on six continents.

“(E) Demonstrating the lethality of XDR-TB, an initial outbreak in Tugela Ferry, South Africa, in 2006 killed 52 of 53 patients with hundreds more cases reported since that time.

“(F) Of the world's regions, sub-Saharan Africa, faces the greatest gap in capacity to prevent, treat, and care for individuals with XDR-TB.”

(2) POLICY.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

“(b) POLICY.—It is a major objective of the foreign assistance program of the United States to control tuberculosis. In all countries in which the Government of the United States has established development programs, particularly in countries with the highest burden of tuberculosis and other countries with high rates of tuberculosis, the United States Government should prioritize the achievement of the following goals by not later than December 31, 2015:

“(1) Reduce by one-half the tuberculosis death and disease burden from the 1990 baseline.

“(2) Sustain or exceed the detection of at least 70 percent of sputum smear-positive

cases of tuberculosis and the cure of at least 85 percent of such cases detected.”.

(3) **ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.**—Such section is further amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (d) through (f) as subsections (e) through (g); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) **ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.**—Assistance provided under subsection (c) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be used to carry out the following activities:

“(1) Provide diagnostic counseling and testing to individuals with HIV/AIDS for tuberculosis (including a culture diagnosis to rule out multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) and extensively drug resistant tuberculosis (XDR-TB) and provide HIV/AIDS voluntary counseling and testing to individuals with any form of tuberculosis.

“(2) Provide tuberculosis treatment to individuals receiving treatment and care for HIV/AIDS who have active tuberculosis and provide prophylactic treatment to individuals with HIV/AIDS who also have a latent tuberculosis infection.

“(3) Link individuals with both HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis to HIV/AIDS treatment and care services, including antiretroviral therapy and cotrimoxazole therapy.

“(4) Ensure that health care workers trained to diagnose, treat, and provide care for HIV/AIDS are also trained to diagnose, treat, and provide care for individuals with both HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis.

“(5) Ensure that individuals with active pulmonary tuberculosis are provided a culture diagnosis, including drug susceptibility testing to rule out multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) and extensively drug resistant tuberculosis (XDR-TB) in areas with high prevalence of tuberculosis drug resistance.”.

(4) **PRIORITY TO STOP TB STRATEGY.**—Subsection (f) of such section (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection) is amended—

(A) by amending the heading to read as follows: “PRIORITY TO STOP TB STRATEGY”;

(B) in the first sentence, by striking “In furnishing” and all that follows through “, including funding” and inserting the following:

“(1) **PRIORITY.**—In furnishing assistance under subsection (c), the President shall give priority to—

“(A) activities described in the Stop TB Strategy, including expansion and enhancement of Directly Observed Treatment Short-course (DOTS) coverage, treatment for individuals infected with both tuberculosis and HIV and treatment for individuals with multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB), strengthening of health systems, use of the International Standards for Tuberculosis Care by all care providers, empowering individuals with tuberculosis, and enabling and promoting research to develop new diagnostics, drugs, and vaccines, and program-based operational research relating to tuberculosis; and

“(B) funding”; and

(C) in the second sentence—

(i) by striking “In order to” and all that follows through “not less than” and inserting the following:

“(2) **AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.**—In order to meet the requirements of paragraph (1), the President—

“(A) shall ensure that not less than”;

(ii) by striking “for Directly Observed Treatment Short-course (DOTS) coverage and treatment of multi-drug resistant tuberculosis using DOTS-Plus,” and inserting “to implement the Stop TB Strategy; and”;

(iii) by striking “including” and all that follows and inserting the following:

“(B) should ensure that not less than \$15,000,000 of the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year is used to make a contribution to the Global Tuberculosis Drug Facility.”.

(5) **ASSISTANCE FOR WHO AND THE STOP TUBERCULOSIS PARTNERSHIP.**—Such section is further amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (g) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection) as subsection (h); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (f) (as redesignated by paragraph (4) and amended by paragraph (5) of this subsection) the following new subsection:

“(g) **ASSISTANCE FOR WHO AND THE STOP TUBERCULOSIS PARTNERSHIP.**—In carrying out this section, the President, acting through the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, is authorized to provide increased resources to the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Stop Tuberculosis Partnership to improve the capacity of countries with high rates of tuberculosis and other affected countries to implement the Stop TB Strategy and specific strategies related to addressing extensively drug resistant tuberculosis (XDR-TB).”.

(6) **DEFINITIONS.**—Subsection (h) of such section (as redesignated by paragraph (5)(A) of this subsection) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end before the period the following: “, including low cost and effective diagnosis and evaluation of treatment regimes, vaccines, and monitoring of tuberculosis, as well as a reliable drug supply, and a management strategy for public health systems, with health system strengthening, promotion of the use of the International Standards for Tuberculosis Care by all care providers, bacteriology under an external quality assessment framework, short-course chemotherapy, and sound reporting and recording systems”; and

(B) by adding after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

“(6) **STOP TB STRATEGY.**—The term ‘Stop TB Strategy’ means the six-point strategy to reduce tuberculosis developed by the World Health Organization. The strategy is described in the Global Plan to Stop TB 2007–2016: Actions for Life, a comprehensive plan developed by the Stop Tuberculosis Partnership that sets out the actions necessary to achieve the millennium development goal of cutting tuberculosis deaths and disease burden in half by 2016.”.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 302(b) of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7632(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2004 through 2008” and inserting “\$4,000,000,000 for fiscal years 2009 through 2013”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “fiscal years 2004 through 2008” and inserting “fiscal years 2009 through 2013”.

SEC. 303. ASSISTANCE TO COMBAT MALARIA.

(a) **AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.**—Section 104C(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 21516-4(b)) is amended by striking “control, and cure” and inserting “treatment, and care”.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 303(b) of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7633(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2004 through 2008” and inserting “\$5,000,000,000 for fiscal years 2009 through 2013”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “fiscal years 2004 through 2008” and inserting “fiscal years 2009 through 2013”.

(c) **DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE FIVE-YEAR STRATEGY.**—Section 303 of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7633) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE FIVE-YEAR STRATEGY.**—The President shall establish a comprehensive, five-year strategy to combat global malaria that strengthens the capacity of the United States to be an effective leader of international efforts to reduce the global malaria disease burden. Such strategy shall maintain sufficient flexibility and remain responsive to the ever-changing nature of the global malaria challenge and shall—

“(1) include specific objectives, multisectoral approaches and strategies to treat and provide care to individuals infected with malaria, to prevent the further spread of malaria;

“(2) describe how this strategy would contribute to the United States’ overall global health and development goals;

“(3) clearly explain how proposed activities to combat malaria will be coordinated with other United States global health activities, including the five-year global HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis strategies developed pursuant to section 101 of this Act;

“(4) expand public-private partnerships and leveraging of resources to combat malaria, including private sector resources;

“(5) coordinate among relevant executive branch agencies providing assistance to combat malaria in order to maximize human and financial resources and reduce unnecessary duplication among such agencies and other donors;

“(6) maximize United States capabilities in the areas of technical assistance, training, and research, including vaccine research, to combat malaria; and

“(7) establish priorities and selection criteria for the distribution of resources to combat malaria based on factors such as the size and demographics of the population with malaria, the needs of that population, the host countries’ existing infrastructure, and the host countries’ ability to complement United States efforts with strategies outlined in national malaria control plans.

“(e) **MALARIA RESPONSE COORDINATOR.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There should be established within the United States Agency for International Development a Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat Malaria Globally, who should be appointed by the President.

“(2) **AUTHORITIES.**—The Coordinator, acting through such nongovernmental organizations and relevant executive branch agencies as may be necessary and appropriate to effect the purposes of section 104C of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 21516-4), is authorized—

“(A) to operate internationally to carry out prevention, treatment, care, support, capacity development of health systems, and other activities for combating malaria;

“(B) to transfer and allocate funds to relevant executive branch agencies;

“(C) to provide grants to, and enter into contracts with, nongovernmental organizations to carry out the purposes of such section 104C;

“(D) to enter into contracts and transfer and allocate funds to international organizations to carry out the purposes of such section 104C; and

“(E) to coordinate with a public-private partnership to discover and develop effective new antimalarial drugs, including drugs for

multi-drug resistant malaria and malaria in pregnant women.

“(3) DUTIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Coordinator shall have primary responsibility for the oversight and coordination of all resources and global United States government activities to combat malaria.

“(B) SPECIFIC DUTIES.—The Coordinator shall—

“(i) facilitate program and policy coordination among relevant executive branch agencies and nongovernmental organizations, including auditing, monitoring and evaluation of such programs;

“(ii) ensure that each relevant executive branch agency has sufficient resources to execute programs in areas in which the agency has the greatest expertise, technical capability, and potential for success;

“(iii) coordinate with the Office of the Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally and equivalent managers of other relevant executive branch agencies that are implementing global health programs to develop and implement program plans, country-level interactions, and recipient administrative requirements in countries in which more than one program operates;

“(iv) coordinate relevant executive branch agency activities in the field, including coordination of planning, implementation, and evaluation of malaria programs with HIV/AIDS programs in countries in which both programs are being carried out;

“(v) pursue coordinate program implementation with host governments, other donors, and the private sector; and

“(vi) establish due diligence criteria for all recipients of funds appropriated pursuant to the authorizations of appropriations under section 401 for malaria assistance.

“(f) ASSISTANCE TO WHO.—In carrying out this section, the President is authorized to make a United States contribution to the Roll Back Malaria Partnership and the World Health Organization (WHO) to improve the capacity of countries with high rates of malaria and other affected countries to implement comprehensive malaria control programs.

“(g) ANNUAL REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008, and annually thereafter, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on United States assistance for the prevention, treatment, control, and elimination of malaria.

“(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include a description of—

“(A) the countries and activities to which malaria assistance has been allocated;

“(B) the number of people reached through malaria assistance programs;

“(C) the percentage and number of children and mothers reached through malaria assistance programs;

“(D) research efforts to develop new tools to combat malaria, including drugs and vaccines;

“(E) collaboration with the World Health Organization (WHO), the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, other donor governments, and relevant executive branch agencies to combat malaria;

“(F) quantified impact of United States assistance on childhood morbidity and mortality;

“(G) the number of children who received immunizations through malaria assistance programs; and

“(H) the number of women receiving antenatal care through malaria assistance programs.”.

SEC. 304. HEALTH CARE PARTNERSHIPS TO COMBAT HIV/AIDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7631 et seq.) is amended by striking section 304 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 304. HEALTH CARE PARTNERSHIPS TO COMBAT HIV/AIDS.

“(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the use of health care partnerships that link United States and host country health care institutions create opportunities for sharing of knowledge and expertise among individuals with significant experience in health-related fields and build local capacity to combat HIV/AIDS and increase scientific understanding of the progression of HIV/AIDS and the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

“(b) AUTHORITY TO FACILITATE HEALTH CARE PARTNERSHIPS TO COMBAT HIV/AIDS.—The President, acting through the Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally, shall facilitate the development of health care partnerships described in subsection (a) by—

“(1) supporting short- and long-term institutional partnerships, including partnerships that build capacity in ministries of health, central- and district-level health agencies, medical facilities, health education and training institutions, academic centers, and faith- and community-based organizations involved in prevention, treatment, and care of HIV/AIDS;

“(2) supporting the development of consultation services using appropriate technologies, including online courses, DVDs, telecommunications services, and other technologies to eliminate the barriers that prevent host country professionals from accessing high quality health care services information, particularly providers located in rural areas;

“(3) supporting the placements of highly qualified individuals to strengthen human and organizational capacity through the use of health care professionals to facilitate skills transfer, building local capacity, and to expand rapidly the pool of providers, managers, and other health care staff delivering HIV/AIDS services in host countries; and

“(4) meeting individual country needs and, where possible, insisting on the implementation of a national strategic plan, by providing training and mentoring to strengthen human and organizational capacity among local health care service organizations.

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 401 for HIV/AIDS assistance, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to carry out this section.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7601 note) is amended by striking the item relating to section 304 and inserting the following new item:

“Sec. 304. Health care partnerships to combat HIV/AIDS.”.

Subtitle B—Assistance for Women, Children, and Families

SEC. 311. POLICY AND REQUIREMENTS.

(a) POLICY.—Subsection (a) of section 312 of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7652) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “The United States Government’s” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States”; and (2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) COLLABORATION.—The United States should work in collaboration with governments, donors, the private sector, nongovernmental organizations, and other key stakeholders to carry out the policy described in paragraph (1).”.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

“(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The 5-year United States strategy required by section 101 of this Act shall—

“(1) establish a target for prevention and treatment of mother-to-child transmission of HIV that by 2013 will reach at least 80 percent of pregnant women in those countries most affected by HIV/AIDS;

“(2) establish a target requiring that by 2013 up to 15 percent of individuals receiving care and up to 15 percent of individuals receiving treatment under this Act and the amendments made by this Act are children;

“(3) integrate care and treatment with prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV programs in order to improve outcomes for HIV-affected women and families as soon as is feasible, consistent with the national government policies of countries in which programs under this Act are administered, and including support for strategies to ensure successful follow-up and continuity of care;

“(4) expand programs designed to care for children orphaned by HIV/AIDS;

“(5) develop a timeline for expanding access to more effective regimes to prevent mother-to-child transmission of HIV, consistent with the national government policies of countries in which programs under this Act are administered and the goal of achieving universal use of such regimens as soon as possible;

“(6) ensure that women receiving voluntary contraceptive counseling, services, or commodities in programs supported by the United States Government have access to the full range of HIV/AIDS services; and

“(7) ensure that women in prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV programs are provided with appropriate maternal and child services, either directly or by referral.”.

SEC. 312. ANNUAL REPORTS ON PREVENTION OF MOTHER-TO-CHILD TRANSMISSION OF THE HIV INFECTION.

Section 313(a) of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7653(a)) is amended by striking “5 years” and inserting “10 years”.

SEC. 313. STRATEGY TO PREVENT HIV INFECTIONS AMONG WOMEN AND YOUTH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7631 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 316. STRATEGY TO PREVENT HIV INFECTIONS AMONG WOMEN AND YOUTH.

“(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—In order to meet the United States Government’s goal of preventing 12,000,000 new HIV infections worldwide, it shall be the policy of the United States to pursue a global HIV/AIDS prevention strategy that emphasizes the immediate and ongoing needs of women and youth and addresses the factors that lead to gender disparities in the rate of HIV infection.

“(b) STRATEGY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall formulate a comprehensive, integrated, and culturally-appropriate global HIV/AIDS prevention strategy that, to the extent epidemiologically appropriate, addresses the vulnerabilities of women and youth to HIV

infection and seeks to reduce the factors that lead to gender disparities in the rate of HIV infection.

“(2) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required under paragraph (1) shall include specific goals and targets under the 5-year strategy outlined in section 101 and shall include comprehensive HIV/AIDS prevention education at the individual and national level including the ABC (‘Abstain, Be faithful, use Condoms’) model as a means to reduce HIV infections and shall include the following:

“(A) Specific goals under the five-year strategy outlined in section 101.

“(B) Empowering women and youth to avoid cross-generational sex and to decide when and whom to marry in order to reduce the incidence of early or child marriage.

“(C) Dramatically increasing access to currently available female-controlled prevention methods and including investments in training to increase the effective and consistent use of both male and female condoms.

“(D) Accelerating the de-stigmatization of HIV/AIDS among women and youth as a major risk factor for the transmission of HIV.

“(E) Addressing and preventing post-traumatic and psycho-social consequences and providing post-exposure prophylaxis to victims of gender-based violence and rape against women and youth through appropriate medical, social, educational, and legal assistance and through prosecutions and legal penalties to address such violence.

“(F) Promoting changes in male attitudes and behavior that respect the human rights of women and youth and that support and foster gender equality.

“(G) Supporting the development of micro-enterprise initiatives, job training programs, and other such efforts to assist women in developing and retaining independent economic means.

“(H) Supporting universal basic education and expanded educational opportunities for women and youth.

“(I) Protecting the property and inheritance rights of women.

“(J) Coordinating inclusion of HIV/AIDS prevention information and education services and programs for individuals with HIV/AIDS with existing health care services targeted to women and youth, such as ensuring access to HIV/AIDS education and testing in family planning programs supported by the United States Government and programs to reduce mother-to-child transmission of HIV, and expanding the reach of such HIV/AIDS health services.

“(K) Promoting gender equality by supporting the development of nongovernmental organizations, including faith-based and community-based organizations, that support the needs of women and utilizing such organizations that are already empowering women and youth at the community level.

“(L) Encouraging the creation and effective enforcement of legal frameworks that guarantee women equal rights and equal protection under the law.

“(M) Encouraging the participation and involvement of women in drafting, coordinating, and implementing the national HIV/AIDS strategic plans of their countries.

“(N) Responding to other economic and social factors that increase the vulnerability of women and youth to HIV infection.

“(3) TRANSMISSION TO CONGRESS AND PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees and make available to the public the strategy required under paragraph (1).

“(c) COORDINATION.—In formulating and implementing the strategy required under subsection (b), the President shall ensure that the United States coordinates its overall HIV/AIDS policy and programs with the national governments of the countries for which the United States provides assistance to combat HIV/AIDS and, to the extent practicable, with international organizations, other donor countries, and indigenous organizations, including faith-based and community-based organizations specifically for the purposes of ensuring gender equality and promoting respect of the human rights of women that impact their susceptibility to HIV/AIDS, improving women’s health, and expanding education for women and youth, and organizations, including faith-based and other nonprofit organizations, providing services to and advocating on behalf of individuals with HIV/AIDS and individuals affected by HIV/AIDS.

“(d) GUIDANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall provide clear guidance to field missions of the United States Government in countries for which the United States provides assistance to combat HIV/AIDS, based on the strategy required under subsection (b).

“(2) TRANSMISSION TO CONGRESS AND PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees and make available to the public a description of the guidance required under paragraph (1).

“(e) REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008, and annually thereafter as part of the annual report required under section 104A(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b-2(e)), the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees and make available to the public a report on the implementation of this section for the prior fiscal year.

“(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) A description of the prevention programs designed to address the vulnerabilities of women and youth to HIV/AIDS.

“(B) A list of nongovernmental organizations in each country that receive assistance from the United States to carry out HIV prevention activities, including the amount and the source of funding received.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7601 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 315 the following:

“Sec. 316. Strategy to prevent HIV infections among women and youth.”

SEC. 314. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.

The table of contents for the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7601 note) is amended by striking the item relating to subtitle B of title III and inserting the following:

“Subtitle B—Assistance for Women, Children, and Families”.

TITLE IV—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 401(a) of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7671(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$3,000,000,000” and inserting “\$10,000,000,000”; and

(2) by striking “fiscal years 2004 through 2008” and inserting “fiscal years 2009 through 2013”.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

Section 402(b) of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7672) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (2) (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this section), by striking “, of which” and all that follows through “programs”.

SEC. 403. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.

(a) HIV/AIDS PREVENTION ACTIVITIES.—Subsection (a) of section 403 of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7673) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) HIV/AIDS PREVENTION ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2013, not less than 20 percent of the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under section 401 for HIV/AIDS assistance for each such fiscal year shall be expended for HIV/AIDS prevention activities consistent with section 104A(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

“(2) BALANCED FUNDING REQUIREMENT.—(A) The Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally shall provide balanced funding for prevention activities for sexual transmission of HIV/AIDS and shall ensure that behavioral change programs, including abstinence, delay of sexual debut, monogamy, fidelity and partner reduction, are implemented and funded in a meaningful and equitable way in the strategy for each host country based on objective epidemiological evidence as to the source of infections and in consultation with the government of each host country involved in HIV/AIDS prevention activities.

“(B) In fulfilling the requirement under subparagraph (A), the Coordinator shall establish a HIV sexual transmission prevention strategy governing the expenditure of funds authorized by the Act used to prevent the sexual transmission of HIV in any host country with a generalized epidemic. In each such host country, if this strategy provides less than 50 percent of such funds for behavioral change programs, including abstinence, delay of sexual debut, monogamy, fidelity, and partner reduction, the Coordinator shall, within 30 days of the issuance of this strategy, report to the appropriate congressional committees on the justification for this decision.

“(C) Programs and activities that implement or purchase new prevention technologies or modalities such as medical male circumcision, pre-exposure prophylaxis, or microbicides and programs and activities that provide counseling and testing for HIV or prevent mother-to-child prevention of HIV shall not be included in determining compliance with this paragraph.

“(3) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008, and annually thereafter as part of the annual report required under section 104A(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b-2(e)), the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees and make available to the public a report on the implementation of paragraph (2) for the prior fiscal year.”

(b) ORPHANS AND VULNERABLE CHILDREN.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by

striking “fiscal years 2006 through 2008” and inserting “fiscal years 2009 through 2013”.

SEC. 404. PROHIBITION ON TAXATION BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

(a) **PROHIBITION ON TAXATION.**—None of the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under section 401 of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7671) may be made available to provide assistance for a foreign country under a new bilateral agreement governing the terms and conditions under which such assistance is to be provided unless such agreement includes a provision stating that assistance provided by the United States shall be exempt from taxation, or reimbursed, by the foreign government, and the Secretary of State shall expeditiously seek to negotiate amendments to existing bilateral agreements, as necessary, to conform with this requirement.

(b) **DE MINIMUS EXCEPTION.**—Foreign taxes of a de minimus nature shall not be subject to the provisions of subsection (a).

(c) **REPROGRAMMING OF FUNDS.**—Funds withheld from obligation for each country or entity pursuant to subsection (a) shall be reprogrammed for assistance to countries which do not assess taxes on United States assistance or which have an effective arrangement that is providing substantial reimbursement of such taxes.

(d) **DETERMINATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The provisions of this section shall not apply to any country or entity the Secretary of State determines—

(A) does not assess taxes on United States assistance or which has an effective arrangement that is providing substantial reimbursement of such taxes; or

(B) the foreign policy interests of the United States outweigh the policy of this section to ensure that United States assistance is not subject to taxation.

(2) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary of State shall consult with the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations at least 15 days prior to exercising the authority of this subsection with regard to any country or entity.

(e) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The Secretary of State shall issue rules, regulations, or policy guidance, as appropriate, to implement the prohibition against the taxation of assistance contained in this section.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—As used in this section—

(1) the terms “taxes” and “taxation” refer to value added taxes and customs duties imposed on commodities financed with United States assistance for programs for which funds are authorized by this Act; and

(2) the term “bilateral agreement” refers to a framework bilateral agreement between the Government of the United States and the government of the country receiving assistance that describes the privileges and immunities applicable to United States foreign assistance for such country generally, or an individual agreement between the Government of the United States and such government that describes, among other things, the treatment for tax purposes that will be accorded the United States assistance provided under that agreement.

TITLE V—SUSTAINABILITY AND STRENGTHENING OF HEALTH CARE SYSTEMS

SEC. 501. SUSTAINABILITY AND STRENGTHENING OF HEALTH CARE SYSTEMS.

The United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE VI—SUSTAINABILITY AND STRENGTHENING OF HEALTH CARE SYSTEMS

“SEC. 601. FINDINGS.

“Congress makes the following findings:

“(1) The shortage of health personnel, including doctors, nurses, pharmacists, counselors, laboratory staff, and paraprofessionals, is one of the leading obstacles to fighting HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa.

“(2) The HIV/AIDS pandemic aggravates the shortage of health workers through loss of life and illness among medical staff, unsafe working conditions for medical personnel, and increased workloads for diminished staff, while the shortage of health personnel undermines efforts to prevent and provide care and treatment for individuals with HIV/AIDS.

“(3) Failure to address the shortage of health care professionals and paraprofessionals, and the factors forcing such individuals to leave sub-Saharan Africa, will undermine the objectives of United States development policy and will subvert opportunities to achieve internationally-recognized goals for the prevention, treatment, and care of HIV/AIDS and other diseases, the reduction of child and maternal mortality, and for economic growth and development in sub-Saharan Africa.

“SEC. 602. NATIONAL HEALTH WORKFORCE STRATEGIES AND OTHER POLICIES.

“(a) **NATIONAL HEALTH WORKFORCE STRATEGIES.**—

“(1) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—It shall be the policy of the United States Government to support countries receiving United States assistance to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, and other health programs in developing, strengthening, and implementing 5-year health workforce strategies.

“(2) **TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.**—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in coordination with the Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally, is authorized to provide technical and financial assistance to countries described in paragraph (1) to enable such countries, in conjunction with other funding sources, to develop, strengthen, and implement health workforce strategies.

“(3) **ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.**—Assistance provided under paragraph (2) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be used to carry out the following:

“(A) Activities to promote an inclusive process that includes nongovernmental organizations and individuals with HIV/AIDS in developing health workforce strategies.

“(B) Activities to achieve and sustain a health workforce sufficient in numbers, skill, and capacity to meet United States and host-country international health commitments, including the Millennium Development Goals and universal access to HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care. In particular, such health workforce strategies should include plans for progress toward achieving the minimum ratio of health professionals required to achieve these goals by 2015, estimated by the World Health Organization to require at least 2.3 doctors, nurses, and midwives per 1,000 population, and additional health workers such as pharmacists and lab technicians.

“(C) Activities to ensure that health workforce strategies are aimed at creating appropriate distribution of health workers and prioritizing activities required to ensure rural, marginalized, and other underserved populations are able to access skilled and equipped health workers.

“(D) Activities to expand the capacity of public and private medical, nursing, pharma-

ceutical, and other health training institutions.

“(b) **POSITIVE BROADER HEALTH IMPACT.**—It shall be the policy of the United States to ensure to expand the capacity of the health workforce engaged in HIV/AIDS programming in ways that contribute to, and do not detract from, the capacity of countries to meet other health needs, particularly child survival and maternal health.

“(c) **SAFETY FOR HEALTH WORKERS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should ensure that all health workers participating in programs that receive assistance under this Act and the amendments made by this Act have the proper training to create safe and sanitary working conditions in accordance with universal precautions and other forms of infection prevention and control.

“(d) **HEALTH CARE FOR HEALTH WORKERS.**—The Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally shall ensure that comprehensive and confidential health services shall be provided to all health workers participating in programs that receive assistance under this Act and the amendments made by this Act, including—

“(1) testing and counseling for all such employees;

“(2) providing HIV/AIDS treatment to HIV-positive employees; and

“(3) taking measures to reduce HIV-related stigma in the workplace.

“(e) **TRAINING AND COMPENSATION FINANCE.**—Where the Coordinator determines such financial support is essential to fulfill the purposes of this Act, the Coordinator shall finance training and provide compensation or other benefits for health workers in order to enhance recruitment and retention of such workers.

“SEC. 603. EXEMPTION OF INVESTMENTS IN HEALTH FROM LIMITS SOUGHT BY INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

“(a) **COORDINATION WITHIN THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.**—The Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally shall work with the Secretary of the Treasury to reform International Monetary Fund macroeconomic and fiscal policies that result in limitations on national and donor investments in health.

“(b) **POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE IMF.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to oppose any loan, project, agreement, memorandum, instrument, plan, or other program of the International Monetary Fund that does not exempt increased government spending on health care from national budget caps or restraints, hiring or wage bill ceilings, or other limits sought by any international financial institution.

“SEC. 604. PUBLIC-SECTOR PROCUREMENT, DRUG REGISTRATION, AND SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat AIDS Globally shall work with the Partnership for Supply Chain Management Systems, host countries, and nongovernmental organizations to develop effective, reliable host country-owned and operated public-sector procurement and supply chain management systems, including regional distribution, with ongoing technical assistance and sustained support to ensure the function of such systems, as well as the function of existing non-public sector supply chains, including those operated by faith-based and other humanitarian organizations that procure and distribute medical supplies.

“(b) AVAILABILITY OF EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES.—The public-sector procurement and supply chain management systems developed pursuant to subsection (a) should ensure that adequate laboratory equipment and supplies commonly needed to fight HIV/AIDS, including diagnostic tests for CD4 and viral load counts, x-ray machines, mobile and facility-based rapid HIV test kits and other necessary assays, reagents and basic supplies such as sterile syringes and gloves, are available and distributed in a manner that is accessible to urban and rural populations.

“(c) DRUG REGISTRATION.—The Coordinator shall work with host country partners and development partners to support efficient and effective drug approval and registration systems that allow expeditious access to safe and effective drugs, including antiretroviral drugs.

“(d) REPORT.—The Coordinator shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report on the implementation of this section, including progress toward specific benchmarks established by the Partnership for Supply Chain Management Systems, and the projection of when host countries can fully sustain their own procurement and supply chain management and distribution systems at a scale necessary for national primary health needs.

“SEC. 605. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 401 for HIV/AIDS assistance, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to carry out this title.

“(b) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subsection (a) are authorized to remain available until expended.”.

SEC. 502. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.

The table of contents for the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7601 note) is amended by inserting after the items relating to title V the following:

“TITLE VI—SUSTAINABILITY AND STRENGTHENING OF HEALTH CARE SYSTEMS

“Sec. 601. Findings.

“Sec. 602. National health workforce strategies and other policies.

“Sec. 603. Exemption of investments in health from limits sought by international financial institutions.

“Sec. 604. Public-sector procurement, drug registration, and supply chain management systems.

“Sec. 605. Authorization of appropriations.”.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in House Report 110-562. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110-562.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. BLUMENAUER:

Page 59, line 7, insert “, safe drinking water,” after “nutrition”.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1065, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to rise dealing with the underlying legislation that contains an important section to address barriers that might limit the start of and adherence to treatment services. This section also encourages direct linkages between the efforts to treat HIV/AIDS, nutrition and income security programs.

I applaud the chairman and ranking member for the work that they have done bringing this together, and the recognition that dealing with HIV/AIDS must be done in a holistic fashion that treats the entire person and their environment, not just the disease.

I have a very personal connection to this legislation now that was not present when I first started working on issues of water for the poor now that I have a daughter working in Mozambique in the Peace Corps who is dealing with these problems on a day-to-day basis.

This direct amendment would add safe drinking water to nutrition and income security on the list of programs for which direct linkages are encouraged. This is an important tribute to our late colleagues, Chairman Lantos and Chairman Hyde, who were so instrumental in the enactment of our Water for the Poor Act, and their insights that are bringing safe drinking is an important component of developmental sectors from health to the environment. To include safe drinking water in legislation through which we honor their memories is a small testament to their lasting legacies.

Including safe drinking water is critical because we cannot treat HIV/AIDS without safe drinking water. USAID has recognized in its guidance for missions carrying out these programs that people with HIV/AIDS are at increased risk for diarrheal diseases and far more likely to suffer severe and chronic complications if infected.

There is terrible irony in providing patients with advanced antiretroviral agents, and then asking them to use the water in a glass that may infect them with a life-threatening illness to wash down the life-saving pills.

To add irony, one of the complications of diarrheal illnesses is HIV-infected patients have a reduced ability to absorb antiretroviral and other

medications from the gut. This poor absorption can contribute to the development of HIV strains that are resistant. In addition to the negative impact on life expectancy and quality of life, they also add significantly to the burdens on caregivers in clinics and at home and put them and other family members at risk for infection.

We are all a part of this in the global community. This legislation is important to tie these challenges together, not deal with it piecemeal, and to help with advancing the overall objective of this legislation.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment for purposes of debate.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I support Mr. BLUMENAUER's amendment, which would add safe drinking water to nutrition and income security on the list of programs for which direct linkages are encouraged. For patients whose immune systems have been compromised by AIDS, the availability of safe, clean drinking water is vitally important. This is especially true for HIV positive women with young infants who use infant formula to avoid transmitting the virus to their babies during feeding. If the water used in the formula is not clean, their babies are at high risk for waterborne diseases. Therefore, this amendment would allow PEPFAR to link with existing safe drinking water programs in order to provide clean water to these treatment patients.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I rise to join you in supporting the gentleman's amendment. What was interesting to me was to learn, and there are many things I learned in this bill that I didn't know, but one was that about 1.2 billion people globally lack safe water to consume in the least-developed countries, and up to 90 percent of AIDS patients, 90 percent, suffer and frequently die from the chronic diarrheal diseases that the gentleman discussed. These diseases are caused by the use of unsafe water.

This is a compelling amendment. I join the gentleman in supporting it.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, I would also like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. BLUMENAUER's amendment to ensure that safe drinking water is a component of our HIV/AIDS strategy. Congressman

BLUMENAUER, the lead sponsor of the Water for the Poor Act of 2005, has been a strong advocate on this issue for years, and he was kind enough to testify about the challenge of clean water in Africa at a hearing of the Subcommittee on Global Health I chaired in May of 2007.

During the course of that hearing, it became clear that in Africa, the region hardest hit by the AIDS pandemic, the problem of safe water is particularly acute. The total number of people without access to potable water in the region has actually increased by 60 million in the past half decade. That is why Mr. BLUMENAUER and I, along with other Members of Congress, successfully secured \$300 million for safe drinking water and sanitation projects for fiscal year 2008.

We all know that HIV compromises the immune system. Those infected with the disease are far more likely to succumb to the illness caused by unsafe drinking water, especially if they are children, and there is no way that people can take ARVs if they do not have access to clean drinking water.

I strongly support Mr. BLUMENAUER's amendment, and thank him for his sponsorship of H. Res. 318, supporting the goals of the United Nations International Year of Sanitation. His resolution encourages international communities to achieve the target of halving the proportion of people without access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation. I encourage my colleagues to support the Blumenauer amendment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to express my deep appreciation to Chairman PAYNE. I appreciate the ranking member yielding time to him. I was prepared to do so, but she was able to give him more time, and that is important.

Congressman PAYNE, your laser-like focus on this with the subcommittee, your long-term advocacy, your work on the continent, is something that I find inspirational. I look forward to working with you and partnering on these issues as we move forward.

To the Chair and ranking member, your willingness to include this is important, and our work together to be able to focus on the whole person and to be able to deal with waterborne disease, the number one preventable cause of death and disease around the world. Half the people who are sick today anywhere in the world are sick needlessly from water-borne disease. Adding this critical amendment to your important legislation is an important step forward. I hope it is just one step that we can work on together to bring people around the world to support this critical priority.

As I say, I can think of no more fitting tribute to your previous predecessors as Chair of the committee, Congressman Hyde and Congressman Lantos, who worked so hard to advance

this cause. I urge adoption of this amendment.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110-562.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. FORTENBERRY:

Page 43, line 4, insert before the period at the end the following: “, including both Principal Recipients and sub-recipients”.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1065, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health, I have been involved extensively in the issues before us today. I really do appreciate the bipartisan cooperation that has guided this process, particularly by Chairman BERMAN and our ranking member, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you. This bill is appropriately named for two giants of this institution, Tom Lantos and Henry Hyde.

My amendment addresses the issue of transparency and accountability in the Global Fund. The Global Fund is a unique, non-governmental multilateral organization headquartered in Switzerland and focused on combating HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria throughout the developing world.

□ 1430

The U.S. Government is the single largest provider of resources and technical assistance to the Global Fund, and since 2001 Congress has appropriated nearly \$4 billion to the Fund. The Lantos-Hyde bill before us today authorizes additional funds that will total in the billions.

The bill currently and appropriately calls for systematic assessments of performance data of principal recipients and subrecipients of funds, as recommended by the Government Accountability Office, the GAO. This technical amendment simply clarifies that audits by the Fund's Inspector General should also encompass prin-

cipal recipients and subrecipients, the entities that actually receive programmatic funding.

Madam Chairman, I believe that this amendment strengthens the spirit of accountability that is present in the underlying bill. According to a June 2005 report by the GAO, the Global Fund possessed a limited ability to monitor and evaluate grants. Concerns have also been raised that the volume of funding provided through the Global Fund may exceed the capacity of the recipients in the field to actually utilize it.

Since we are considering an additional contribution that may total in the billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars to the Global Fund over the life of this reauthorization, I believe that it would be beneficial for ourselves, as well as for the Fund, as well as for other donors, to have additional clarity on how these funds are being used in the field for those most in need of our assistance.

Madam Chairman, I intend to support the overall bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, while I do not oppose the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to take the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, the gentleman's amendment, and I have spoken to him about it, encourages the Global Fund Inspector General to not only audit its grantees, but also the subgrantees and subrecipients who receive Global Fund money.

Obviously, I share the gentleman's concern that transparency and accountability in the use of HIV/AIDS assistance provided through the Global Fund is critically important for all the reasons that he stated. The Global Fund, in all fairness, I do want to point out, has shown, I believe, its commitment to that transparency and accountability. It has a new inspector general, and has instituted an enhanced accounting system that focuses on improving accountability among subrecipients. But the principle of this amendment makes sense. While there are some technical issues I will want to talk to him about as we move through the legislative process, I look forward to working with him on it and I certainly urge the adoption of the amendment.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Florida, the ranking member.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, I also support Mr. FORTENBERRY's amendment which would ensure that audits by the Global Fund Inspector General include information on sub-contractors.

The U.S. government is the largest contributor to the Global Fund to fight HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. Since the fund was created, the U.S.

has appropriated and pledged \$3.5 billion for contributions to the Global Fund, representing nearly one-third of the total budget of the Global Fund. It is an important component to the world's response to these three diseases, and has made progress on issues of transparency and accountability in recent years.

As the bill makes clear, continued support to the Global Fund should be based on the Fund's ability to meet certain transparency and accountability benchmarks.

This amendment builds on and clarifies the underlying text in order to ensure that the audits conducted by the Global Fund's Office of Inspector General cover both primary recipients of grant funding and subrecipients who perform smaller pieces of the grants. These audits are important. I thank the gentleman for the time, and I support the Fortenberry amendment on Inspector General audits at the Global Fund.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Africa Subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Chairman, I rise to speak on the amendment offered by Mr. FORTENBERRY. We appreciate the work that he does on the subcommittee and he contributes greatly.

We feel that the Inspector General has been doing an adequate job; however, we do not oppose this amendment. The Office has approved over \$10 billion for programs in 136 countries around the world so far, which amounts to 21 percent of all donor HIV/AIDS spending, and two-thirds of all the donor spending on malaria and tuberculosis. Through the Global Fund, 1.4 million people have been treated with life-saving antivirals, 3.3 million cases of TB have been treated; and, in a new area, 46 million bed nets have been distributed to protect children against malaria. And I am pleased to say that Ray Chambers from New Jersey and my congressional district has been appointed ambassador for the U.N. to combat malaria.

So, we do not oppose this amendment, and we look forward to the bill's passage.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee for his support of this. I understand the concerns he addressed and understand his comments, as well as the chairman's of the subcommittee. I look forward to continuing to work with him, but do appreciate his support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. MC COLLUM
OF MINNESOTA

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110-562.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota:

Page 35, line 13, insert ", Malawi, Swaziland, Lesotho" after "Republic".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1065, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. McCOLLUM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, the amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and myself would add three Southern African countries, Malawi, Swaziland, and Lesotho, to the lists of countries that will be a part of the focus countries in the reauthorization of this Global HIV/AIDS legislation.

In 2003, the original PEPFAR legislation designated 14 focus countries. These countries were prioritized for intensive investment of resources and technical expertise as provided through PEPFAR. The bill on the floor today adds focus countries by designating Vietnam and 14 Caribbean basic countries with PEPFAR focus status. Unfortunately, these three countries in Southern Africa, each confronting devastation as a result of HIV/AIDS, have not been granted priority status in PEPFAR. The crisis of HIV/AIDS confronting Malawi, Swaziland, and Lesotho is real and in some cases worse than the existing focus countries.

Malawi is a country of 13 million people, with 900,000 children orphaned by AIDS and nearly 1 million of its adults living with HIV, a 14 percent infection rate. Swaziland, with a population of only 1.1 million people, has over 200,000 adults living with HIV, one in three adults, or a 33 percent adult infection rate. Lesotho has a population of 2 million people, and an HIV infection rate among its adults of 23 percent.

These three countries are not only confronting HIV and AIDS, but they are also among the poorest countries on the planet, which makes their challenge so much greater. Malawi, for example, is 164th out of 177 countries on the United Nations Human Development Index. Also, each country is geographically surrounded by countries that were designated focus countries in the original PEPFAR legislation, South Africa, Mozambique, Zambia, Tanzania, which are presently receiving massive investments to confront their epidemics.

Malawi, Swaziland and Lesotho are working bilaterally with the United States; but by not being granted

PEPFAR's focus country status, the gap that they face between the needs and available resources means that too many people will continue to be infected, too many people will continue to die needlessly, and too many orphans will be left to fend for themselves.

This amendment has the support of the governments of Malawi, Swaziland and Lesotho.

I submit for the RECORD a letter of support from the three governments.

EMBASSY OF THE REPUBLIC OF MALAWI,
Washington, DC, March 28, 2008.

Hon. BETTY MCCOLLUM,
House of Representatives,
Washington DC.

DEAR HONOURABLE MCCOLLUM, we are writing to follow up on our recent meeting during which we discussed, among other things, the re-authorization of the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR).

We are deeply concerned that the three countries that have been heavily impacted by the HIV/AIDS virus in Southern Africa, and whose prevalence rates are above 14% have been left out from the new list of focus countries as reflected in H.R. 5501. Our countries have become islands amidst countries that are receiving tremendous resources from PEPFAR within the region.

The AIDS epidemic in our countries has brought additional pressure to bear on the health sector. We are failing to train adequate number of health workers to provide services to those living with HIV and suffering from AIDS. The few that we have trained have died from the virus while others have left the continent for greener pastures in the western countries. Although the recent increase in the provision of ARV has brought hope to many, it has also put increased strain on the remaining healthcare workers. In addition, there are many more people living with the HIV virus who are not receiving treatment due to lack of resources to purchase drugs and to train personnel to administer treatment.

The presence of AIDS has also affected many households. Many children have lost one or both parents due to HIV/AIDS. At the same time, we have a large number of children who were born with the virus because the risk of mother-to-child transmission remains very high. Although we have put in place orphan care programs, the need for more resources to provide comprehensive care cannot be overemphasized. The pandemic has also added strain to the food insecurity in many areas because agricultural work has been neglected or abandoned due to household illness. The labor force, in general, has also been affected by HIV/AIDS, setting back economic and social progress.

Our leadership is highly committed to the fight against HIV/AIDS. Our governments have provided enough domestic resources within their means and are receiving external funding for HIV/AIDS programs. However, there is a wide funding gap between planned programs and resources required for implementation. It is for this reason that we humbly request you to introduce an amendment to H.R. 5501, to include Lesotho, Malawi and Swaziland as focus countries.

Your assistance on this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

HAWA OLGA NDILOWE,
Ambassador of Malawi
to the U.S.

EPHRAIM MANDLENKOSI M.
HOPE,
Ambassador of the
Kingdom of Swaziland
to the U.S.

MABASIA NTSOAKI
MOHOBANE,
*Charge d'Affaires, Em-
bassy of the King-
dom of Lesotho to
the U.S.*

These countries believe, as I do, that the severity of the epidemic in their countries should make their fight against AIDS a priority for this Congress and for the American people.

Finally, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their commitment for fighting HIV/AIDS, and for their hard work in bringing H.R. 5501 to the floor.

I also had the honor of serving on the International Relations Committee under the leadership of Mr. Hyde and Mr. Lantos when we passed the original PEPFAR legislation. They were both extraordinary men and wonderful mentors to me. They were compassionate leaders in this House, and it is fitting that we pay tribute to their lives and their contributions to this country by passing a bill that will save lives and improve life all around the world. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to be included in the bill, and also to support passage of this important bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment for purposes of debate.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, I actually support the McCollum-Jackson amendment, which would add Malawi, Swaziland and Lesotho to the list of countries in which the Global AIDS Coordinator is given explicit statutory authority.

Malawi, Swaziland, and Lesotho all face major HIV/AIDS epidemics and have received significant resources through PEPFAR in the first 5 years of implementation. By giving the Global AIDS Coordinator explicit authority over the U.S. Government's HIV/AIDS programs in these countries, the Congress is signaling that it believes the U.S. Government should continue to come alongside these nations' governments and their citizens to support them in the fight against HIV/AIDS, and I commend Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. JACKSON for offering it.

I would like to yield the remaining time, Madam Chairman, to our chairman, Chairman BERMAN of California, as well as Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, with Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey first.

Mr. PAYNE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentlelady from Wisconsin.

Southern Africa has the highest rate of HIV and AIDS in the entire world. In Lesotho, we have heard, a country with an HIV/AIDS prevalence rate of 38 percent among pregnant women, only 19 percent of those in need of treatment for the disease have access for it. Even

more troubling is the fact that only 5 percent of HIV-positive mothers get drugs to prevent the transmission of the virus to their children during childbirth. Life expectancy for women is 44 years, and for men a mere 39.

In Malawi, the situation is a little better; men are expected to live 41 years, women 42. The health care worker shortage in the country remains a major obstacle.

Circumstances in Swaziland are equally grim: 26 percent of adults are HIV positive. In a country of just over 1 million, there are 70,000 AIDS orphans. Clearly, HIV and AIDS pose a dire threat in these countries and must be urgently addressed. Therefore, I commend the gentlewoman, Ms. MCCOLLUM, for her amendment to make Swaziland, Lesotho, and Malawi focus countries, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, if I could yield now to Chairman BERMAN, the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I support this amendment. I congratulate Representatives MCCOLLUM and JACKSON for their leadership in adding these hard-hit nations to the focus country list.

All three of these Southern African countries suffer from both high HIV/AIDS prevalence rates and high poverty rates, with devastating effects. The statistics in all three countries regarding AIDS have been put on the record by both the gentlelady from Minnesota and the gentleman from New Jersey, so I will just add my words of support for the amendment.

□ 1445

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman, the ranking member, and the distinguished Chair of the Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health for their kind words, and urge all of my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CARSON OF INDIANA

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 110-562.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

Page 49, line 10, insert before the period at the end the following: "Recognizing that

human and institutional capacity form the core of any health care system that can sustain the fight against HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, the plan shall include a strategy to encourage postsecondary educational institutions in host countries, particularly in Africa, in collaboration with United States postsecondary educational institutions, historically black colleges and universities, to develop such human and institutional capacity and in the process further build their capacity to sustain the fight against these diseases."

Page 104, line 21, before "capacity" insert "human and institutional".

Page 105, line 5, insert "partnerships," after "telecommunications services."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1065, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 5501, the Tom Lantos and Henry Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008 and to offer my amendment which I believe will enhance the base bill. I want to thank Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN for their hard work in bringing this legislation to the floor.

I find it of coincidence the timing of our consideration of this legislation for it is juxtaposed between two pivotal historical moments in time: The deaths of the renowned African American medical doctor, Dr. Charles Drew on April 1, 1950, and the celebrated human rights leader, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. on April 4, 1968.

Both Dr. Drew and Dr. King were products of the American educational system and particularly of historically black colleges and universities. Madam Chairman, I cannot think of any better way to explain the importance of this amendment and its use. The effort to address HIV/AIDS requires the best of human rights and of medical science.

My amendment is a simple amendment that would make changes to section 204 of H.R. 5501. The amendment directs the coordinator of the United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally and the administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to expand their plan for strengthening health systems of host countries by allowing for African post secondary educational institutions to collaborate with United States post secondary educational institutions and specifically historically black colleges and universities to develop such human and institutional capacity.

The goal of my amendment is to allow our Nation's finest post secondary educational institutions to be directly involved in the training of health care workers that will enhance the effectiveness and efficacy of the efforts put forth in H.R. 5501.

Madam Chairman, I can think of no better way for the citizens of Indiana, the great Hoosier State, to contribute

in the fight against this pandemic than to train the best and brightest, and to commit to countries whose health care systems suffer woefully from the lack of trained health professionals. After all, who are we to block the opportunity to these children to be successful.

Madam Chairman, before I close, I want to acknowledge and salute the two men this piece of legislation is named after, Congressmen Tom Lantos and Henry Hyde. I didn't get a chance to work with them in this body, but I cannot think of a better way to honor their service in this great institution.

Finally, I want to thank the wonderful staff of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Rules Committee for helping me craft this amendment. Madam Chairman, I ask for support of my amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment for purposes of debate.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, first of all, I would like to thank Mr. CARSON for his well-reasoned and important amendment. We all had the honor of serving with his grandmother, Julia Carson, for many years in this body, and I know that Congresswoman Carson is looking down at her grandson and saying she is mighty proud. So thank you so much for your amendment, and thank you for carrying on in her great legacy by presenting wonderful topics and themes for us to discuss on the floor.

I fully support the Carson amendment because it focuses on building human and institutional capacity in PEPFAR host countries. It directs the global AIDS coordinator and the USAID administrator to expand their plan by strengthening health systems of host countries by encouraging post secondary educational institutions, particularly those in the African continent, to collaborate with the post secondary educational institutions here in the United States, including historically black colleges and universities in training health care workers.

As other provisions of this bill made clear, an important component of the fight against HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, is the strengthening of the educational capacity in host countries to train health care workers. The Carson amendment does exactly that. I congratulate him for it. He is a welcome addition to our Chamber.

I would like to yield to Ms. LEE of California who has been working on this issue for a long time, Madam Chairman.

Ms. LEE. I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I rise today to support this amendment and to commend the gentleman

from Indiana. I understand this is his first amendment, and it shows that he has hit the ground running. Today, I am reminded of our former colleague, his grandmother, our beloved Congresswoman Julia Carson. I know she is smiling today and is very proud of your efforts; thank you.

Historically black colleges and universities have trained some of our finest dedicated doctors, nurses and health care workers. These colleges and universities go way beyond the call of duty. They have a deep cultural and historical understanding and connection to the continent of Africa. They are attacking HIV/AIDS here on the homefront where HIV and AIDS is disproportionately affecting the African-American community. So by developing human and institutional capacity in Africa and in the Caribbean, we are bringing to bear, in a comprehensive manner, mechanisms to maximize our effectiveness in combating HIV and AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis.

So I want to salute and thank the gentleman from Indiana once again for his leadership and for helping to strengthen this bill.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the gentlelady, the ranking member, yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of the Carson amendment relating to the building of human capacity to fight HIV/AIDS through collaborations between U.S. colleges and universities and those in the developing world.

I, too, am very pleased to see this piece of legislation by Mr. CARSON. We all knew Julia Carson. She came to my district to deal with health disparities in my district in New Jersey, and traveled to Africa with me on a trip dealing with this problem. So this is very appropriate, and let me commend you again.

In May of 2007, Doctors Without Borders released a report that found that in southern Africa, a shortage of trained health care workers was the main barrier to increasing access to antiretroviral treatment.

The report found that in Mozambique, people had to wait up to 2 months to start ARVs because there were not enough doctors and nurses to manage it. In one health district in Lesotho, nearly half of the nursing posts were vacant. Malawi has only two doctors per 100,000 people. The minimum standard according to the WHO is 20 doctors per 100,000 people.

I am pleased to say that the bill under consideration seeks to address those problems. It calls on the United States to train 140,000 new health care workers and professionals so people can start on life-saving therapy.

University partnerships are a logical and effective means through which to support this goal. So I once again commend Mr. CARSON for his amendment, and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by Mr. CARSON. Congressman CARSON's amendment rightfully recognizes that the HIV/AIDS epidemic is proliferating at an alarming rate around the globe, particularly in Africa.

This amendment establishes a cooperative framework in which AIDS researchers in Africa can collaborate with American medical experts, including researchers at historically black colleges and universities, on the best ways to treat and prevent the spread of this devastating infectious disease.

I commend and thank the gentleman from Indiana for offering this worthwhile amendment. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. I want to thank the Members for listening and considering this amendment. I think it is a great opportunity for us.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 415, noes 10, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

AYES—415

Abercrombie	Boucher	Coble
Ackerman	Boustany	Cohen
Aderholt	Boyd (FL)	Cole (OK)
Akin	Boyd (KS)	Conaway
Alexander	Brady (PA)	Conyers
Allen	Brady (TX)	Cooper
Altmire	Braley (IA)	Costa
Andrews	Broun (GA)	Costello
Arcuri	Brown (SC)	Courtney
Baca	Brown, Corrine	Cramer
Bachmann	Brown-Waite,	Crenshaw
Bachus	Ginny	Crowley
Baird	Buchanan	Cuellar
Baldwin	Burgess	Culberson
Barrett (SC)	Burton (IN)	Cummings
Barrow	Butterfield	Davis (AL)
Bartlett (MD)	Buyer	Davis (CA)
Barton (TX)	Calvert	Davis (IL)
Bean	Camp (MI)	Davis (KY)
Becerra	Cantor	Davis, David
Berkley	Capito	Davis, Lincoln
Berman	Capps	Davis, Tom
Berry	Capuano	Deal (GA)
Biggert	Cardoza	DeFazio
Bilbray	Carnahan	DeGette
Bilirakis	Carney	Delahunt
Bishop (GA)	Carson	DeLauro
Bishop (NY)	Carter	Dent
Blackburn	Castle	Diaz-Balart, L.
Blumenauer	Castor	Diaz-Balart, M.
Blunt	Chabot	Dicks
Boehner	Chandler	Dingell
Bonner	Christensen	Doggett
Bono Mack	Clarke	Donnelly
Boozman	Clay	Doolittle
Bordallo	Cleaver	Doyle
Boren	Clyburn	Drake

Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foster
Foxo
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inlee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
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
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam

Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller

Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)

Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Garrett (NJ)
Goode

Bishop (UT)
Boswell
Cubin
Faleomavaega

Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Page 122, after line 2, insert the following:
SEC. 405. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) According to Congressional Budget Office estimates, \$50 billion to carry out the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 would not be spent during the five-year authorization period, but instead would take 10 years or until 2018 to spend.

(2) Recent funding disbursement trends for the current program suggest that the current funding levels are outpacing the capacity of the countries and nongovernmental organizations to efficiently implement the program. Over the 2005–2006 funding period, assistance commitments grew \$1.3 billion from \$4.3 billion to \$5.6 billion, while the actual disbursements of funds grew at a much slower rate of \$400 million from \$3.5 billion to \$3.9 billion. As such, the current commitment exceeds disbursement by \$1.7 billion, or 30 percent of the current commitment.

(3) Reports from recipient countries indicate the absorptive capacity for HIV/AIDS programs has become a constraint on actual expenditure of funds. For instance, a 2005 survey of World Bank Multi-Country AIDS Program (MAP) country directors in Africa found that nearly 40 percent of those countries believed that absorptive capacity “remains limited and is the real issue; new financial resources will exacerbate this problem”.

(4) Additionally, a 2007 Center for Global Development report on HIV/AIDS programs in Mozambique, Uganda, and Zambia found that overburdened government staff at all levels, along with the limited absorptive capacity of sub-grantees, created major bottlenecks for funding disbursement.

(5) Advocates of increased HIV/AIDS funding appear to have based their recommendations for such funding at least in part on UNAIDS’ estimates of a global price tag for addressing the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Such international estimates are flawed, however, because the primary source for such projections—the UNAIDS’ “Resource Needs Model”, or RNM—overestimates the resources needed, relies on a higher estimate of people living with HIV/AIDS, and includes support for countries that are also Global Fund donors. Specifically:

(A) The UNAIDS report titled “Critical Review of Costing Models to Estimate Resource Needs to Address Global HIV and AIDS” found that “the [RNM] has a number of limitations”, each of which contributes to an overestimate of the resources needed to mount a successful response.

(B) Newer projections such as the 2007 “Epidemic Update” lowered the estimated number of people living with HIV/AIDS worldwide from 39.5 million to 33.2 million—a 16 percent reduction—yet UNAIDS has not publicly released a revised lower projection of resource needs.

(C) Projections in the RNM report include significant financing for middle-income countries such as China, Russia, and Brazil that are actually Global Fund donors themselves and should not require international assistance.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—In light of the findings contained in subsection (a), which indicate that even current levels of funding for HIV/AIDS programs cannot be disbursed in an efficient and effective manner, Congress should ensure that the amount of funding authorized by this Act to carry out the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 is consistent with the demonstrated absorptive capacity to carry out such programs around the world.

NOES—10

Hensarling
Jordan
Neugebauer
Poe

Sessions
Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—10

Granger
Jefferson
Miller (FL)
Rush

Souder
Tauscher

□ 1521

Mr. WESTMORELAND changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. ADERHOLT and Mrs. BACHMANN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROSS) having assumed the chair, Ms. NORTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5501) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to provide assistance to foreign countries to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1065, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5501 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 96, line 10, strike “\$4,000,000,000” and insert “such sums as may be necessary”.

Page 97, line 1, strike “\$5,000,000,000” and insert “such sums as may be necessary”.

Page 116, line 8, strike “\$10,000,000,000” and insert “6,000,000,000”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the reading). Without objection, the reading is dispensed with.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to start off by complimenting the chairman of the committee and the ranking member of the committee, along with all the other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for working in a bipartisan way to put together this compromise.

We heard a very good fulfilling debate about the merits of PEPFAR. I, too, agree that the PEPFAR program is a very worthwhile program. So we agree that this is the right thing to do.

The question is, should we more than double the authorization of this program? Now, the President's budget called for doing just that. And I think you can make a very good and compelling case that this program is so successful that it ought to be doubled. That's not what the underlying bill does. This underlying bill more than triples this program.

I have three concerns about this tripling of this program. Number 1, the spending levels set out in this authorization bill are higher than the recipient countries can even accept. They can't absorb all of this money. We know this from the studies in the field. So even if we hit these authorization levels, we know that the recipient countries cannot even accept all of this money. They can't spend it that fast.

Point Number 2, the Congressional Budget Office has told us that we couldn't even spend this money this fast. So why are we having this kind of an authorization level when our own Congressional Budget Office is telling us that it would take at least 10 years to spend down a \$50 billion authorization?

And that brings me to my third point, and that is the budget resolution that passed the floor just 2½ weeks ago. The Democratic budget resolution itself assumes the \$30 billion level. The Democratic budget resolution assumes we're funding this at the President's request of \$30 billion. In fact, the Democratic budget resolution has a lower level of funding for section 150, the Foreign Affairs program, than even the President's budget does. We don't know what cut they're talking about, but more to the point, why don't we defend the budget resolution that passed this very house 2½ weeks ago?

Mr. Speaker, we support this program. I support this program. It's a good program. It has proven to work. By any metric, by any definition, it's impossible to deny the success of PEPFAR.

The question is, should we be tripling a program when we know full well it breaks the budget resolution, it purports to spend money faster than we can even spend, and those who are re-

ceiving this money can't receive it nearly as fast as we're proposing.

□ 1530

This recommit is not intended to kill this bill. This is a forthwith recommit. This recommit is very simple. It says, rather than funding it at \$50 billion, let's fund it at \$30 billion. That's the level called for on the Democratic budget resolution. That's the level called for in the President's budget. That's the level that independent experts have said can be justified. So this says go from 50 to 30 forthwith, that's all.

I want to compliment the gentleman, the chairman of the committee, the ranking member of the committee, all of those who worked in a bipartisan basis for this very worthwhile program, but this is a time when we have fiscal problems in America. We have a deficit. We have a looming debt. We need to show discipline in Congress. We should not be tripling funding for programs that we know the recipients themselves cannot receive at this pace and we know from our own independent budget experts that we simply can't spend at this pace.

Let's bring it back down to earth. Let's double it and keep it within reason. That is why we should pass this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First, I appreciate the compliments of my friend from Wisconsin. I prefer that the compliments be withheld and the motion to slash this bill by 40 percent be rejected, although I do appreciate the implication of his comments that a recommitment motion that is forthwith is not intended to kill the bill and that, therefore, the recommitment motions that are not forthwith are intended to kill the bills they are made to.

But getting to the merits of this. The purpose of my comments is directly to the other side. I know the easy vote, even for those who support this bill, is to vote both to cut some money and to support the minority on their motion to recommit.

But I would like to suggest that in this particular case, given what has transpired in terms of putting together this bipartisan bill, both on the merits of the motion to recommit and on the message it sends about how we can work on a bipartisan basis in the future, this motion is wrong and that Members on the other side should oppose it along with the Members on our side.

First, on the facts. The administration supports this bill and supports our number on this bill. To the extent they have concerns about what the level of appropriations may be in this year,

their statement of administration position directly says, talk about the level of appropriation; don't cut the authorization.

Secondly, the U.N. HIV/AIDS commission, which I'm not a fan of a lot of different agencies that start with "U.N.," but this one is the preeminent authority, talks about the incredible remaining need. And in the issue of absorptive capacity, this was the same argument made in 2003 against a \$15 billion authorization for which the Republican Congress appropriated far more than the authorization because we were able to see an absorptive capacity, and we saved well over a million lives.

But here we are dealing with a situation where there are 35 million people worldwide that are still living with HIV/AIDS. This is a program that works. The combination of changing behavior, prevention, and treatment is saving lives. I don't like to throw the words "moral imperative" around. It's usually used for anything people feel passionately about. But talk about pro-life, I can't think of any single program that I have been involved with where we are going to be more pro-life than in pushing this with programs that work, with the capacity that can be absorbed. No one is saying we are going to spend \$50 billion in the next 5 years. We are going to obligate, based on the appropriation moneys, and those moneys will be spent probably over the course of 8 to 10 years. That's the way this appropriation process works, as everyone knows.

My final point is the ranking member and I, the White House directly, the President and his chief of staff were directly involved, the Republican leadership in this body, we put together a bipartisan bill. Part of the key negotiation was about the number. In return for that, a number of issues of importance to the minority were preserved in this bill: the preservation of the concept of behavior change through abstinence and faithfulness; the understanding that approved family planning programs would be the ones that were funded. A variety of different aspects. The belief in the use of faith-based institutions.

How are we, in the future, going to come together on bipartisan programs where the deal is made and then all of a sudden a key part of the quid pro quo, the other side says "no" to?

I would suggest, sure there are issues about what is our fiscal condition and what can we do, and the appropriations could be weighing these very carefully. But this was a fundamental agreement to maintain a bipartisan tradition on this legislation named after Henry Hyde and Tom Lantos, both of whom worked in that capacity.

I think this motion to recommit massively undercuts that whole bipartisan approach, and I would urge my colleagues to defeat it.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do rise in opposition to this motion to recommit with great respect to my friend from Wisconsin.

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

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. 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 passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 175, nays 248, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

YEAS—175

Aderholt Gerlach Pearce
Akin Gillibrand Pence
Alexander Gingrey Peterson (PA)
Altmire Gohmert Petri
Bachmann Goode Pickering
Barrett (SC) Goodlatte Pitts
Bartlett (MD) Graves Platts
Barton (TX) Hall (TX) Poe
Biggart Hastings (WA) Porter
Billray Hayes Price (GA)
Bilirakis Heller Pryce (OH)
Bishop (UT) Hensarling Putnam
Blunt Herger Radanovich
Boehner Hoekstra Ramstad
Bonner Hulshof Regula
Bono Mack Hunter Rehberg
Boozman Inglis (SC) Reichert
Boustany Issa Renzi
Brady (TX) Johnson (IL) Reynolds
Broun (GA) Johnson, Sam DeGette
Brown (SC) Jones (NC) Rogers (AL)
Brown-Waite, Keller Rogers (KY)
Ginny King (IA) Rogers (MI)
Buchanan Kingston Rohrabacher
Burgess Kline (MN) Roskam
Burton (IN) Knollenberg Royce
Buyer Kuhl (NY) Ryan (WI)
Calvert LaHood Sali
Camp (MI) Lamborn Saxton
Campbell (CA) Lampson Schmidt
Cannon Latham Sensenbrenner
Cantor LaTourette Emanuel
Capito Latta Shadegg
Carter Lewis (CA) Shimkus
Castle Lewis (KY) Shuster
Chabot Linder Simpson
Coble LoBiondo Smith (NE)
Cole (OK) Lucas Smith (TX)
Conaway Lungren, Daniel Souder
Crenshaw E. Stearns
Davis (KY) Marchant Sullivan
Davis, Tom McCarthy (CA) Taylor
Dent McCaul (TX) Terry
Diaz-Balart, L. McCotter Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, M. McCrery Tiahrt
Doolittle McHenry Tiberi
Drake McHugh Turner
Dreier McKeon Upton
Ehlers McMorris Walberg
Everett Rodgers Walden (OR)
Fallin Mica Wamp
Feeney Miller (MI) Weldon (FL)
Flake Miller, Gary Whitfield (KY)
Forbes Moran (KS) Wilson (NM)
Fossella Murphy, Tim Wilson (SC)
Foxy Musgrave Wittman (VA)
Franks (AZ) Myrick Wolf
Frelinghuysen Neugebauer Young (AK)
Gallegly Nunes Young (FL)
Garrett (NJ) Paul

NAYS—248

Abercrombie Gonzalez
Ackerman Gordon
Allen Green, Al
Andrews Green, Gene
Arcuri Grijalva
Baca Gutierrez
Bachus Hall (NY)
Baird Hare
Baldwin Harman
Barrow Hastings (FL)
Bean Hersth Sandlin
Becerra Higgins
Berkley Hill
Berman Hinchey
Berry Hinojosa
Bishop (GA) Hirono
Bishop (NY) Hobson
Blackburn Hodes
Blumenauer Holden
Boren Holt
Boswell Honda
Boucher Hooley
Boyd (FL) Hoyer
Boyd (KS) Inslee
Brady (PA) Israel
Braley (IA) Jackson (IL)
Brown, Corrine Jackson-Lee
Butterfield Jackson-Lee (TX)
Capps Johnson (GA)
Capuano Johnson, E. B.
Cardoza Jones (OH)
Carnahan Jordan
Carney Kagen
Carson Kanjorski
Castor Kaptur
Chandler Kennedy
Clarke Kildee
Clay Kilpatrick
Cleaver Kind
Clyburn King (NY)
Cohen Kirk
Conyers Klein (FL)
Cooper Kucinich
Costa Langevin
Costello Larsen (WA)
Courtney Larson (CT)
Cramer Lee
Crowley Levin
Cuellar Lewis (GA)
Cummings Lipinski
Davis (AL) Loeb sack
Davis (CA) Lofgren, Zoe
Davis (IL) Lowey
Davis, David Lynch
Davis, Lincoln Mack
Deal (GA) Mahoney (FL)
DeFazio Maloney (NY)
DeGette Manzullo
DeGette Markey
Delahunt Marshall
DeLauro Matheson
Dicks Matsui
Dingell McCarthy (NY)
Doggett McCarthy (NY)
Donnelly McColium (MN)
Doyle McDermott
Duncan McGovern
Edwards McIntyre
Ellison McNeerney
Ellsworth McNulty
Emanuel Meek (FL)
Emerson Meeks (NY)
Engel Melancon
English (PA) Michaud
Eshoo Miller (NC)
Etheridge Miller, George
Farr Mitchell
Fattah Mollohan
Ferguson Moore (KS)
Filner Moore (WI)
Fortenberry Moran (VA)
Foster Murphy (CT)
Frank (MA) Murphy, Patrick
Giffords Murtha
Gilchrest Nadler

NOT VOTING—7

Cubin Jefferson
Culberson Miller (FL)
Granger Rush

□ 1555

Messrs. GILCHREST, DUNCAN, MACK, Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. MANZULLO, MARSHALL, KANJORSKI, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. PETERSON of

Minnesota changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ALTMIRE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BERMAN. 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 308, noes 116, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

AYES—308

Abercrombie Davis, Tom Jackson-Lee
Ackerman DeFazio (TX)
Ackerman DeGette Johnson (GA)
Allen Delahunt Johnson (IL)
Altmire DeLauro Johnson, E. B.
Andrews Dent Jones (OH)
Arcuri Diaz-Balart, L. Kagen
Baca Diaz-Balart, M. Kanjorski
Bachus Dicks Kaptur
Baird Dingell Kennedy
Baldwin Doggett Kildee
Barrow Donnelly Kilpatrick
Bean Doyle Kind
Becerra Dreier King (NY)
Berkley Edwards Kirk
Berman Ehlers Klein (FL)
Berry Kline (MN)
Biggart Ellison Knollenberg
Bilirakis Ellsworth Kucinich
Bishop (GA) Emanuel Kuhl (NY)
Bishop (NY) Emerson LaHood
Bishop (NY) Engel Lampson
Blumenauer English (PA) Eshoo Langevin
Bonner Eshoo Etheridge
Bono Mack Farr Larson (WA)
Boozman Fattah Latham
Boren Fergusson Latta
Boswell Filner Lee
Boucher Fortenberry Levin
Boustany Udall Lewis (CA)
Boyd (FL) Fossella Lewis (GA)
Boyd (KS) Foster Lewis (KY)
Brady (PA) Frank (MA)
Braley (IA) Frelinghuysen
Brown, Corrine Gerlach
Butterfield Giffords Lofgren, Zoe
Capito Giffords Lowey
Capps Gilchrest Lungren, Daniel
Capuano Gillibrand E.
Cardoza Gonzalez Lynch
Carnahan Gordon Mahoney (FL)
Carney Green, Al Maloney (NY)
Carson Green, Gene Markey
Carter Grijalva Marshall
Castle Gutierrez Matheson
Castor Hall (NY) Matsui
Chabot Hare McCarthy (NY)
Chandler Harman McColium (MN)
Clarke Hastings (FL) McCotter
Clay Hersth Sandlin McDermott
Cleaver Higgins McGovern
Clyburn Hill McHugh
Cohen Hinchey McIntyre
Cole (OK) Hinojosa McNeerney
Conyers Hirono McNulty
Cooper Hobson Meek (FL)
Costa Hodes Meeks (NY)
Costello Holden Melancon
Courtney Holt
Cramer Honda Miller (NC)
Crowley Hooley Miller, George
Cuellar Hoyer Mitchell
Cummings Hulshof Mollohan
Davis (AL) Inglis (SC) Moore (KS)
Davis (CA) Inslee Moore (WI)
Davis (IL) Israel Moran (KS)
Davis (KY) Issa Moran (VA)
Davis, Lincoln Jackson (IL) Murphy (CT)

Murphy, Patrick	Ross	Thompson (CA)
Murphy, Tim	Rothman	Thompson (MS)
Murtha	Roybal-Allard	Thornberry
Nadler	Ruppersberger	Tiahrt
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Tierney
Neal (MA)	Salazar	Towns
Nunes	Sánchez, Linda	Tsongas
Oberstar	T.	Turner
Obey	Sanchez, Loretta	Udall (CO)
Olver	Sarbanes	Udall (NM)
Ortiz	Schakowsky	Van Hollen
Pallone	Schiff	Velázquez
Pascrell	Schmidt	Visclosky
Pastor	Schwartz	Walberg
Payne	Scott (GA)	Walsh (NY)
Pelosi	Scott (VA)	Walz (MN)
Pence	Serrano	Wasserman
Perlmutter	Sestak	Schultz
Peterson (MN)	Shays	Waters
Pickering	Shea-Porter	Watson
Platts	Sherman	Watt
Pomerooy	Shimkus	Waxman
Porter	Shuler	Weiner
Price (NC)	Sires	Welch (VT)
Pryce (OH)	Skelton	Weller
Rahall	Slaughter	Wexler
Ramstad	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (NM)
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Wilson (OH)
Regula	Snyder	Wilson (SC)
Rehberg	Solis	Wolf
Reichert	Souder	Woolsey
Reyes	Space	Wu
Reynolds	Spratt	Wynn
Richardson	Stark	Yarmuth
Rodriguez	Stupak	Young (AK)
Rogers (AL)	Sutton	Young (FL)
Rogers (MI)	Tanner	
Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor	

NOES—116

Akin	Franks (AZ)	Musgrave
Alexander	Gallegly	Myrick
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)	Neugebauer
Barrett (SC)	Gingrey	Paul
Bartlett (MD)	Gohmert	Pearce
Barton (TX)	Goode	Peterson (PA)
Bilbray	Goodlatte	Petri
Bishop (UT)	Graves	Pitts
Blackburn	Hall (TX)	Poe
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Boehner	Hayes	Putnam
Brady (TX)	Heller	Radanovich
Broun (GA)	Hensarling	Rogers (KY)
Brown (SC)	Herger	Rohrabacher
Brown-Waite,	Hoekstra	Roskam
Ginny	Hunter	Royce
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Burgess	Jones (NC)	Sali
Burton (IN)	Jordan	Saxton
Buyer	Keller	Sensenbrenner
Calvert	King (IA)	Sessions
Camp (MI)	Kingston	Shadegg
Campbell (CA)	Lamborn	Shuster
Cannon	LaTourette	Simpson
Cantor	Linder	Smith (NE)
Coble	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Conaway	Lucas	Stearns
Crenshaw	Mack	Sullivan
Culberson	Manzullo	Tancredo
Davis, David	Marchant	Terry
Deal (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Doolittle	McCaul (TX)	Upton
Drake	McCrery	Walden (OR)
Duncan	McHenry	Wamp
Everett	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Fallin	McMorris	Westmoreland
Feeney	Rodgers	Whitfield (KY)
Flake	Mica	Wittman (VA)
Forbes	Miller (MI)	
Foxx	Miller, Gary	

NOT VOTING—7

Cubin	Miller (FL)	Tauscher
Granger	Renzi	
Jefferson	Rush	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Less than 2 minutes remain.

□ 1603

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 5501, TOM LANTOS AND HENRY J. HYDE UNITED STATES GLOBAL LEADERSHIP AGAINST HIV/AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS, AND MALARIA RE-AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 5501, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and in the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 865

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H. Res. 865.

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

There was no objection.

FIX FISA IMMEDIATELY

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express to the House the fear and uncertainty felt by the American people. For over a month, America has been vulnerable to terrorist attacks. Not only has the majority refused to call a vote on bipartisan legislation that would reauthorize the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, they will not even let us debate this very crucial matter.

I have heard from hundreds of constituents regarding this matter, and they want the Senate bill. They are fearful and angry that Congress cannot accomplish one of its principal tasks, and that is protecting the security of this great Nation.

Just recently, there were reports that the majority said we were too busy to add FISA to the schedule of bills. Is Congress too busy to protect the citizens of this country? We are too busy to monitor the activity of terrorists who have launched attacks on innocent civilians, and are likely to do it again? There are few things more important than protecting our Nation from terrorist activity.

MARINE PATRICK DOWDELL OF BREEZY POINT

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, it is easy in the era where we look at the big

numbers and the headlines in the newspaper to forget about the great acts of heroism that are going on right this very moment in Iraq and elsewhere in our world. I rise to bring to the attention of this body the heroism of Lieutenant Patrick Dowdell. He is serving with the 4th Infantry in Iraq as we speak. That is a division that has lost, unfortunately, over 135 heroic men and women. He is not the only hero in the family. His younger brother, James, recently began service in Ladder Company 174 in East Flatbush. I hope you will join with me and all of his neighbors in Breezy Point in expressing tribute to this family.

This family has one other chapter of heroism in its book. Lieutenant Kevin Dowdell, the father of both Patrick and James, was lost on September 11, a firefighter, in the World Trade Center. We join with this entire body and all of this country in commending Rose Ellen, their mother, and the acts of heroism that they are paying both here and in generations in the past. May God bless them, and God bless the United States of America.

TRIBUTE TO CONCORD HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and pay tribute to the Concord High School girls basketball team for winning the North Carolina State Championship this year. Lady Spiders ended a 31 win and 2 loss season by defeating Beddingfield 77-62 on March 15, the first girls championship in the school history and the fourth State championship for the school in the last 5 years.

Concord's Nyshia Hammond was named Most Valuable Player, and T.T. Belcher won the Most Outstanding Player Award for the Spiders. Concord's coach and school Athletic Director, Angela Morton, was also named the 2008 Associated Press women's basketball Coach of the Year for North Carolina. Morton has coached the team for five seasons, during which she led them from a 0-24 season, to a State championship title.

The athletic program at Concord High is one of the great traditions that dates back even further than my years. The nickname, Spiders, came from the athletic field at the old high school, named after Principal and School Superintendent A.S. Webb. Concord's first title was won in 1929.

I am extremely proud of the hard work and dedication of these young women from my hometown. Congratulations, Coach of the Year, Angela Morton; Assistant Coaches, JarMark Parker and Samantha Bedford, and the Lady Spiders on your successful season and State championship victory.

REAUTHORIZE THE NATIONAL POISON CONTROL INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. TOWNS. Yesterday, I introduced legislation with LEE TERRY from Nebraska to provide for the reauthorization of the Poison Control Center. Since being codified into law in 2000, the Poison Control Centers must undergo reauthorization every 3 years. These centers provide immediate value to the public, providing free medical facilities that are staffed by toxicologists, nurses, and other professionals.

Each year, poisoning results in 285,000 hospitalizations, 1,200 days of acute hospital care, and 1,300 fatalities. H.R. 5669 will reauthorize these critical Poison Control Centers to keep our national public health infrastructure in tact. I would like to thank Congressman TERRY for this support.

The 24-hour emergency and information hotline services that are provided for this legislation are given by the National Poison Center Toll-Free Telephone number. By providing direct patient care services to residential callers, health care professionals and institutions, Poison Control Centers save lives and help avoid costly hospitalizations. Let us keep that in mind as we move forward and reauthorize the Poison Control Centers.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COHEN). 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.

□ 1615

AMERICAN DEATH TOLL IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, when the American death toll in Iraq hit 4,000 on March 23, there was a great deal of coverage about it in the media. But the media only seems to care about the death toll when it reaches a special milestone. But now that the number of dead has reached 4,012, they have packed up their cameras, they have gone back to ignoring Iraq. Once again, our brave soldiers are dying in virtual anonymity, surely paying the highest price.

Here at home, the administration's occupation policies are harming American people in other ways. I am talking about the millions of Americans who are suffering because we are spending our Nation's treasure in Iraq rather than on vitally-needed social and economic programs here at home. We're spending about \$4,600 every second on

the occupation, or about \$12 billion a month.

Joseph Stiglitz, the Nobel Prize winning economist, has calculated that the occupation will ultimately cost \$3 trillion, and that, Mr. Speaker, is a conservative estimate. And it will certainly cost a whole lot more if the administration gets its way and we establish permanent bases in Iraq or the others get their way and we remain involved in Iraq for 50 to 100 years.

This enormous drain on our resources has buried us so deeply in debt that we cannot make investments in the programs that would really move our Nation forward. Just think of what we could do with all of those trillions of dollars.

We could invest in the education of the 48 million children in our public schools. We could prepare them to compete and win in the global economy.

We could invest in early childhood education and the childcare that millions of poor and middle-class families so desperately need.

We could invest in the medical research needed to cure disease and to save millions of Americans from needless suffering and from premature death.

We could invest in our infrastructure and new green technologies which could produce millions of jobs around our Nation.

We could produce an economic stimulus package to fulfill remaining unmet needs.

We could help States and cities to provide their first responders with the equipment they need to save lives in the event of terrorism or natural disasters.

We could build more affordable housing and assist those who have been caught up in the mortgage meltdown.

We could provide health care to our citizens, starting with SCHIP for our children.

We could move to ensure the solvency of Social Security.

We could invest in global health. As a member of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health, I can tell you that every single dollar spent on global health is a dollar spent to make our world more peaceful and stable.

These are just a few examples, Mr. Speaker. We couldn't do them all, but if we did just a few, we would go much further toward safeguarding our national security than we are currently doing in Iraq.

I hope my colleagues will remember this when General Petraeus arrives next week with his bar charts and statistics. Let us remember that the turmoil in the Middle East is helping to spike gas prices at the pump. It is leading us deeper and deeper into the effects of the Iraq recession.

The responsible redeployment of our troops out of Iraq is the one policy that makes sense, and the one policy that the great majority of the American

people support. It is high time for us to do what the American people expect us to do, and they expect us to end our occupation of Iraq.

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

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF IRAQ ON THE NATIONAL SECURITY OF AMERICA IS NEEDED

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

Mr. SESTAK. Shortly, General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker will come before the House and the Senate to provide an update on the military and the political situation in Iraq. That is my grave concern, that once again we will have placed a man who is responsible for the security, the military security only, of Iraq, in the position, in the singular position, of determining the national security policy of the United States and the public's perception of it, when what is needed, what is direly needed, is a comprehensive assessment of the national security of America and the impact of the strategy we have in Iraq upon it. So in fact it is the questions that General Petraeus cannot or should not answer that are the most important ones.

For example, the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be asked directly, what is the impact of Iraq upon the military's readiness to deploy and meet the required timelines of its various war plans, when in fact today it cannot deploy its forces, its army, in order to protect the 28,000 men and women who wear the cloth of our Nation in South Korea from an attack on the timelines required by North Korea against the South?

And while before Iraq we actually trained on multiple areas of warfare, for the past 3 years your army has only been training in counterinsurgency. The Joint Chiefs of Staff must address the impact of 3 years of its army training only in one warfare area and being unable to meet any timeline of any war plan by its army in America's arsenal of war plans.

Then, in the long term, the impact of 42 percent of our men and women who we are recruiting today being less capable than ever of being able to operate

and maintain the systems of our weaponry in the future as they can in the past 3 years.

Second, it is not the general or the ambassador who should come here to speak about Iraq's security, but rather our intelligence agencies that must address the question about whether the Iraq strategy has improved our overall efforts in the global war on terror, with Afghanistan once again prey to terrorists, and the Taliban having gone back into the ungoverned regions to protect them, and General Hayden, head of the CIA, having said that al Qaeda now has a safe haven in the border regions between Afghanistan and Pakistan. What is the impact of a strategy in that unstable region that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has described as "in Iraq what we do what we must, but in Afghanistan, we do what we can."

Officials from the State Department likewise must address the impact upon our allies of this war in Iraq and our relationships with them and the efforts to achieve other diplomatic goals, remembering that when we went into Bosnia, 50 percent of the coalition troops were non-U.S., and when we went into Iraq 5 years ago, less than 7 percent of the troops that entered that country were non-U.S.

And then the Treasury, how can they explain the impact of what all economists agree are now almost \$2 trillion to \$3 trillion as the cost of this war in Iraq? When Iraq is awash in oil revenues, why are we using taxpayers' dollars?

Therefore, the questions that General Petraeus can and should not answer comes down to, he should not be the one to tell us how long and at what cost before we change our strategy. It is only if Congress changes the forum for this general to come before us to say and hold up a national mirror, this is the impact of Iraq upon our overall national security strategy, and if it is not working and if it is negatively impacting it, we must therefore change the strategy.

I believe it is against the spirit, as a man who has served in the military 31 years until I entered Congress, to have a military man placed in the position to determine singularly, when he is only responsible for the security of Iraq, to then determine without everyone else there the right strategy and course for America's national security.

We must have that debate. Is the strategy working? Is it harming our overall national security? If it is, change the strategy.

PRESIDENT BUSH INSULTS THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WITH HIS SELECTIVE PARDONS AND COMMUTATIONS

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, President Bush pardoned 15

people and granted one commutation to crimes that ranged from falsifying records, conspiracy, bank embezzlement, dealing in firearms, distributing marijuana, conspiracy to commit wire and mail fraud, heroin importation, selling migratory bird parts in violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, aiding and abetting the escape of a prisoner, distributing more than 50 grams of crack cocaine, and a variety of other crimes.

This brings to about 157 the number of pardons and/or commutations that President Bush has distributed in his administration in his term in office. And although that number is fewer than other presidents, it in fact is reflective of something that I consider to be a serious problem, and that is this, that although the President has been compassionate or for whatever reason chosen to commute or pardon 157 people up to this point in time, he leaves two Border Patrol agents in jail today because I believe of the misbehavior of the U.S. Attorney in that particular district. And this is unconscionable.

This House actually voted last session unanimously to in fact deny funding to the Department of Justice to continue to hold Border Patrol agents Ramos and Compean in the Federal prison where they have been incarcerated now for well over a year. And their terms are for 11 and 12 years. This is because they have been sentenced because of the testimony of a known drug smuggler by the name of Osvaldo Aldrete-Davila, who was given immunity from prosecution by U.S. Attorney Sutton.

The SUV that Aldrete was driving was found to contain 743 pounds of marijuana. The jury in the Ramos-Compean trial was never told of Aldrete's criminal background. They were led to believe that Aldrete was a one-time smuggler trying to make money to help a sick relative. In fact, he was a professional drug smuggler, and his history was known to the DEA and to Johnny Sutton, who was the prosecuting attorney, at the time of the trial, but this history was kept from the jury.

It has been revealed in documents since the trial that U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton deliberately delayed the arrest of Aldrete for a subsequent drug smuggling incident that occurred while Aldrete was under the grant of immunity but before the trial date. All of this information, of course, was withheld because it would have revealed Aldrete as a professional smuggler, not an innocent victim of the Border Patrol agents. This is a flagrant abuse of prosecutorial discretion.

These mistakes were compounded by asking for a mandatory 10-year sentence for Ramos and Compean for the use of a firearm in the commission of a "crime." The law was never intended to apply to law officers who use their weapons in the performance of their jobs.

The key question at the trial was whether the drug smuggler Aldrete had

a weapon and had pointed it at one of the Border Patrol agents. Mr. Aldrete denied having such a weapon. It was his word against the testimony of the Border Patrol agents, so the credibility of each witness was critical to the jury's evaluation of the incident, yet the jury was kept in the dark about Aldrete's other arrests and his history as a drug smuggler.

The mistakes made by Ramos and Compean in trying to apprehend Mr. Aldrete should have been handled as a violation of agency rules, the failure to write and file a report of an incident involving Aldrete, and punished by a 5-day suspension, not by criminal prosecution. For that reason alone, this conduct rises to the level of reprehensible, the conduct I believe of the U.S. Attorney in this case and of the President of the United States.

To compound the injustice in this case, it is widely known that the U.S. Attorney is a friend of the President, going back to his days as Governor. But Bush's refusal to issue a pardon or a commutation amounts to a coverup I believe of this misconduct in this trial.

Ramos and Compean have appealed their conviction to the U.S. Circuit Court and a decision on that appeal is due shortly. At the very least they deserve a new trial. President Bush has it within his power to end this injustice now by issuing a pardon or a commutation. I sincerely hope that he takes that responsibility seriously and offers this to Mr. Ramos and Mr. Compean, who are languishing in prison for literally no good reason.

COMMEMORATING THE LEGACY OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., BY SERVICE FOR PEACE

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the 40th anniversary of the week Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was killed to commemorate his legacy as continued by Service for Peace.

During his short life, Dr. King marched in my hometown of Louisville, Kentucky, on his way to touching millions of American lives throughout this Nation and inspiring the masses with his message of freedom and of peace. Today, I am proud to say that, in no small part thanks to the efforts of Reverend Peter Hayes, our local Service for Peace, and programs like 40 Days of Peace, the MLK Season of Service, and the King Memorial Walk and Peace Fest, the spirit of Dr. King is alive and well in our hometown.

Each year, Service for Peace reminds us that though King was taken from us far too early, the gifts he gave to us, his lessons, his passion, his legacy, remain and continue to inspire within us a deep sense of justice.

Nationwide, half a million volunteers took part in this year's MLK Day of

Peace, contributed to their communities and committed themselves to peace and justice.

□ 1630

This Saturday for the second year in a row I will join with members of the Louisville community for the King Memorial Walk and Peace Fest. We will gather at the Muhammad Ali Center to share stories of yesterday's struggles and a vision for tomorrow's successes, before walking as one to the north side of the Ohio River. Crossing that boundary once was a journey between slavery and salvation, Jim Crow and justice, oppression and opportunity for far too many Americans. But this weekend, when we return to Louisville, we will enter a community proud of its diversity, alive with the spirit of peace, and working toward a more just future for all.

While it is true that we cannot bring Martin Luther King, Jr., back, by promoting his teachings, Service for Peace ensures that we will never really lose him, either. The activism of Service for Peace is so much more than a tribute to a great American hero; it is a practical and proven strategy to reduce drug use, crime, violence, and murder in my community and others throughout our great Nation.

I know my colleagues will join me in honoring Service for Peace, just as Service for Peace honors the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

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.)

WIN-WIN FOR U.S. AND COLOMBIA

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, and I urge the Speaker of the House to bring this important measure before the House for an up-or-down vote, and submit for the RECORD two articles, one a column recently published in the New York Times by Edward Schumacher-Matos, a former foreign correspondent for the Times and a visiting professor of Latin American studies at Harvard, as well as an editorial in this week's Washington Post in support of the trade agreement.

KILLING A TRADE PACT

(By Edward Schumacher-Matos)

President Bush has been urging Congress to approve a pending trade agreement with Colombia, an ally that recently almost went to war with Venezuela and Hugo Chávez. Even though the agreement includes the labor and environmental conditions that Congress wanted, many Democrats, includ-

ing Senators Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama, now say that Colombia must first punish whomever has been assassinating the members of the nation's trade unions before the agreement can pass.

An examination of the Democrats' claims, however, finds that their faith in the assertions of human-rights groups is more righteous than right. Union members have been assassinated, but the reported number is highly exaggerated. Even one murder for union organizing is atrocious, but isolated killings do not justify holding up the trade agreement.

All sides agree that trade-union murders in Colombia, like all violence, have declined drastically in recent years. The Colombian unions' own research center says killings dropped to 39 last year from a high of 275 in 1996.

Yet in a report being released next week, the research center says the killings remain "systematic" and should be treated by the courts as "genocide" designed to "exterminate" unionism in Colombia. Most human-rights groups cite the union numbers and conclude, as Human Rights Watch did this year, that "Colombia has the highest rate of violence against trade unionists in the world."

Even if that is true, it was far safer to be in a union than to be an ordinary citizen in Colombia last year. The unions report that they have 1 million members. Thirty-nine killings in 2007 is a murder rate of 4 unionists per 100,000. There were 15,400 homicides in Colombia last year, not counting combat deaths, according to the national police. That is a murder rate of 34 citizens per 100,000.

Many in Congress, moreover, assume that "assassinations" means murders that are carried out for union activity. But the union research center says that in 79 percent of the cases going back to 1986, it has no suspect or motive. The government doesn't either.

When the Inter American Press Association several years ago investigated its list of murdered Colombian journalists, it found that more than 40 percent were killed for nonjournalistic reasons. The unions have never done a similar investigation.

There are, however, a growing number of convictions for union murders in Colombia. There were exactly zero convictions for them in the 1990s, Colombia's bloodiest decade, when right-wing paramilitaries and leftist guerrillas were at the height of their strength. Each assassinated the suspected supporters of the others across society, including in unions.

With help from the United States, in 2000 the Colombian military and the judicial system began to reassert themselves. Prosecuting cases referred by the unions themselves, the attorney general's office won its first conviction for the murder of a trade unionist in 2001. Last year, the office won nearly 40.

Of the 87 convictions won in union cases since 2001, almost all for murder, the ruling judges found that union activity was the motive in only 17. Even if you add the 16 cases in which motive was not established, the number doesn't reach half of the cases. The judges found that 15 of the murders were related to common crime, 10 to crimes of passion and 13 to membership in a guerrilla organization.

The unions don't dispute the numbers. Instead, they say the prosecutors and the courts are wasting time and being anti-union by seeking to establish motive—a novel position in legal jurisprudence.

The two main guerrilla groups have an avowed strategy of infiltrating unions, which attracts violence. About a third of the identified murderers of union members are leftist

guerrillas. Most of the rest are members of paramilitary groups—presumed to be behind two of the four trade unionist murders this month. The demobilization of most paramilitary groups, along with the prosecutions and government protection of union leaders, has contributed to the great drop in union murders.

President Álvaro Uribe, who has thin skin, can be unwisely provocative when responding to complaints from unions and human rights groups. Still, the level of unionization in Colombia is roughly equal to that in the United States and slightly below the level in the rest of Latin America. The government registered more than 120 new unions in 2006, the last year for which numbers are available. The International Labor Organization says union legal rights in Colombia meet its highest standards. Union leaders have been cabinet members, a governor and the mayor of Bogotá.

Delaying the approval of the trade agreement would be convenient for Democrats in Washington. American labor unions and human-rights groups have made common cause to oppose it this election year. The unions oppose the trade agreement for traditional protectionist reasons. Less understandable are the rights groups.

Human Rights Watch says that it has no position on trade but that it is using the withholding of approval to gain political leverage over the Colombian government. Conversely, they are harming Colombian workers in the process. The trade agreement would stimulate economic growth and help all Colombians.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 31, 2008]

FREE COLOMBIA—A TRADE PACT EVERYONE CAN LOVE

Sometime after Congress returns from Easter recess this week, President Bush is likely to present the Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement for the approval of the House and Senate. As we have said, the proposed pact is good policy for both Colombia and the United States. Colombia has long enjoyed periodically renewable tariff-free access to the U.S. market; the agreement would make that permanent. In exchange, U.S. producers would, for the first time, get the same tariff-free deal when they export to Colombia. Meanwhile, the agreement contains labor and environmental protections much like those that Congress has already approved in a U.S.-Peru trade pact. A vote for the Colombia deal would show Latin America that a staunch U.S. ally will be rewarded for improving its human rights record and resisting the anti-American populism of Venezuela's Hugo Chávez.

Sending the agreement to the House of Representatives without the prior approval of Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) would be risky for the president; usually, the executive and legislative branches tee up such votes cooperatively. But months of Democratic resistance to the Colombia deal may have left Mr. Bush no choice. The agreement is being held hostage by members of the House (and Senate) who argue that Colombia—despite a dramatic drop in its overall murder toll under the leadership of President Álvaro Uribe—hasn't done enough to protect trade union activists or to punish past murders of labor leaders. Its a spurious complaint: Actually, in 2006, union members were slightly less likely than the average Colombian to be murdered. But the human rights issue has served as cover for many Democrats whose true objections are to free trade itself.

Once the agreement arrives on the Hill, Congress will have 90 legislative days to vote yes or no—no amendments and no filibusters

allowed, because special "fast track" rules apply. The Bush administration is betting that enough Democrats would support the pact to ensure its passage in the House, if it ever comes up for a vote. Of course, Ms. Pelosi could make an issue of the president's failure to get her approval to submit the pact and then could have her caucus shoot down the deal. But she could also engage the White House in serious negotiations. The president has signaled a willingness to consider reauthorizing aid for workers displaced by trade, legislation that is dear to the Democrats' labor constituency and that he has heretofore resisted.

Ms. Pelosi recently said that no Colombia deal could pass without trade adjustment assistance—without also mentioning the bogus trade unionists issue. Perhaps she is realizing that talking to Mr. Bush about swapping a Colombia vote for trade adjustment assistance might actually lead to a tangible accomplishment. At least we have to hope so.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement. I urge the Speaker to schedule a vote soon on this important agreement. Why? It is good for Illinois.

I represent an export dependent district. I have 8,000 union workers who make construction equipment; and, because of the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, the 15 percent tariffs, taxes, the 15 percent on that construction equipment exported to Colombia are eliminated on day one. When you talk to agriculture, our farmers, those who raise corn and soybeans and livestock and specialty crops, they will tell you the U.S.-Colombia agreement is the best ever for agriculture. Clearly, States like Illinois win under the U.S.-Colombia Trade Agreement.

I would note that, overall, 80 percent of U.S. exports currently taxed will see those taxes waived and eliminated immediately upon implementation of the U.S.-Colombia Agreement. And facts have shown, if we have a trade agreement with a nation, exports grow 50 percent faster. So, it is good for Illinois and good for America.

Ladies and gentlemen, who is Colombia? Let me tell you, Colombia is America's best friend in Latin America. It is the oldest democracy in Latin America. It is America's most reliable partner in counterterrorism and in counternarcotics in this entire hemisphere. And today, President Uribe, who was democratically elected overwhelmingly with a mandate to bring security to the country, has been successful in driving the leftist narcotic-trafficking terrorist group, the FARC, to the fringes of Colombia and brought security to his country. As a result, he is the most popular elected president anywhere in the hemisphere, with an 80 percent approval rating.

I would note that 71 percent of Colombians in a recent opinion poll say that they believe that Colombia is more secure because of President Uribe, and 73 percent of Colombians say that President Uribe respects human rights. Homicides are down 40 percent, kidnappings are down 76 percent. And I would note, the murder

rate in Colombia today is lower than Washington, DC. It is safer to walk the streets of Colombia than it is our own Nation's capital. President Uribe has made tremendous progress in the last few years in reducing violence.

Now there are those who oppose the U.S.-Colombia Trade Agreement, and they say that President Uribe hasn't done enough. He hasn't done enough, particularly when it comes to violence against labor leaders. Let's look at the facts regarding President Uribe and the democratically-elected government of Colombia as it comes to violence against labor leaders as well as against other Colombian citizens.

President Uribe has increased by 75 percent in the last 2 years funding for the prosecution of those who commit violent acts. He has added over 2,100 new posts overall in the Prosecutor General's Office, adding 418 new prosecutors and 545 new investigators. He has made major changes. Colombia should be recognized and rewarded for the progress they have made. And, I would note that Carlos Rodriguez, president of the United Workers Confederation, has said about this effort: "Never in the history of Colombia have we achieved something so important."

When it comes specifically to labor leaders and labor activists, almost \$39 million was spent by the government of Colombia last year to provide body guards and protection for labor activists and labor leaders; 1,500 individuals, labor activists and labor leaders, participated and they are protected. And, I would note, that it has been successful. No labor leader has suffered a violent act or lost his life under this protection. Again, as the Washington Post noted this week, the murder rate for labor activists is actually lower than the national average. So he has made tremendous progress.

I would note, the International Labor Organization has removed Colombia from its labor watch list, even while Colombia has agreed to permanent ILO representation in Colombia. Most telling is 1,400 major labor union leaders have endorsed the Trade Agreement. The bottom line is, those who oppose this trade agreement always say they never do enough, but they never say what more can they do. Colombia deserves to be rewarded.

The U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement is good for America, it is good for Illinois, it is good for Colombia. They deserve a vote. Let's bring this agreement to the floor for an up-or-down vote soon.

TEACH YOUR CHILD—GO TO JAIL

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, homeschooling is an ever growing choice for parents in America. Parents teach their children at home for various reasons: They are concerned about

the quality of education, or the lack of it, in government schools; they don't approve of the public school curriculum; they want their kids to have a religious-based education, which is of course strictly forbidden in public schools; parents are concerned about school safety, especially in big urban schools; or, parents have special needs children that are not adequately served in public schools. Whatever the reason, many parents choose to homeschool.

Homeschooling is successful. Recent statistics show that homeschooled kids get higher test scores on ACT tests than non-homeschoolers. In the last 10 years, homeschooled children have scored higher every year on the ACT test than non-homeschoolers. I just recently appointed a homeschooled student to the United States Air Force Academy, and his homeschooled education was superb.

But now, an appellate State court in California has ruled that, "Parents not only don't have a constitutional right to homeschool; parents that homeschool their children can face fines and go to jail," sayeth the all-powerful Judge Walter Croskey.

Where does the California court get such nonsense? Education has been the responsibility of parents since the beginning of time. Public education really is a relatively new concept. And now we have judges saying that parents are criminals unless their children are taught in government schools. This reminds me of my visit to the school system in the Soviet Union, which mandated all students should be indoctrinated with propaganda in the communist school system. This is Big Brother and government control at its worst. Can you imagine? A crime to teach your own children.

I have nothing against public schools or teachers. My mother was a public school teacher. All my daughters are teachers. I even taught in the State university. But no government has the right to tell parents how to educate their children, not even the government in California.

Parents and students need all education options. They need private school options, public school, religious school, or even home school. The real issue is not quality of education, but education freedom of choice by parents.

The judge says it is unconstitutional to homeschool your children. Well, Justice Croskey must not have ever read the U.S. Constitution. There is nothing written in the United States Constitution about giving government or judges the authority to control education. In fact, the word "education" is not even mentioned in the Constitution as a responsibility of government. The California court's ruling, in my opinion, is unconstitutional.

Education has generally been deemed a matter for local communities and parents. We have always believed that in this country. In fact, the Constitution in the Tenth Amendment states,

“The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the states are reserved to the states respectfully or to the people.”

And, I submit, “the people” in that phrase are parents that have the power, under our Constitution, to decide how to educate their children. It is their responsibility, their right, and their authority. After all, our children do not belong to the government and are not government possessions to be molded as the government or government judges deem fit.

The U.S. Constitution gives liberty to Americans, not enslavement to government. It is a parent’s responsibility and right, not the government’s, to raise our children. That includes how best to educate our children.

Living in a Nation that was founded on the inalienable right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, means that parents have the right to raise and teach their children in a manner that is consistent with their beliefs and their principles, whether the California appellate judges like it or not.

And that’s just the way it is.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4847, UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

Ms. SUTTON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-563) on the resolution (H. Res. 1071) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4847) to reauthorize the United States Fire Administration, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HONORING FORMER REPRESENTATIVE BILL DICKINSON OF ALABAMA

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to rise and talk a little bit about a great former member who just passed away, Bill Dickinson of Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, when I came in in 1981 and campaigned with Ronald Reagan in that great year in which we brought back a policy of peace through strength to the United States Government with respect to foreign policy, I was lucky enough to be placed on the Armed Services Committee and Bill Dickinson was the new ranking Republican member.

In those days, we had 1,000 petty officers a month leaving the U.S. Navy because they couldn’t afford to take care of their families on the pay they were making; we had 50 percent of our aircraft or more which were not combat mission capable; we had what was called a hollow Army, that is, an Army

within which skilled people were leaving at an enormous rate. And, under Ronald Reagan’s leadership and Bill Dickinson’s hard work as the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, along with lots of right-thinking Republicans and Democrats, we reversed that trend. We rebuilt national security.

I will always remember Bill working the budgets that Ronald Reagan brought in his early years, that 12.6 percent pay raise that we brought in early to start moving military families up to scale, the new equipment budgets that we brought in. The decision that we were going to stand up to the Soviet Union, and those decisions that the President made like the one that he made to move ground launch cruise missiles and Pershing 2s into Europe as the Russians were then ringing our allies with SS-20 missiles, and the fact that that helped to bring them to the table, helped to bring them to the point where they picked up the phone and said, “We want to talk.”

I can remember Bill Dickinson standing tall and supporting the President very strongly when, in Central America, we saw the FMLN in El Salvador, the Communist group that was taking arms and materiel from the Soviet Union and trying to establish a Communist beachhead in El Salvador.

□ 1645

I remember the United States moving in to provide a shield around that fragile new government that was standing up, a democratically elected government. I remember Bill Dickinson, as a ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, spearheading support in Congress for that very important initiative.

Time after time, Bill Dickinson moved to the fore to make sure that we rebuilt America’s forces, that we operated under a policy of peace through strength. And he was, indeed, Ronald Reagan’s strongest ally with respect to national security in the House of Representatives.

Bill was a wonderful guy, a great guy with a sense of humor, a guy who was elected in a district in Alabama that until 1964 had not been Republican for 100 years. But he kept that district with a good sense of humor, a good sense of touch with the people, being approachable, and having a very strong, conservative peace-through-strength philosophy that resonated not only with his constituents but with the American people.

To Barbara and the children, we express our greatest condolences. We have lost a great former representative, and I have lost a great friend.

ENACT U.S.-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we are entrusted with the responsibility of keeping this Nation’s economy strong by enacting policies which keep U.S. companies competitive in the global marketplace, to also support job growth at home, and ensure that the Federal Government operates effectively and efficiently.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the 9,000 U.S. companies who export industrial and consumer goods to our fourth largest trading partner in Latin America face tariffs of up to 35 percent in their exports while most Colombian products imported to the U.S. enter tariff free, tax free.

On February 27, just 5 weeks ago, the House agreed unanimously to extend existing unilateral trade preferences to Colombia and other Andean countries. In May 2007, House leadership publicly committed to passing a full bilateral trade agreement with Colombia, thereby allowing equal access to U.S. businesses in Colombia.

The Colombian government supports lowering these tariffs on U.S. goods, and many Members of Congress have shown time and time again that they support lowering barriers to trade with free nations. Yet the answer so far has been total inaction by the leadership. Inaction on the part of this Congress has levied an unnecessary burden and an uncalled for tax upon American companies, including 8,000 small- and medium-sized businesses, many of which operate in southern Florida.

Furthermore, it has been reported in the press that files recovered from a computer belonging to Raul Reyes, a leader within the terrorist rebel Colombian Revolutionary Armed Forces, FARC, link the terrorist organization to the Venezuelan leadership in Caracas. In light of this news, Mr. Speaker, recent threats also made by the reckless and irresponsible leader, Hugo Chavez, and the ongoing attacks by the FARC, the United States needs to be supportive of the Colombian government, which stands up to anti-democratic and anti-American forces in the region.

It is time for the House leadership to follow through on their promises. Enactment of the U.S.-Colombia trade promotion agreement would show our strong support for this democracy while strengthening our own economy by creating greatest access for U.S. companies and creating more jobs in our communities here in the United States.

It would be negligent, irresponsible and unthinkable for this House to not immediately pass a free trade agreement with our closest ally in an otherwise volatile region.

Passage of this agreement will benefit businesses in our communities, create jobs for our constituents, and help strengthen our alliance with that democratically elected government and the people of Colombia. I call upon the House leadership to bring this agreement to the floor for a vote so we can

show the world community that the United States stands with its allies.

COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by associating myself with the very eloquent remarks of my colleague from Miami, Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

Mr. Speaker, you never get a second chance to make a first impression, so the old saying goes that we've all heard. Once first impressions are made, it can be difficult to reinvent oneself. Circumstances may change, but assumptions and perceptions are very stubborn things. Just ask any Colombian.

People became familiar with the country of Colombia in the 1980s and the 1990s as the drug wars exploded. We didn't know much about the place, but we were familiar with the highlights: Bloody drug wars fought in jungles and on the streets of cities like Medellin, Bogota and Cali. And although we probably couldn't name many of the elected officials in Colombia, everyone knew the name of Pablo Escobar, the drug lord.

But over the course of this decade, a dramatic transformation has taken place in Colombia. The rule of gang lords has been replaced by the rule of law. The streets have become safe again. Armed terrorist organizations no longer operate in huge swaths of the country with impunity, and paramilitary groups have been dismantled with their leaders having gone to jail.

Funding for the Colombian Justice Department has nearly doubled, to ensure that criminal cases, old and new, are dealt with professionally and expeditiously, sending a clear signal that the days of impunity are long gone. Poverty has been cut dramatically, while social spending has increased. The Colombia of today is unrecognizable to those who knew it just a decade ago.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of being there on several occasions and have been amazed by what I have seen. Nowhere is the transformation starker than in the city of Medellin. This city was ground zero for the Escobar drug cartel. Its murder rate rivaled the most dangerous places on the face of the Earth. Terror and violence ruled everyday life.

Today, the city tells an utterly different story. Violence has plummeted. New public transportation projects and schools have given hope to previously blighted neighborhoods. New jobs and development, especially in the apparel industry, have provided a path to that first rung of the economic ladder, and greater upward mobility which was totally unheard of just a few years ago.

Mr. Speaker, fair trade and specialty coffee industries have also provided

new opportunities for well-paying jobs in the area. This thriving community is a shining example of the stunning turnaround that it has made since 2002.

And yet much of the world has failed to take notice. While hostages and explosions make for front-page headlines, the slow and steady work of rebuilding a country is far less flashy. But the very difficult and remarkable work that has been done deserves recognizing. Many of us in Congress are working hard to solidify the gains that have been made through the implication of a free trade agreement. This agreement is strongly supported by the private sector unions of Colombia because they welcome the jobs and opportunity that the agreement will bring.

I hope very much that the free trade agreement will be considered soon for a vote. But as this debate does go forward, I believe it must proceed based on facts, not assumptions, inaccurate perceptions, and outdated figures. When we talk about Colombia in the year 2008, we are not talking about the Colombia of Pablo Escobar. We are talking about a country transformed and on the mend. After the long, difficult struggle of the Colombian people, we owe them a little credit and recognition for the remarkable things that they have accomplished.

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

(Mr. FRANKS of Arizona addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. WESTMORELAND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. WEINER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BUDGET SCHOOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the recognition and I appreciate the opportunity to come and talk about a subject that is near and dear to the heart of every single taxpayer in this Nation. That subject is the Federal budget. It is something that as we debate issues here, we say it affects 10 percent or 20 percent or 50 percent of the population. Our Federal budget, it affects everyone, Mr. Speaker, and I think we should start this second session of budget school with a little bit of perspective.

I have got a copy of the Constitution of the United States, and there is also included in this a Declaration of Independence. Now this copy is small enough to fit into my pocket. I could put it in my jacket pocket and carry it with me all day long.

What is a little bit frightening, Mr. Speaker, is here is the phone book for the news media that covers Washington, D.C. We are one of the most covered places on the face of the Earth, and here is the phone book that covers that.

Well, I also have the Federal budget. As you can see, it is an enormous document. It is much larger. By the time you have the tables and the justifications and the analytical information and go through the appendix and find what you need, it is a huge document. It is much larger in size than the simple documents on which this great Nation was founded.

What we are going to do today is talk a little bit about this budget and talk about what our response should be on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the time. I am coming to the floor as a

member of the Republican Study Committee. This group of conservatives within the Republican conference have developed this project called "Budget School" because we think that it is imperative that the American people know what is in this budget and know where to find this budget and are fully aware of how their money is being spent because we realize it is not the Federal Government's money that is being spent, Mr. Speaker, it is the money of the taxpayers of this great Nation.

This evening to open our session as we begin this period of time called special orders which comes at the end of our workday, and Congress has finished its regular business for the day, and it is 5 minutes of 5 in the afternoon here in Washington, and we are moving into the period of time called special orders. It is the period of time when we can come to the floor and talk a little bit more at length about the issues that are very important to us.

This evening we have several of our colleagues from the Republican Study Committee that will join me to talk about the budget and their concerns with the increase in spending, the concerns with the increase in taxation and their concerns about the long term fiscal health of this great Nation.

I would like to begin our conversation this evening by yielding to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) to hear his comments on the budget.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for yielding, and there are a couple of points I want to make. One is just now a lesson that we have simply learned or seen, I guess, witnessed, if you will. The Democrats passed a budget the week before we adjourned for a 2-week work recess, so it would have been 3 weeks ago. So 3 weeks the Democrat budget is passed, and it had in it \$30 billion for AIDS money for Africa.

As we know, the President has been very passionate about getting AIDS support for the continent of Africa. Indeed, Africa has suffered a lot because of the AIDS problem. But the President called for a \$30 billion expenditure.

□ 1700

Now, the Democrats called for a \$30 billion expenditure as well in the budget 3 weeks ago, but something may have happened in their districts over the last 2 weeks. I suspect person after person who's paying \$3.25 a gallon and who's concerned about the war and concerned about health care ignored that and said to their Democrat Member, you have got to spend more than the President has promised for AIDS in Africa; and don't just spend \$30 billion, spend \$50 billion. So, when we get back to Washington, the first thing the Democrats do is ignore the President's request, ignore their own budget, and go \$20 billion on one vote on one line item expenditure.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. KINGSTON. Absolutely.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. The budget that was presented is over a \$3 trillion budget, and it calls for a \$683 billion tax increase. And discretionary spending is increased in this budget by \$280 billion. So, what I'm hearing the gentleman say, that's not enough. We've already, day two coming back from our Easter district work period, day two we have seen them move forward and increase \$20 billion more.

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KINGSTON. That's correct. So, here we are, the first day back basically voting on anything of substance, we've already spent \$20 billion over a budget that's only 3 weeks old.

Now, you had mentioned discretionary spending, and I want to make sure folks understand. Discretionary spending means Congress has agreed that year by year that level of spending can fluctuate. Now, that's opposed to what we call mandatory spending. And I use the term "mandatory" loosely because nothing is mandatory if you're the legislative branch that set laws. But we call things like Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security mandatory spending, meaning, not just that we're going to spend a certain amount every year depending on a formula, but it also means, and I don't know if my friend from Tennessee or the other gentleman from Texas or Tennessee know this, but we don't have hearings on mandatory spending traditionally.

I'm a member of the Appropriations Committee. We spend a huge amount of money on Social Security and Medicaid, but we've never had a hearing on it. Every year we wrestle on some of the mandatory spending and some of the discretionary spending, but the biggest portion of the budget we don't do hearings on. And I think that it's time that we start talking about some of the mandatory spending if we're ever going to be serious about balancing the budget.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. If the gentleman will yield.

There are a couple of things that I would point out. I'm sure people are sitting there going, I'm not believing this. I have worked all day long, I work all year, I haven't even finished paying my obligations for my property taxes, my state taxes, my Federal income taxes this year because you have to work until around the first of June to meet your obligations on taxes before you're working for money to take home.

So, what I'm hearing him say is, all that increasing, they want you to work further into the year to pay them. Somebody sitting at their desk right now, they're thinking, I can't believe this. If they want to pull down a copy of the budget, here are some Web sites and some resources we would encourage them to use. To get a copy of the President's budget, they can go to whitehouse.gov/omb. To get the Republican response, which our Republican Study Committee was involved in,

budget.house.gov/republicans. And to get some of our budget school resources, they can go to house.gov/blackburn. They can also go to YouTube and Face Book and pull some of this information.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me ask, before the gentlewoman takes that down, do those budgets balance, by the way; or when do they balance out, when do they balance? And do they have to be passed by the Senate and the House?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. We're going to work through explaining that process this evening because the budget has come through the House and it is going to the Senate, it will come back to conference committee. And we set all of those different, the template, if you will, and then it will go through the appropriations process this year.

And I wanted to show this second poster. You were just mentioning about Medicare and Social Security and some of the different functions that are entitlements. And then we also have the areas that are seen as being discretionary. And you were mentioning discretionary spending. And those who want to follow the budget discussion with us can follow these different functions in the budget documents that we had mentioned earlier.

And I yield back to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, I think, though, that when you're talking about spending, you have to look at everything. And when you have such a large portion on mandatory spending, and I think of it in terms of automatic spending, and I understand that Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare are sacred cows, that if you touch them politically somebody's going to twist your words around and say that you're trying to do something nefarious, but the reality is if you're ever going to balance the budget, you have to look at everything. And there are areas I know that we can do a better job on.

Now I'm on the AG Committee on Appropriations. Many people don't know this, and they always complain about how big the USDA is. Sixty-three percent of the agriculture budget is in welfare. Food stamps, the WIC programs, school nutrition programs, these are supplemental assistance programs to the poor. Now, I was here in 1996 when we reformed welfare, and it went from 14 million people who were on welfare down to 5 million people. That was a step in the right direction because you want to help those who truly need it, but you don't want to create a system where able-bodied people are able to game it and not work.

But what we're doing in AG appropriations is year after year making it a little bit easier to qualify for food stamps. We lighten up on the work requirements. We extend it to this group or the other. The WIC program is a child nursing supplement program. And Dr. BURGESS knows well, it's a supplemental program for nursing mothers,

but you're eligible for age 6. Now, I'm a father of four. I know you're a mama, you weren't breast-feeding your children at age 6, I assume.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. And I'm about to be a grandmother. And I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia's comments about the historical data that is involved in that. And as we look at the budget, and how did this budget get to be so big? That is just so very important. And if you look at the budget, which is what I have right here on the podium in front of me, and you can see it, you can hardly hold it up it's so big, but it comes in sections. This much is just the overview. And I said, that pales in comparison when you look at the small size of our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence.

Here's the appendix. And you would get inside this and look for the program that you're talking about with the Department of Agriculture. Then you would come in here to the Analytical Perspectives. This volume is where you would go to look at the analysis that you were just speaking of. And then, here are the historical tables.

And Mr. Speaker, this is where our colleagues go to look at where a program was when it started, to trace back through why this program was put in place and go back and see if that program is still aimed toward meeting what it was put in place for, meeting that original mission, how has it changed? And as you're pointing out, so many programs get changed on a regular ongoing basis. You go into the analysis and look at if you think this is worthy, if those are certainly the type data and the type premises on which you want to be operating to fund that budget. You look at this appendix to see how much they decided that they ought to be putting into that budget.

So, the gentleman is quite right in explaining how these programs grow, and did they begin to move away from their original mission? That is why some of our colleagues that are joining us this evening have been busy working on fighting waste, fraud and abuse, fighting increased spending, fighting wasteful earmarks, and working for the past few years to raise this issue.

And I know the gentleman from Georgia has constituents, and we have the gentleman from Iowa, Ms. BACHMANN, who is from Minnesota, Mr. DAVIS from Tennessee, who are joining us on the floor this evening to talk about this issue and to talk about where we are seeing the movement in this budget.

At this time, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) who has worked tirelessly. He was in my freshman class as we made waste, fraud and abuse our freshman class project, and as we have worked to reduce what the Federal Government spends and begin to try to tame this budget and to bring it back in so that it is a friendlier budget for the American taxpayer.

And I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for organizing this Special Order and for the privilege to address you, Mr. Speaker.

This budget issue that rolls out in front of us, I'd like to take us back to anchor it a little bit on what's really going on. And we haven't gone very far into all the news and the indicators we have on this economy, but this budget is the largest tax increase in the history of America; it amounts to \$683 billion in tax increases over the next 5 years. That's almost triple the largest tax increase in history that took place in 1993. We remember that year, 1993, that was a \$240.6 billion tax increase, about a third of what this one amounts to in '93. We will look back and remember what happened in 1994, Republicans took over the majority in the House of Representatives partly because of over-spending.

But as we followed this economy a little over a year ago, I remember the swearing-in ceremony here on the floor of Congress when Speaker PELOSI took the gavel for the first time. I watched what went on when all new committee chairs for the first time in 12 years picked up the gavel and began to manage their committees. And I watched as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee went on the talk circuit all around the country, media stop after media stop after media stop, and he was constantly asked, are you, Chairman RANGEL, going to make the Bush tax cuts permanent? Are you going to preserve any part of the Bush tax cuts? And he demurred on a straight answer time after time. But by a process of elimination it became clear to the American investor that those Bush tax cuts were not going to be made permanent, that every one of them was going to be designed to end, expire and fail at some point.

Now, these tax cuts, the big ones, the ones that matter, was on May 28, 2007. That was when we had the real tax cuts that inspired this economy. And we have been on a growth pattern ever since that time and today we're still on that growth pattern in spite of what they say about our economy if you just track the DOW. But when the public understood and the investment community understood that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee was going to continue down this path of spending, that he didn't see a tax cut he liked and he didn't see a tax increase that he didn't like, they stopped investing in industrial investment.

The reduction in industrial investment that took place January, February, March, April and onwards of 2007 was the lead indicator for this economic inactivity that we're seeing today. That was item number one, the understanding that there would be tax increases, this understanding that we know, according to Adam Smith and Wealth of Nations from 1776 when he said "the cost of any goods is the cost

of the labor that it takes to produce it and the capital required to support the labor." And the cost of capital went up because of the tax increases that were around the corner, the tax increases that were implicit in this budget. When the cost of capital went up, capital is always reactive and smart, and capital investments declined. That led us into the subprime, and we know about the subprime, but that's only really about \$150 billion in real losses. There might be a greater reaction on that in this Congress, but about \$150 billion. That's equivalent to a dollar a gallon on gasoline. By the way, there's no energy policy either.

But what this matters to us in this country is, we want to slow this growth in spending. We want to balance this budget. We want to bring a budget that gets us down to a responsible budget. And we want to get into the entitlements, fix Medicaid, fix Medicare, fix Social Security. And if we go down this path and we see the tax increases that were part of this, we put in it in one term that's relevant, what's relevant to us, how does this affect the family of four, mom, dad and two kids that are making \$50,000 a year? The result of this budget and the tax increases that are part of it to a family of four making \$50,000 a year, it will cost them annually \$2,100 in additional taxes.

And additionally, we're paying more for gas. We have no plan for a balanced budget coming out of the majority side. This economy has been driven down into the drink because of lack of confidence, lack of an energy policy, because of the tax increases that reduce the capital investment, especially in industrial investment, and because of the subprime.

Things that you do in a bad economy are not increase taxes, not increase government spending. You don't take a larger share out of your gross domestic product and roll that into government, that's the nonproductive sector of the economy. That's one I'm not feeling charitable; I call that the parasitic sector of the economy. We need to have more dollars in the productive sector and the private sector of the economy; that means less taxes, less government, more personal responsibility, more fiscal discipline on the part of this Congress and this House where we start the spending here.

So, I applaud the gentlelady for leading this Special Order. I look forward to many more. I look forward to the day when I can say, I stood on the floor of this Congress and voted for a balanced budget that made it through the Senate to the President's desk, and fiscal responsibility, and letting people keep the money that they earn.

Thank you for yielding. I appreciate it.

I yield back to the gentlelady from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding back.

And he is exactly right. In 1993, the \$240.6 billion tax increase that came

about in 1993 is something that people in this Nation stood up and said we are not going to stand for this.

□ 1715

And I appreciate also that the gentleman mentioned Wealth of Nations and made reference to that wonderful work.

I think another one that we could add to the reading list of those who are fiscal conservatives is Road to Serfdom, which is a book, and I would commend that, Mr. Speaker, to all of our colleagues, to go back and read that work by a wonderful economist, Friedrich Hayek. And it talks about how, when you tax more and government spends more, and you take more from your people in a Nation, that you're walking on that Road to Serfdom.

As the gentleman was saying, we look at the rate of taxations based on our GDP, where we are right now in 2007, and many of us feel like this is too high. We are under 20 percent.

This is the CBO long-term outlook for taxation. You can see by looking at the bars, the red one is net interest. Social Security is the purple area. Medicare and Medicaid is the orange area, and then you have all other spending, which is in green.

Look at this chart, and look at what happens from 2007 to 2015, where we move above that 20 percent. Look what happens by 2030, when meeting the cost of your entitlements and your interest are going to take all revenue coming in on our current percentage of taxation. And then 2040, look at what happens, when you're spending about 35 percent of your GDP on taxes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I will yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. As I look at your chart, it occurs to me that that's Federal spending. And I'm going to speculate here, though, that if we would add to that the State and the political subdivision spending on to that, because that also is a share of the GDP, we have a significantly higher percentage. And I would think that that percentage today may well go to 37 percent.

I've seen some studies by some very well-respected and highly credentialed economists that make the argument that there's a right size to government, and that right size to government, when you add all the taxation across the spectrum, from Federal to State to local, that right size of government taxing a percentage of GDP, they believe, falls somewhere between 17 and 23 percent. So I'd just argue that we've passed that already, and we've got to go down in those numbers. I'd like to see those bar charts go down.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. And the gentleman is exactly right. And we would all like to see, and that is the reason that we are here. And my hope is that as we work with our colleagues on this budget issue, that we will see these charts level off and then head down-

ward, because Federal spending is far too high. And then you're exactly right; when you add your political subdivisions and the State taxation and spending to that, you do see a different picture.

At this point, to talk a little bit more about what we see happening with this budget, I want to yield to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) who has joined us this year and has jumped right into the discussion of budget and taxation, and does a wonderful job representing our conservative perspective.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I want to thank the gentlelady from Tennessee and applaud her and thank her for her efforts as she is leading this wonderful budget school for the people of the United States, and I would consider her the dean of our budget school, and she's doing a wonderful job as dean. And I think that Representative STEVE KING may be considered a tenured professor in the budget school that the gentlelady from Tennessee is quite brilliantly hosting for the benefit of the American people.

It's so important that we're taking up this topic and devoting this time, because what all Americans share in common is that we, generally speaking, all are working for a living. And the one thing that we're finding is that more and more of our time is being spent working on behalf of political subdivisions. Whether it's the Federal Government, whether it's State government, whether it's local government, quite often our taxes are taking up perhaps as much time as from when we get up on January 1 and go to work, or if it's January 2, until perhaps in May or June, almost everything that we make during that time period is going to government.

I know that's hard to believe. But when you add up all the money that we're paying in taxes, about that much of our time is going to earn money that will, in turn, be handed over to government to spend our money. That's what's happening, and that's what we're yielding in terms of our sovereignty, is the amount of time that we are spending working to provide for our families; that much time is being spent going to government, because someone is going to spend the money that we earn.

The question is, will we have the power over being able to make those choices over spending, or will political subdivisions, whether it is the Federal, State or local, have the ability to make those choices?

I want to show you now a chart that we have up here. This talks about how much the budget that has just been passed, which the majority, the Democrat majority has the largest spending increases in American history for the budget and the largest tax increases in American history.

Take a look at the numbers. On every State, from Alabama to Wyoming, there's an increase in taxes for

every American across the board, on average, from Alabama to Wyoming. And these aren't small increases. This is over and above what the average American is already paying.

But take a look at these increases. If you're in the State of Alabama, it's over a \$2,500 increase in taxes beyond what you're paying now. If you're in the State of Wyoming, it's over a \$3,100 tax increase.

I represent great people, great people from the State of Minnesota in the Sixth Congressional District. In Minnesota, the average taxpayer in Minnesota will pay over \$3,000 more in taxes than what they're paying now.

Well, take a look at what your grocery bill has been doing. It's been going sky high lately.

And take a look at what we're paying at the gas pump. I was in St. Cloud, Minnesota last week. The price of diesel gasoline was \$3.81. The price of regular gasoline was \$3.14. When I took office and was sworn in for the first time as a brand new freshman Member of Congress, I thought gasoline was too high then, and it was about \$2.25 a gallon.

Well, what has this Congress yielded, the 110th Congress?

So far this Congress has gone for the largest tax increase in American history, the largest spending increase in American history.

And as the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), and as Representative STEVE KING has said, from Iowa, and also the gentleman from Georgia, Representative KINGSTON has said, this Congress has failed to do anything to reform Social Security and Medicare. Every American should take pause right now and realize how sobering that is, because the United States Government has made a promise to the senior citizens of this country, has made a promise. I'm worried that this Congress will have difficulty keeping that promise with our senior citizens if we don't reform these important programs. We can't do that if we are raising the average American's taxes.

And I will yield back to the gentlewoman from Tennessee after I make this important point, and it's this: In the Budget Committee markup of Fiscal Year 2009 there was a unanimous vote to increase the marginal tax rates.

What does this mean?

Whether you are a low-income American, a middle-income American, or a high-income American, guess what? Your taxes are going up. That will impact you in an already weak economy.

Unanimously, unfortunately, the Democrats voted to cut the \$1,000 child tax credit in half. That really hurts. My husband and I have five kids. We raised 23 foster kids. Do you know how important a \$1,000 child tax credit is to the average family? That's really important. Well, they voted unanimously, unfortunately, the Democrats, to cut the \$1,000 child tax credit in half. That will impact average Americans.

They also voted to eliminate the marriage penalty tax relief. Why would we do that? Why would we want to take away tax credits for people who are married? Married people are raising the next generation of Americans. We want to help them, not hurt them.

They also voted to eliminate the capital gains and dividends relief. This was the big driver. From 2000 until 2008, this has driven our economy forward. This has been a good thing.

And also, unfortunately, to bring back the death tax.

This is not the direction we want to go. The direction we want to go is one, a budget that the Republicans have put forward, and that's a growth budget, a budget to cut your taxes, cut wasteful spending, and put in place the mechanisms that will provide growth for this economy so that you can keep more of your income and start working for you, rather than working for the government.

And that's why I commend the gentlelady from Tennessee. As the dean of our budget school, she has been letting the American people know, in the plainest possible language, that we are here because we want to work for you. We hear you. We hear the difficulties that you're laboring under.

And I yield back to the gentlelady now to go on and continue to explain forthwith to the American people how important this ongoing discussion is.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota. And as she said, we do have a response to this budget. You can go to budget.house.gov/republicans and pull that budget up, because it is a budget that is there to encourage growth, reduce taxes, and be certain that our constituents have the money left in their pockets.

At this time I yield to David Davis, the gentleman from Tennessee who joined us in this House this year. He was in the State Legislature in Tennessee. He knows firsthand how important a low rate of taxation, low and reasonable regulation is to having small businesses grow and develop jobs. And as we all know, there is no economic stimulus as good as a job. And I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. I'd like to thank my colleague from Tennessee. Thank you for your leadership, Ms. Blackburn. You're doing a wonderful job. I had the opportunity to serve with you in the State Legislature, and we fought off a State income tax together back in our home State. And it worked well in Tennessee and it would work well here to keep our taxes low.

As you well know, mothers and fathers all across Tennessee, I'm more concerned about East Tennessee, to be honest with you, but mothers and fathers all across East Tennessee and across America sit around their kitchen tables putting budgets together. They have to make decisions on how am I going to fill up my pickup truck or my car and it costs over \$50 a tank? How am I going to put food on my table? How am I going to pay my housing payment? How am I going to pay for my health care? Those are some of the things that real Americans, real

mothers and fathers have to make decisions about.

And if you look at the gasoline prices and you look at the energy bill that actually came out of this House back in December, I voted against the legislation. It had new taxes. It had new regulations. The only thing it didn't have was any new energy. And I think the American people are starting to feel that today, and because of that, they're starting to see increases in things such as their food bill going up.

I know my wife comes home every week and says, I can't believe how much our grocery bill's gone up this month. So people all across East Tennessee are struggling to make ends meet.

The Democrat budget resolution fails the test of fiscal responsibility miserably. Instead of exercising fiscal restraint and lowering taxes, the Democrat budget raises taxes, as you well know, by \$683 billion over the next 5 years. You heard me correctly. \$683 billion over the next 5 years.

And as it's been pointed out, that is the largest tax increase in America's history. Not only America's history. It's the largest tax increase in America's history, but it's also the largest tax increase of any country in the world. That's pretty amazing.

I don't go home every weekend and hear people say, if you could just raise my taxes, my family will do better. I hear just the opposite. Keep taxes low. Keep regulations low. Lower gasoline prices, and let me succeed.

This budget actually blows away the previous record tax increase back in 1993. That was \$443 billion.

These are real tax hikes being imposed on real people. Here are some of the staggering statistics for families in Tennessee's First District. According to the Heritage Institute, because of the Democrat budget, the average taxpayer in my district will be forced to pay an increase of \$1,596, and it will result in almost 2,000 jobs being lost, and a loss of \$188 million in the First District's economy.

□ 1730

That's not what I hear when I go home every weekend to east Tennessee: If you could just raise my taxes, increase regulations, then it's going to be good for my family. That's not what I hear. I hear, Keep taxes low, keep regulations low, lower gas prices and get government out of my way and we will be able to do better.

And by reimposing the marriage tax, you know, I hear comments here in Washington that, well, if we could only tax the wealthy. Well, when I go home to east Tennessee every weekend, there's a lot of married folk that are not wealthy. That's just common sense. And by bringing back the marriage tax, roughly 23 million taxpayers will see their taxes increase by \$466 by the year 2011 simply because they're married. I don't know if that's the policy that we need to be bringing forth in this Congress. That's not what I hear when I go home to east Tennessee every weekend.

We have a choice between bigger economy or bigger government. Taxing

and spending is not a road we need to head down. Ronald Reagan once said, "We don't have a trillion-dollar debt because we haven't taxed enough; we have a trillion-dollar debt because we spend too much."

I think we, as Members of Congress, need to be more concerned about the budgets of mothers and fathers who have to put a budget together around their kitchen tables back in East Tennessee and across America rather than growing a Federal budget that supports out-of-control spending that relies on taking money from the very mothers and fathers who are struggling to make ends meet back in northeast Tennessee and across America.

I would like to thank my colleague, Congresswoman BLACKBURN, for her leadership in putting on this budget school; and if we could just get back to using some common sense, we will go forward in America. It's worked well for over 200 years; we just need to get back to that common sense.

Thank you for your leadership.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, and as he said, the loss to the economy is something we hear a lot about.

Look at this chart. You can see what happened with Federal revenues in 2001, 2002. Look at what happened when we reduced taxes in 2001 and then again in 2003, and look what happened, how we took off with a growth in Federal revenues. It just shows you what happened when you reduce taxes, when the government takes less and allows individuals to make those decisions, what to do with that money. When government doesn't take first right of refusal on so much of that paycheck and allows our constituents to make those choices, you can see there are four straight years of increases there.

To talk a little bit about the impact of the economic policy that's before us on his constituents from Ohio, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. JORDAN.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her leadership on this special order hour and her leadership in Congress and her work with the RSC along with our chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government spends a lot of money. The American people understand that instinctively. In fact, let me give some context to it.

The United States' economy is a \$14 trillion annual economy. The second largest economy in the world is Japan, approximately \$4 trillion annual economy. The third largest economy, if you define it this way, would be the Federal Government. So 1 year of spending by the Federal Government would be the third largest economy in the world. \$3 trillion, the largest budget in history, is what passed on this floor 4 weeks ago.

Again, to provide a little context to that, \$3 trillion budget. That's the Federal Government spending your tax dollars, the American families' taxpayer money for families in Ohio and across this country spending at \$100,000 a second, \$6 million a minute, \$350 million an hour. I mean, even by politicians' standards, that is spending money like crazy.

The Federal Government spends, again, just to provide some context, and I appreciate the work that everyone has done and what the previous figures have said. The Federal Government spends \$25,000 per year per family. Instead of spending \$25,000 per family, if we would just spend \$20,000 we could balance the budget in 1 year. Just spending \$20,000 per family, we could do it.

The previous speakers have talked about the tax burden that was also contained in this budget, \$600 billion in taxes. You always hear about tax-and-spend politicians. I actually argue that it's just the opposite. In fact, the gentleman from Tennessee just talked about this. It's spending tax. Spending always drives the equation.

So to make sure that this \$3 trillion could be spent, this budget contains the largest tax increase in the history of our country. At a time when families are already dealing with tough economic situations in their family and in their communities, the last thing we need is higher taxes.

You can compound all of this situation by what we heard last week. And I just want to read from the trustees' report, the 2008 Social Security and Medicare trustees' report, because I think it's poignant to this, a discussion about where we are at this point in our Nation's history. The trustees said, We are increasingly concerned about the inaction on the financial challenges facing the Social Security and Medicare programs. The longer action is delayed, the greater will be the required adjustments, the larger the burden on future generations, and the more severe the detrimental economic impact on our Nation.

The longer we wait to do anything, the tougher it is going to be to address it and fix the problem.

In fact, outgoing Comptroller General David Walker has said this: We run the risk, for the first time in American history, turning over a worse financial picture to the next generation. It's never happened before in the history of the United States.

One of the reasons we are the greatest countries in history is because parents make sacrifices for their children so they can have a better economic situation, a better life, a better standard of living than what we have. We run the risk of beginning to turn that. We have got to begin to address that.

I just want to bring up two simple concepts that were proposed in the Budget Committee by Members of the Republican party and the RSC. We offered two simple ideas. One was, it's time for a second Grace Commission. If you remember, President Reagan put together the Grace Commission. He had outside business people come in and look at the Federal Government, look at the government, say, Where is the waste? Where is the fraud? Where is the redundancy? Where is the ridiculousness? Let's get rid of it and save taxpayer money and better spend taxpayer money.

Back in the 1980s, they identified \$400 billion in waste, fraud, and redundancy. Certainly we can find some savings by doing that. The Grace Commission, unfortunately, was defeated in committee.

We also offered an amendment that said let's hold the line on spending. Outside of the military, let's just hold the line, and let's keep the baseline lower, which saves us a lot of money in the outyears. And we made the argument in committee that this won't solve the problem, but this will better position our Congress, better position our government to deal with what we know is coming, to deal with what the trustees reported last week is coming relative to Social Security and Medicare. Two simple ideas that we couldn't even get passed in committee because the majority party wouldn't go for it. Things that we need to do to long-term begin to address the situation.

As the previous speaker said, and I will close with this and turn it back over, he's confident that we will get this right. I am, too. Not because the politicians in Washington get it but because the American people do. The old adage is often true: Most politicians don't see the light; they feel the heat. And they feel the heat from their constituents because their constituents have the common sense of the folks, like in East Tennessee and back in western Ohio as well, and they understand the situation is real, they understand it's time for politicians and elected officials to step forward and say, Enough is enough. Let's fix this because it's about our kids and about our grandkids.

That's why I applaud the leadership of the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, we have had some absolutely wonderful freshmen to join us this year, and the gentleman from Ohio is one of them; and we are just so grateful to his constituents who have sent him here to join in on seeking fiscal responsibility for this great Nation of ours. We appreciate his leadership, as Mr. DAVIS and Ms. BACHMANN, and the work that they have done.

And now someone who came to this Congress and has been a leader serving on the Budget Committee working toward fiscal responsibility.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. And I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for all of your work on this matter and others as well, shining the light of day on the budget process here in the House under Democrat control of this legislature.

That last point, under Democrat control, here we find ourselves 15 months into the 110th Congress under a new Democrat majority in this House, and we have to ask that basic question, What has that Democrat control of 15 months brought? Well, in outside groups in the media, it has been re-

ported this has been one of the most inefficient and ineffective Congresses in passing legislation out of the House and making it to the President's desk and getting it signed, in most people's memory. And that is a bad thing when it comes to trying to solve the problems that are addressing America's families and America's pocketbook as well.

I would like to spend my couple of minutes personalizing this budget process from the great State of New Jersey and other residents of my State as well and how it impacts upon them.

New Jerseyans are already overtaxed. Just recently, the legislature in Trenton, the State capital, raised taxes. They raised the sales tax, they raised corporate taxes, they raised user fees and what have you. And now there is talk about, in our State, maybe doubling or tripling the tolls on the road, and not to speak, of course, about property taxes which are going through the roof in our State. So New Jersey families are already taxed.

What do we see here in the Congress under Democrat control with the budget that they have passed through this House? Well, for New Jerseyans it would amount to around \$3,700 increase, a \$3,700 increase in taxes on the American family or the New Jersey family. More of their hard-earned money being taken from them and sent to Washington.

And what else? Well, another independent analysis, this one done by the Heritage Foundation, shows that folks in my district, the Fifth District in New Jersey, which my district represents, they would lose upwards to 2,000 jobs. So mind you, the budget that the Democrats have passed would do two things: raise our taxes in my State by around \$3,700 for the average family, and we would lose 2,000 jobs. All a bad thing now under the Democrat's Congress.

So while it may have been one of the most ineffective and inefficient Congresses under the Democrat leadership, they are doing some things all bad.

Let me take a moment, if I may, to address three points that went through the budgetary process when the bills came through the committee.

If you hadn't been turned on C-SPAN from 10:30 in the morning when the bills came through with the Budget Committee initially until around 1 o'clock the next morning when the bill finally came out, you may have missed exactly what the Budget Committee did under the leadership of the Democrat Conference.

Let me touch upon three of them. Democrats proposed their budget. Republicans tried to take a bad bill and tried to make it better with a number of amendments, and I will go through very quickly, if I may, three of those amendments. In each instance, when we took our amendments and said, Here is an idea that maybe would make your bill a little bit better, they voted

unanimously, and it shows the bipartisanship is not there in that committee, unanimously against our ideas.

First idea. AMT, alternative minimum tax. We suggested that this very harsh tax should be repealed. Remember, it was the AMT started under 1969 under a Democrat Congress, in the 1990s under a Democrat President, Bill Clinton. We Republicans tried to repeal it. He said no. Now we said we have to get rid of this unfair tax that in just a couple of years from now, around 34 million American families would see their taxes go up incredibly. They said "no" to our amendment.

Secondly, again, Democrats unanimously voted against another amendment that we suggested to their bill with regard to earmarks. We all have problems with earmarks. It made the news heavily in the last months, what have you. We see the waste, fraud, and abuse there. We suggested we could save a billion dollars in earmarks and let's appropriate it over to veterans and for their good causes. That was our amendment. They voted unanimously to oppose it.

And finally in the area of Social Security. You would think here is one area that there would be bipartisanship, that they would reach across the aisle and try to get something done. Again, no go. Earmarks, again, was the basis of our areas that we thought we could save some money. There was so much waste, fraud, and abuse with their earmarks. We said, Let's save some of the money there. Let's make sure that Social Security is here for seniors today and for the next generation and next generation. Let's stop robbing from the Social Security trust fund. We put in an amendment to do that. What do the Democrats do once again? Unanimously they voted against that amendment as well.

The amendments all went down. The bill passed as the Democrats initially proposed it, in essence, and that bill, of course, is bad for my constituents, bad for New Jerseyans as we will be losing jobs, seeing our taxes go up.

So, again, I close where I began, commending the lady for bringing this information to the American public as we work together to make it a better situation.

Thank you.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, and I do thank him, Mr. Speaker, for his continued leadership. As I mentioned, we were freshman classmates in the 108th Congress and have worked each session of these past three sessions of Congress to bring to light the needed changes that are there for our government budget processes, the way we go about building this budget, and the way we handle the taxpayers' money.

Another of our 108th freshmen who worked making waste, fraud, and abuse our class project as we developed to the wasteful Washington spending and the Washington waste watchers and started shining some light on earmarks and

the need to change that practice on wasteful spending, on increased taxation, on programs that may be have outlived their usefulness, and that is the chairman of our Republican Study Committee, JEB HENSARLING of Texas.

And as I mentioned, we are all Members of the Republican Study Committee, and I want to yield to our chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) for his comments and remarks on the budget process and welcome him to this session of budget school.

□ 1745

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for yielding, and I certainly thank her for her leadership and ingenuity in putting together this budget school for the American people. It is their money. Too often people come to this floor and they think it's their money. It's not. It's the people's money, and they need to know what the U.S. House is doing about it.

The gentlewoman had so many great speakers from our Conservative Caucus, the Republican Study Committee, and I think I just want to sum up really what is probably a tale of two budgets: the Republican budget and the Democrat budget. And, unfortunately, for the American people, it was the Democrat budget that was passed into law.

Number one, the Democrat budget included the single highest tax increase in American history on American families at a time when we know the economy is struggling, American families are struggling. I have two small children. I know what's happened to the price of milk. I know what's happened to the cost of a loaf of bread and to all the various and sundry cereals that they see advertised on Saturday morning that my wife and I are compelled to buy. Groceries have gone up. Gasoline has gone up. Ever since the Democrats took control of the economic policy of America 15 months ago, all we have seen is that American families have to struggle.

But what are the Democrats doing on top of this as American families are struggling? They are imposing a tax increase of almost \$3,000 per American family over the course of the next 3 years. I mean, Mr. Speaker, this is just simply unconscionable. In my district in East Texas, the average family will see their taxes increase \$2,734. Small businesses, as we struggle to make sure that we keep our jobs, that we expand our jobs, small businesses, their taxes are going to go up by as much as 13 percent. Taxes on capital gains will go up 33 percent; dividends, 164 percent. Mr. Speaker, you can't have capitalism without capital. You can't have the job engine if you take that away. And so at a time when people are concerned about their paychecks, the Democrats are going to take even a bigger bite out of their paychecks and the people who create those paychecks in the first

place: the small business. I mean, Mr. Speaker, this is just unconscionable.

The death tax is going to go from zero percent up to 55 percent. People work their whole life to put together a farm, a ranch, a small business; and all of a sudden Uncle Sam can come in and take over half of it, and there's just not enough left to go around. The child tax credit is going to be cut in half. The lowest tax bracket is going to be increased by 50 percent. The marriage penalty will return. This is the Democrat plan for economic growth? This is the Democrat plan to help struggling American families?

A tale of two budgets. The Republican budget has no tax increase, Mr. Speaker. I repeat, no tax increase.

Another incredibly distinguishing aspect of the tale of two budgets is that the Republican budget says enough is enough on these earmarks. No more bridges to nowhere. It's your money. So the Republican budget included an earmark moratorium. They said you know what? The system's broken. The system's wasteful. We're going to stop it. We are going to ensure that there's a select committee to see if there's a better way to spend the people's money. And, instead, the Democrat budget rejects that. And, instead, what do they have? They have almost \$15 billion for congressional earmarks that all too often represent the victory of seniority over merit, special interest over the general interest, and secrecy over transparency.

In the Democrat budget, in the last budget, they financed \$2 million so that one of their committee chairmen could build a museum to himself; \$100,000 is sent to the Los Angeles Fashion District for landscaping at the same time they are increasing taxes on American families. They earmark \$300,000 to train people to work on Hollywood movie sets while they're taxing hardworking American families. And the list goes on and on. They are the party of congressional earmarks. Business as usual.

Some say it's not a whole lot of money. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope I'm never in Congress so long that I conclude that \$16 billion of the people's money is not a lot of money. It's a lot of money to the people in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas. And at the time when they are trying to keep a roof over their head, send their kids to college, pay for a gallon of gasoline, pay for a gallon of milk, to sit there and be building museums to sitting Members of Congress, to be sending money to the L.A. Fashion District is simply unconscionable.

So, Mr. Speaker, again, when you look at two budgets, it's not just about numbers; it's about visions. At a time when we need more jobs and more growth and we need to secure the family paycheck, all the Democrats offer are more earmarks, and they offer tax increases on the American family as much as \$3,000 per year.

The Republican budget has no tax increase. It will help the family paycheck. It will help create small businesses. It has spending control and will lead to a brighter future for our children and future generations and provide them with greater freedom and greater opportunity. That is the tale of two budgets and how the American people's money is spent.

So I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for this wonderful program on the budget. I thank her for her leadership within the Republican Study Committee, the Conservative Caucus in Congress.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Texas for the leadership that he provides every day on these issues.

And at this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), who has such a wonderful understanding of the budget.

And as I mentioned earlier, we have our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence, a little tiny document. Then we've talked about the appendix of the budget, this big volume right here. And what you're going to find there with some of the line items, as our colleague from Georgia was talking about, is the ag program. That's where you find that information. Then there is analytical and historical data that we look at and what we actually find with our trust fund and with our debt.

And to provide some insight into this, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland for his insight into the budget and the budget structure.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be instructive for the last couple of minutes of this hour to kind of put what we've been talking about in perspective.

When you say "budget," you have to know which budget we're talking about because we have two budgets in Washington. We have the one we talk about publicly, and then we have the official budget that we have to deal with, and they're different. You will understand in a couple of moments why they're different.

When we generally talk about public, you'll hear what we call the unified budget. Now, the unified budget is all the money that comes into Washington and all the money that we spend. But about 10 percent of the money that comes into Washington shouldn't be Washington's money to spend because it's moneys that they've taken from you, like Social Security, Medicare, railroad retirement, and about 50 others, presumably to be put in trust for you. But they do not put those moneys in trust for you. What they do with them in Washington is immediately convert them to a nonnegotiable U.S. security and spend them.

When we talk about debt, there's the national debt and the public debt, and

I will bet you, Mr. Speaker, that not one person in fifty out there knows the difference between the national debt and the public debt.

Our time's going to run out in just a couple of minutes, and I would like to come back to the floor to talk again. But there never was a moment in time during those years during the Clinton presidency when we said we were paying down the debt that, in fact, the national debt went down. Because what we were doing with the lockbox money, which was surplus money from Social Security and Medicare, we were taking that money and paying down the public debt. The public debt did go down, but for every dollar the public debt went down, the trust fund debt went up another dollar. So there was no change in the total debt, or the national debt. But there were some trust fund moneys that were not lockbox moneys. In fact, only two of them were lockbox, Social Security and Medicare; so we happily took that additional money and spent that, and so the national debt did go up. As a matter of fact, there was not a moment in time during those years when we said we had a budget surplus when, in fact, the national debt went down.

There's a lot of duplicity in Washington. It probably shouldn't surprise you to learn that you shouldn't believe everything that comes out of Washington. I have the numbers here for that debt, and a half hour ago when I came to the floor, the public debt was over \$5.3 trillion. They call this the intergovernmental holdings debt, which was just a little over \$4 trillion. I have \$4 trillion here, \$5 trillion here, and the total national debt was \$9.446 trillion.

I would very much appreciate coming back to the floor at another time to expand on this because I think it's very instructive for people to know, as your budget school says up there, who have the right to know how Washington spends your money.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think individuals can see how instructive and how exciting our next session will be because we're going to talk a little bit about this budget, and I thank the gentleman for his insight.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to come before the House once again.

As you know, in the 30-Something Working Group, we work very hard to put forth the agenda of the American people. We have been consistent over a number of years in doing this. And I think that it's important for the forward progress of not only the House of

Representatives but also for the American people.

The good thing about coming to the floor and sharing what's happening here in the Capitol Dome, or what's not happening, is its importance in strengthening our democracy and also strengthening our economy and strengthening the faith in government by the American people. And I think that some of the information, especially as it comes in a bipartisan fashion, that it allows our friends on the Republican side of the aisle to be able to take part in legislation that the American people support wholeheartedly.

Case in point: increasing the minimum wage, adopting all the 9/11 recommendations, and also looking at the issue of the greening of America, putting forth incentives of saving our Earth as we move forth, fighting for community police officers for local law enforcement agencies, State law enforcement agencies, and also the Federal outlook of being able to deter crime in this country; also assisting children and getting a level of health care that they deserve in a universal sense as it relates to S-CHIP, or what we call CHAMP here on the floor; and to also have hearings, to open up this government to the American people, of transparency.

As we started talking about Member projects, Mr. Speaker, in the appropriations process, we brought about the transparency that the American people have been looking for, disclosure, to make sure that these projects are worthy projects, and also having what we call reform, and we have shown that.

□ 1800

I want to just talk about a few things, Mr. Speaker, if I can, before the rest of the 30-Something Group is recognized, of what is happening now, not only in America, but overseas. We know that a number of officials from the Bush administration have been asked to come to Capitol Hill to testify before various committees, be they House or Senate. Today's news is the economy. When we start looking at testimony that took place here today, where it was first mentioned, not that we were trying to make history, a Bush administration official saying that the country is in a small recession and that recovery will be soon, and very soon, well, it reminds me of the debate when we talked about what was going on in Darfur, in Africa, if we want to call it genocide or not. We already knew it was genocide so we didn't necessarily have to wait for the President or the Bush administration to say it was genocide. But it did help when they said that it was.

Well, since now the Bush administration has come around to find out that their policies of tax breaks for billionaires and millionaires did not help the economy, and now has testified that we are in a recession, or a small recession, using the R word, maybe we can start

dealing with the solution as a unified government.

One example of how we have worked together in unity has been what was shown when we passed the small stimulus bill that was passed, and I know that the Speaker and Democratic leaders are looking, and also hopefully Republican leaders, are working towards a stimulus package that will create jobs, U.S. jobs here, and would allow those from the GED education to the post-graduate education, doctoral, those that have gone beyond in their education to be able to take part in new job creation here in the United States. So we have these forward leaning initiatives that we are ready and willing to work on.

The second point, I think it's also important as we look at the housing crisis that we are in right now. Mr. Speaker, I am actually in the next couple of weeks holding a "save your home" or recovery effort in my district. I am asking my constituents to come forth, those that are trying to make their mortgages, and bringing lenders together, along with credit counselors, to be able to assist them to save the only thing that they have, and that is their home.

I think it's so very, very important that we continue to work very hard. I know that Chairman FRANK, the Financial Services Committee, will be having a hearing in response to what has been happening in the housing crisis. I know that the Senate is working very hard to have some product come before this House soon, and very soon, to deal with this.

I think it's important that those of us in Congress not only support the public efforts that are going on, but also encourage the banking community and the lending community to step forward and try to assist as much as they can in saving the piece of the pie of the American dream. With so many Americans, that dream is now turning into a nightmare. It's our job to be able to stand up for those individuals.

I think that it's also important to know the chair of the Federal Reserve is continuing to warn us of a possible recession. I think that it's important for us to look at it as a reality where it is now.

Now for individuals that have substance abuse problems, or whatever the case may be, first you have to admit that you have a problem for us to get to the recovery, or to recover from that problem, to be able to receive the kind of treatment that is needed. As it relates to the decision makers in Washington and in the lending community, admitting that there is a problem is important. Many of us have, but we still have some holdouts for the sake of holding out. I think that as we move on, that we press on in a bipartisan way to make that happen. There will be efforts to make that happen. I ask my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle to be a part of the solution and not just the argument.

I think that when we also, Mr. Speaker, and I just want to share some of these thoughts because we have had 2 weeks off and I have had an opportunity to focus on some of the things that I wanted to share with the House of not only the observations, my personal observations, but what I have read of what others have written of their concerns about the lack of leadership on recovering or bringing about the kind of recovery we need on this economy. That there are certain things that have to be in place.

I know the first stimulus package we did gives some relief to homeowners through Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and FHA loans and raising that ceiling so they can be able to assist individuals to save their homes. But we have got to go further than that. We have to be able to create the jobs that individuals need to be able to save their homes.

The second point I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, that I think is vital, General Petraeus is going to be here on the Hill within a week. We know that we are starting to see violence again in Iraq. We know that we have put a large investment on the ground in Iraq, not only in our men and women that are over 140,000, that are there, but also we put a major cash investment on the streets of Iraq in hiring a number of Iraqis with U.S. dollars, cash dollars that they are paid in to help keep the peace in certain neighborhoods that have been a part of the uprising and the insurgency.

If I had the dollars that we have on the ground in Iraq in my district, there would be no crime. We would be able to hire those individuals that some may say are unemployable, that are out doing things that we don't necessarily agree with. Some justify their actions on the lack of being able to be employed, some justify their acts on the fact that they are not able to, even if they are employable, there are no jobs for them to get to be a productive member of society. Of course, there is a lack of job training dollars in our States and in our communities. There is a lack of bridge dollars to be able to introduce these individuals back into society, especially those that have made youthful indiscretions.

But as we start looking at General Petraeus' testimony when we come back before Congress, we have to look at it from the standpoint of where are we going from this point. I think that the American people are ready for the Iraq experience to be over as it relates to street-to-street, neighborhood-to-neighborhood protection of the Iraqi people. I think that it's time for our government to be able at the highest levels, and I know many Members of the House, including myself, have personal editorials on this issue. But we are looking forward to General Petraeus' report. We are also looking forward to Ambassador Crocker's report.

We are also looking forward to hearing not only from other experts that

are in the area of Iraq, and I know the Armed Services Committee is going to be dealing with that, but I ask the Members in a bipartisan way to look at it not with a partisan eye, but look at it from a standpoint of what is best for the United States of America. So when we deal with the economy and we deal with Iraq, I mean there are two major issues that are going on in the country. For those that write books and for those that are historians, they are paying very, very close attention to what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be joined by my colleagues. I am just going to do it in order of seniority and order of people that are next to me. Even though I am going to recognize Mr. ALTMIRE, since he made it here first, we have Mr. RYAN from the great State of Ohio, and represents Niles, Ohio, Youngstown, and has been doing great work here when we first started the 30-Something Working Group. We do have what I mentioned at the beginning of my comments, Mr. Speaker, is what we look for is consistency and accuracy on what we share with the Members and also the American people.

I have my good friend Ms. CLARKE, YVETTE CLARKE from the great State of New York, and representing Brooklyn in a very proud way. I have been to her district and seen her work, and she has worked on the local government level and brings a flavor to this body that all Members should appreciate, and I know that will continue to be a force here in Congress. And Mr. JASON ALTMIRE, he and Mr. RYAN speak of very fondly, in the same television market, media market. Mr. RYAN actually participated in Mr. ALTMIRE's election. I am glad that Mr. ALTMIRE is here. He is a great voice here in Congress and has passed bills on this floor that are substantial to the very fiber of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, with that, just these opening comments that I have made, I know that with us being off 2 weeks, many of these Members have a lot to share. But as we look at the next couple of weeks and beyond, there is going to be a lot going on here in the Capitol dome, and the American people are going to be paying very careful attention to it, and we need bipartisan support in making that happen.

Mr. Altmire.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman from Florida, and I look forward to continuing the discussion tonight on all these issues the gentleman has brought up.

The gentleman closed with Iraq. We are going to have General Petraeus and we are going to have Ambassador Crocker come before Congress again next week and give their status report on what they see on the ground in Iraq. As the gentleman from Florida knows, he and I traveled to Iraq together last year. One of the things that you would see over there is that the military situation, without question, our brave men and women are doing incredible work

over there. It's amazing to see firsthand the men and women in action and seeing the great things that they have been able to do with the situation that they have been presented with in Iraq.

But I cannot say the same thing about the politicians in Baghdad, the Iraqi politicians. We have had for several months now, if not more than a year, a situation in Baghdad where the politicians have just refused to step up and make the necessary political accommodations to administer their own government and run their own affairs. This situation in Iraq can only be resolved by the Iraqis themselves. It is their country. Our brave men and women in the military have provided a bubble of security around Baghdad to give the decisionmakers, the Iraqis in Baghdad the opportunity to make the tough political accommodations that are necessary, and they have refused to do it.

What we have seen in recent weeks, unfortunately, is the situation in Iraq regress. We will hold judgment on that until I hear from General Petraeus next week and Ambassador Crocker and hear what they have to say. But it does not appear that the situation in Iraq over the past several weeks has gotten any more stable. I hope that General Petraeus has good news.

But nobody can argue that our brave men and women in the military, the best and brightest this country has to offer, have done everything they can possibly do to give the Iraqis the opportunity to take the reins of power and control their own affairs and manage their own destiny. Unfortunately, it appears that they have refused to do so, the politicians in Baghdad. So we will certainly talk more about that.

I also wanted to touch on the economic downturn that we are in. There's a lot of debate on what you call it; is it a recession, are we in a recession, or are we not. I really don't care what we call it, what I know about is when I go back to my district in western Pennsylvania and I talk with people who are struggling in this economy, I can see firsthand what has happened and what the impact of this economic downturn has had on my constituents in southwestern Pennsylvania. We hear stories from all around the country of families going through the same trouble and turmoil as my constituents are in western Pennsylvania.

One of the things I hear over and over again is, well, these are just people who bought too much house. They got in over their heads and they bought more house than they can afford. You know what, they are getting what is coming to them.

That is not what happened. What we have had is people all across this country that have a mortgage, but they also have health care costs.

□ 1815

They have kids in school, where they are paying college tuition that is going up three and four and five times the

rate of inflation. They have perhaps businesses to run. They have costs with fuel and gas prices and everything that that affects, with food prices going up.

Perhaps they took out a second mortgage, and maybe then they got overextended because they couldn't afford their daily household expenses because of everything else happening in the economy. This wave came on, and we had over 1 million foreclosures last year. We are on schedule this year to perhaps double that in 2008.

And I don't think anyone can argue that the economy is certainly in trouble right now. It is in a downward spiral, and we are hoping to prevent a recession, if we are not in one already. But I think to have an argument, as we have had on this floor many times with people on the other side who want to deny that this is a recession or not, that is missing the boat. I don't care what you call it. What I want to do is get out there and make a difference for the American people in a way that is going to make their life better and help them pay their daily household expenses and avoid bankruptcy and avoid defaulting on their mortgage. And that helps everybody.

Perhaps you do say, well, these are people who bought too much house and they got what they deserve. Even that is not the case. If those people live in your neighborhood and they default on their mortgage and their house is foreclosed, guess what? That is going to hurt your property values. That is going to have a direct impact on you, and maybe at that point you might take a second look at it. I don't want it to get to that point. I want to take proactive action.

The President this week, when he talked about what his economic plan was he was moving forward, it sounded a lot like Herbert Hoover and what his plan was in the 1930s. And if you sit on your hands and you do nothing, I can promise you, this is not going to correct itself. This problem is going to continue to get worse.

So I am grateful that we have come here tonight to talk about these important issues and to take action on these issues as a Congress, because working together we can take a giant step in solving these problems for the American people, hopefully avoiding a recession, if we are not in one, but in the long term making policy decisions that are going to directly improve the lives of our constituents all across the country.

With that, I would now yield to the gentleman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE. Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Mr. ALTMIRE, and to my colleague the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) and to my colleague the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), it is great to be here with you once again. I just wanted to come and have a conversation with you folks out there and, of course, my colleagues here.

I was in my office when I heard the wrap-up of the last Republican hour,

and I thought I heard one of my colleagues state that we are in this economic crisis currently due to the last 13 months of Democratic control. I couldn't believe what I heard, because I thought to myself, what a joke. Who does he think he is fooling with this type of baseless rhetoric?

Americans know exactly who and what caused this economic downturn. Pointing the finger right now does not help us to put milk in the refrigerators of our neighbors and our constituents, and it certainly doesn't fill the gas tank, and it certainly does not enable people to stop fretting about whether they can make next month's mortgage payment.

One of the things that we can all be grateful for is that this Democratic-controlled Congress saw fit to rise to the occasion to forecast what we see as a real economic downturn by putting forth in a bipartisan way an economic stimulus package that we hope will bring at least a moment of respite, a moment where folks can catch their breath and catch their bearings as we present to them the opportunities to refinance their homes and the opportunities to just sort of take a look at the landscape and be able to catch up.

Right now, everyone is sort of running after themselves and trying to catch up with the mounting costs of just living today. And it is really just not a time for us to be pointing fingers. It is a time for us to put our shoulders to the wheel with real solutions for all Americans.

Certainly this "New Direction" Congress has enacted an economic stimulus package that brings relief to our families and provides recovery rebates starting next month, that raises loan limits for mortgages backed by the FHA, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and allows our families to get mortgages with better terms. That is the type of language that Americans want to hear today. That is what the families of my district need to know is coming from us today.

When you think about the fact that we are going to be putting hundreds of dollars in the hands of more than 130 million American families who will spend it immediately to invigorate the economy, then you know that we are concerned, that we are not just saying that you got yourself into this, now get yourself out.

I noticed that no one said to Bear Stearns, you got yourself into this, now get yourself out. We decided as a nation that we had to make sure that the underpinning of our economic society was not withdrawn from under us. We need to do that for every single family here in America. We need to get that done.

Listening to our caucus and the conversations we are having as Democrats around phase two of our economic stimulus is quite heartening; knowing that we are examining what is needed to really get this economy going, which means really innovation, which

means bringing to the table the idea that we cannot continue to buy oil which is not an unlimited source, but that we have to look at renewable energies and the type of industry that will be developed in the years to come through that industry and looking at our infrastructure that has not been addressed, at least in my lifetime, that we know that we are going to need to get this done over the next decade or so.

So all of these things are on the table. These are things we are discussing as Democrats in terms of phase two, because we know that this stimulus is just the beginning of a multi-pronged strategy that we must take to ensure the future economic growth and strengthening of America.

So I want to just thank my colleagues for their continued focus, and not being distracted by those who would rhetorically joke about what is really a major concern to so many Americans right now as they sit at their kitchen tables, at their dining room tables, and they look at the energy bills that have come in from a very harsh winter and a very rough climate in many parts of the country, as they look at the fact that the cost of milk per gallon is now the same cost as gasoline per gallon, as they look at what it takes to travel from one part of this Nation to another, the cost, or from their homes to where they work each day, the cost. All of this is what we need to be focused on, and I am really excited that we are on our way.

We talked about the war in Iraq, and there is a direct correlation between what is happening with us economically and what we are able to do economically when we have got so much invested in a war in Iraq.

Just this last week, we have looked at 5 long years of war. I can't ever recall in my lifetime, and that is just to give you a sense, of us ever being at war this long. It says something to those who have given their lives and who are veterans of the wars of years gone by and those who would give their lives as our soldiers in the future that we can't be reckless about the call to arms in this country.

Some would say that what we have done with the war in Iraq has not been the best moment in our history. So as we look at the fact that over 29,000 Americans have been injured and more than 31,300 have been treated for non-combat injury and illness, I hope that we will also focus on the redeployment that will ultimately have to take place once the Iraqi government stands up. It is in the capacity to do so, and we are hoping that these things will happen simultaneously, quite frankly. But that we also pay attention to these families in our communities, of the walking-wounded warriors who will need our support and will need our help as they readjust to coming back to an America that has a faltering economy, that is struggling to keep its own people in their homes.

We need to pay very close attention to what is happening with our veterans, and this Democratic Caucus, this Democratic Congress, has been in the forefront of veterans' rights, of veterans' benefits, in a way that no other part of this government has paid attention to it.

So when I hear my colleagues in the last Republican hour focus on trying to cast aspersions at what the Democratic Congress has done, I really hope that they will join us in the bipartisan effort to focus on what is real. What is real are the veterans that are coming home to our communities and the struggles of their families and the distress that their families have been under in just trying to make ends meet on veterans' salaries. It is the struggle that everyone in our communities is facing, whether it is personally or it is a neighbor, in seeing those for-sale signs going up throughout the neighborhood. These are the issues that we are concerned about.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. If the gentlewoman will yield for a second, I want to share something with the Members and also with those of us here on the floor.

During the break, I took the privilege of going out to Camp Pendleton in California. As you go through the gate off of I-5, there is a billboard that is there, like you would see out in front of a drugstore or something, but it is an electronic billboard and it talks about if you need counseling. They have folks coming back every 4 months or so, some folks who have gone on their third and fourth tour.

Think about it. You have families that live on that base. You have individuals the age of 18 or 19 years old, just single, that are living there.

I had an opportunity to go through a simulator there at Camp Pendleton like you are in an Iraqi village or in a city, in Baghdad, in Fallujah. I have walked the streets of Fallujah. Mr. ALTMIRE and I have done it. Mr. RYAN and I have been to Iraq on another trip. The ground, the structure, the folks dressed as though you are in Baghdad, it is a true simulation, and they have gunfire and IEDs and all of these things kind of going off in this simulator.

Just walking through that was an experience for me, and that was just an enactment of what could happen or what should happen and giving our troops, our Marines, units going through there, a real flavor of what is going on.

I can imagine being in the situation. I knew that I could walk out, the sun will be shining, it will be California weather. But when you are in that kind of situation, some folks feel that this is just some sort of made-for-television kind of thing.

I love the troops. Mr. RYAN and I, we have been hearing this since we have been in Congress, because when we first got here, the war just started. We weren't here for the vote to go or not

to go, but we got here right as soon as the war actually started. Some of the statements that are littered throughout the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are, you know, "our troops, we'll show 'em," and carrying on.

We do have the best and the greatest and the most able military on the face of the Earth, by far. But when you start dealing with the real human issues of our men and women that are in combat, they go through a lot and their families go through a lot.

What you said, Ms. CLARKE, about we should take under consideration what happens to those individuals, it's not a game.

□ 1830

Mr. RYAN OF Ohio. Just to share a little bit, Mr. Speaker. We were up at Walter Reed on Monday. And you want to talk about the issue of war smacking you right in the face, when you see someone just a few years younger than we are without legs, traumatic brain injury. You hear stories from parents who say, "I got a call from Iraq, and my son or daughter, all they told me was he had a brain injury, and hung up the phone," and they don't hear back for 4 days.

I mean, when you put all these stories together, that one particular mom waiting there 4 days not knowing, the unknown of whether or not your kid is going to live or die; or you hear the stories about the soldier we had in Batavia, Ohio, where you didn't know; the body was missing, you couldn't find it, and then you find it.

When you add all of this stress up and you put it into our families and you put it into the soldiers that are there, and you talk about the long-term health care costs of this war, not to mention what is happening there day-to-day there now, but the long-term effects when at some point this is all settled hopefully, one way or the other, at least our portion of it is and our troops are back home for the most part, the effects are still going to be left with us. And I don't know if any of you have had the opportunity to see, Phil Donahue has this new documentary out called Body of War, and it is all about the actual physical injuries that these families are going through. And I think it is important for us to remember that. And when you hear and read in the paper that 10 or 15 civilians or four troops, those are real people. And those kind of situations, when you have all these civilian deaths in Iraq, from a very practical standpoint, one is they are civilians and that is a whole other issue, but from a very practical standpoint it makes it very difficult for us to solve the political problems over there when everyone who is a part of the government are losing brothers and sisters and aunts and uncles who are getting killed by these bombs that are going off over in Iraq. It makes it very difficult.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman from Ohio. I wanted to think

about this in the terms of what this Congress has done to resolve some of the issues that we are talking about right now for our brave service men and women and their families. Because anyone listening to this debate would say, well, that is great that you are talking about what the problems are; but what have you done to solve the problems? And I want to tell anyone who is willing to listen that we have a tremendous record of accomplishment in supporting our troops. Not just saying the words, but supporting the troops with our actions, not just our words. And we are in the sixth year of the war in Iraq right now, and here are some things that this new Congress has done, bills that have been signed into law to address the issues that we are talking about.

The gentleman from Ohio talks about traumatic brain injury and the incredible impact that has had. TBI is the signature injury of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, because people who would have been killed in previous wars, thanks to better medical technology and better armor and equipment, thankfully they survive; but, unfortunately, in many cases they are horrifically injured, the type of injuries the gentleman witnessed at Walter Reed. I took a trip to Walter Reed, myself, and I saw the same types of injuries, the lost limbs, the spinal cord injuries and the traumatic brain injuries.

But what happens is, when these men and women come back and they are still in the Defense health care system, they are treated for the apparent physical injuries that you can see in front of you. And because they are moving so quickly, they don't think to screen them for TBI if it is not a severe case of TBI. They move them over to the VA. The VA has no record of them having had a head injury, so it doesn't become part of their medical record and we have symptoms that go undiagnosed the rest of the time they are in the VA health care facility.

So what this Congress did is said that every VA facility in this country has to have somebody on staff who is equipped and trained to treat traumatic brain injury, and we created a national data base for all of those cases where we establish treatment protocols to make sure that those brave men and women who suffered from TBI get the highest quality care anywhere in the country. That is something that is going to directly impact people's lives.

Because of that law that we passed in this House and that has been signed into law, every veteran who enters a VA health care facility is going to be screened for traumatic brain injury, so never again will it go undiagnosed.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I was also watching our friends who were here before, and they were saying things like: We have been so unproductive in this Congress. We haven't really done anything; and the things we have done, they are all bad. And I wrote the quote down. They are all bad.

Is this bad? Is this piece of legislation that we passed to make sure that our soldiers get at least looked at for traumatic brain injury, is that bad? We can give the gentleman an opportunity to come back here and maybe correct his statement, because I am sure he didn't mean it.

But to inject the kind of politics that some folks have on this floor over the course of the past few years into this debate has really poisoned it; and these are things that have been successful.

The largest increase in veterans spending in the history of the VA. Was that bad? Increasing the minimum wage. Was that bad? The education funding, more funding and more expansive, and the most investment this country has made since the GI bill and the education. Was that bad? Cutting student loans. Was that bad? I don't think so.

So we are trying to have these debates here very civilized in a bipartisan way and talk about how we can improve the situation for our soldiers.

I didn't mean to interrupt.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman for that clarification, because that is instructive when we do hear from the other side, the unproductivity alleged of this Congress.

How about this. The gentleman from Florida talked about the tremendous strain, as did the gentlewoman from New York, the tremendous strain our families of our men and women who are in the Guard and Reserve that are being deployed not once, not twice, but multiple redeployments, four, even five times now as we head into the sixth year of the war in Iraq, and we have been in Afghanistan since before that. So these families are left behind, and they have to struggle just to make ends meet.

What has this Congress done about it? We are being told on the other side we haven't done anything, we don't have any record. Well, let me tell you what this Congress has done about it. This has been signed into law.

We expanded the Family and Medical Leave Act for the first time to cover the families of our military Guard and Reserve, people who are putting their lives on the line for us with multiple redeployment overseas. And now, because of the action in this Congress, you can use Family and Medical Leave Act time to care for a wounded service man or woman when they come back, to use time to reassimilate as a family, to get to know your kids again and get to know your spouse again after being away for 15 months. And while they are gone, the spouse can use that time to attend these deployment briefings that happen often during the workday and they can't get time off of work, they can use it for child care, they can use it to get their economic house in order and deal with the household finances, things that weren't covered before.

That is a law that is going to directly impact people's lives. It is going to make it a little bit easier for the fami-

lies of our military Guard and Reserve, and that is something that we did in this Congress after the previous Congresses had done nothing to address the issue.

So, I do take offense to the comment that the gentleman from Ohio relayed that had been made about how we had done nothing.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. ALTMIRE, I can tell you, it is a breath of fresh air. I want to differ with you all just for a minute.

I don't mind our colleagues on the Republican side giving misinformation. I don't mind it, because American people have a lack of trust in what they say and very little understanding of what they do.

We speak here in the 30-Something Working Group, Ms. CLARKE, about fact, not fiction. We spend a lot of time working with the Speaker's staff, working with our personal staffs to make sure we are accurate when we come to the floor, because it does mean something when you come to this floor and share with your colleagues about what we should be doing, how we should be doing it, and what we have done. And I am glad you focused on what we have done.

When I was in the State legislature, there was a gentleman by the name of Alzo Reddick that represented Orlando, Florida; I represented Miami, Florida. And I will never forget, I was like in my second year of public service or something and all of this debate is going on in the legislature; it was a great melting pot of opinions.

We were going back and forth, and folks were spending a lot of time describing the problem. And he got up and he said, "I just want to remind the members that we were not only elected to describe the problem, but mainly to do something about it. Okay? And now we are trying to do something about it with this bill." And he went on from there.

And it was very profound, because I have a lot of folks in my district who spend a lot of time describing problems, and a lot of them I run into when I am at the grocery store or what have you, and there are a lot of folks who are on the sideline who don't want to get in the game. This is a contact sport in many ways in this legislative body. And when we were in the minority, we talked about what we would do if we had the opportunity. Remember that, Mr. RYAN? And I know that you all remember it because you were watching and a part of it and running for office at the time. So you were out there echoing "what I would do once I get there." And I am glad you talk about that, because there was a laundry list. And, Mr. Speaker, you know prior in this hour we talked and I talked about some of the accomplishments we have made. And we have done it, Ms. CLARKE, in a bipartisan way.

We don't stand up here and dance in the end zone and say where are Democrats only passed this piece of legislation. There has been some legislation

that Republicans have not seen eye to eye and it has become law. And we don't want to dance in the end zone on that, because the American people want to win.

So I say all of that to say this. I very seldom make reference to what my colleagues say on the other side, because as far as I am concerned, I don't want to echo inaccurate information. But we do need to clarify it so that folks don't get concerned and start saying, "Oh, my gosh. Do you mean to tell me that's true? Is it really true?" So we're trying to build faith, because right now Congress is not where it should be as it relates in the minds of the American people that they feel good and warm and fuzzy. Polls have shown that they do feel more comfortable with Democratic leadership in Congress than Republican leadership in Congress. But as an institution and as a government, I guarantee you that Suzy whoever and Johnny whoever would like to see a government that works in a cohesive way toward the common good.

The gentlewoman, YVETTE CLARKE, came to the floor with a purpose today. She came to the floor with the purpose of talking about the realities of life. And you know that we have Members here thinking that our commitment and our loyalty to the military comes in the form of smart bombs, guns, and some sort of grenade. But, guess what, it also comes in the form of thinking about their families.

We just can't use and abuse and just say, well, we don't want to deal with that part that is after the fact; that is dealing after. Because when I was at Camp Pendleton, I stayed on base, as I do when I went to MacDill Air Force Base, as I do when I go to any location. I have been down to Norfolk, Virginia and big Navy. I stay on base so we can hear the stories from these families of what they are going through. And they say, well, we understood a Member of Congress is on base, and you bump into them: Sir, I just want to let you know how I feel as an individual. And that is important. And we have taken that, because we have had hearings in the Armed Services Committee, we have taken that into consideration in the Appropriations Committee. Mr. MURTHA has done an excellent job by making sure that we pump dollars in on the family side and doing some of the things in our MILCON appropriations trying to do things to help those kids deal with the shock and the trauma of dad or mom coming home screaming in the middle of the night and they don't understand what is going on.

So when we look at these issues, I am glad that we are addressing those issues, but we have to look at retooling this whole Iraq debate and how we got into this in the first place, because we are going to have Ambassador Crocker here, we are going to have General Petraeus that we have met with, we have met with all of these individuals before in the past. We want the real deal from them. But, as Members of

Congress, we have got to stand up on behalf of the American people, be they Democrat, Republican, or Independent.

Ms. CLARKE. The gentleman from Florida really has emphasized what we know is a challenge for America right now. And we are making the marriage here in our conversation, the marriage between the fact that we have to disengage from Iraq, that we realize that our policies have failed there, that it is now a diplomatic mission more so than anything else. And, yes, there will be a cost to redeployment, but the cost to American families has been extensive. And as our brave men and women come back to the United States of America, come back to our respective communities and they face the economic challenges that we have all been facing over the past couple of months, couple of years in some communities, that just compounds the whole reintegration process that is going to be required, the health care, the ongoing health care that is going to be required. And I think that we have positioned ourselves as a Congress to really meet those issues. We know what the challenges are. We have heard firsthand.

And when you look at our first economic stimulus package that will provide child tax credits as a rebate to these families, when you look at that expansion of financing opportunities for those who may be in mortgage crisis; and, believe me that we can't separate the wounded warrior from the home they own in the community and the cost of gasoline to get back and forth to the VA hospital and the milk that they have to buy for their child.

□ 1845

This economic stimulus is going to be of support to those families as well. But they are going to face what we are facing as civilians in a very special way. And I know that the work we are doing here, Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. RYAN, is making a difference in their lives. That is why it was important for me to talk about the baseless rhetoric that I heard coming from across the aisle because I don't want Americans to overlook the fact that we have raised the bar and set the standard for how we are going to treat one another as Americans, how we face our challenges head-on, and come up with the solutions that are most important.

Right now there is a crisis in health care. There is a crisis in affordable housing and mortgage financing, and there is a crisis called Iraq. There is a direct correlation if you put the equation together, the type of money that we have been spending on this war in Iraq, and let's not forget our soldiers who are also fighting in Afghanistan, but the primary cost, the overwhelming cost is going into the war.

And our hope is that we will down surge, redeploy, have a surge in diplomacy and get our economic house in order in the United States of America and treat our veterans and their fami-

lies as they ought to be treated, treat all Americans as they ought to be treated, and help them through this time of extreme pressure and extreme challenge.

I am proud to be a member of this Democratic caucus that has looked at the landscape in its entirety, that is dealing with it in a holistic way. We are not compartmentalizing these issues because one has a direct bearing on the other.

I see Mr. RYAN standing here in rare form, and I know he wants to chime in.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You were mentioning the troops and how complicated things have gotten.

One of the things you mentioned was what was happening in Iraq, and Mr. MEEK mentioned how we got in. I think it is important to recognize, and there was a great article today in the Washington Post, what is happening with our troop strength, where we are getting to the point, we have all of these troops who go for 15 months and come back for a year. We are hearing from psychologists and psychiatrists at Walter Reed that they are not getting enough downtime. It is intense, urban warfare. They are not getting enough downtime, and that is contributing to a lot of the psychiatric problems that our troops are coming back with that need to be addressed.

What people are saying now in the military is that it has to be a year on or 15 months on, and 2 years off. Can you imagine if that is the recommendation. The recommendation is 15 months and then 2 years. Or it may even be 1 year. No, they are asking for 1 year on, 2 years off; and then if they have to go back, send them back. Can you imagine, that is the recommendation.

For them to now say you wonder what the issues are going to be when it is 15 months on, 1 year off and back again, the psychological effect on our soldiers and the cost long term to our VA health care. I think that is important.

I wanted to highlight this. This is General Richard Cody, Army's vice chief of staff who was testifying yesterday, and was talking about basically troop strength. Mr. MEEK, you sit on the Armed Services Committee. You know how critical this is to where our country needs to be in case there is another conflict somewhere in the world that we have to react to.

Right now what the military leaders are saying is that we do not have the capability to react to that. Now can you imagine putting this country in that position, that we can't handle two separate fights going on at the same time when that has been the golden rule from the military for years. And what Cody said was that "I've never seen our lack of strategic depth be where it is today. The Nation needs an airborne brigade, a heavy brigade, and a striker brigade ready for 'full spectrum operations' and we don't have that today."

Now if anybody wants to make a judgment, it is not the Democrats

making a judgment against President Bush, this is the Army vice chief of staff who happens to be retiring in the next couple of months and maybe feels a little freer to say the kinds of things that need to be said, but if we don't recognize what position we are in, and then to have some folks saying we need to be there another hundred years, how are we going to possibly sustain this?

Ms. CLARKE. That's real, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That's the real deal.

Another quote, "There has been little, if any, change of the stress or tempo of our forces," calling the current pace of operations "unsustainable." That's where we are.

To quote Cody again, "Where we need to be with this force is no more than 12 months on the ground and 24 months back."

It is critical that these soldiers get the kind of rest that they need. When you look at the cost now, saying the projection, when you factor in the health care, and we are close to a trillion dollars for this war, and the projections, when you factor in the health care costs over time, this war is going to cost us \$3 trillion.

And we have Members of this body who stand up and want to slash out an earmark for \$250,000 to help a local community that doesn't have any money put in an EPA-mandated sewer and ignore the 800-pound gorilla sitting in the middle of the room. It is a shame. It is a shame that the debate has gotten that messy.

If we stay focused on what we have been trying to accomplish in the past few years, focus on the veterans, focus on making sure that there is an assessment for their mental health, making sure that they have their money, which we put up, the highest investment in veterans' health care in the history of the VA, those are the kinds of things that we need to focus on as a country in a time of war.

I would just urge all of our colleagues to have this debate be civilized and not taken to the lowest recesses of political dialogue, which is sometimes I think where we end up.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. RYAN, you've put your finger on the pulse of what we are trying to accomplish here. It is our responsibility to redirect those who would take the debate to its lowest common denominator and distract the American people from the realities of where we are today.

Where we are is a Democratic Congress that has risen to the occasion, that has filled in the gaps and is holding the line while others would seek to continue failed policies that are costing us more and more and more with each day. Basically mortgaging, you know, the lives of our children and our grandchildren in order to pay for it, while at the same time neglecting all that needs to be done to make sure that we can live a decent standard of living here in this country.

So we have fought this and we are still fighting. I yield.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think it is important for us to recognize as we have this debate in Congress, we recognize where we are at right now. And our friends are talking about their alternative budget, and I know my friend from Florida doesn't like me using quotes from the other side, and I understand that.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You can do whatever you want to do. It's a free country.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is a free country, and I am an American so I am going to say what I want.

Our friends on the other side, this alternative budget, alternative this, alternative that, I think it is important for us to recognize if you want to know what the conservative, neoconservative, right-wing government looks like, all you have to do is open your eyes, read the paper, go to the gas station, pay your health care bill, pay your tuition bill, and you will know that philosophy implemented is the reality we are living in today. They deregulated the financial markets, deregulated the energy sector, gave billionaires tax cuts. You see this every day. Increased tuition, energy costs going up double the rate of inflation, milk going up 26 percent, eggs going up 40 percent. And \$3 trillion in war over the course. And you put all of this together and you say that's the alternative? That's what you want us to go back to?

We spent the whole year just trying to get back to ground zero, raising minimum wage, cutting student loan interest rates in half, investing in alternative energy, implementing the 9/11 report, making sure that our veterans are taken care of. We are still digging out of a hole. Can you imagine, these folks raised the debt limit five times to the tune of \$3 trillion, borrowing it from China, Japan, and OPEC.

And the mortgage crisis, the anxiety people feel, that is the conservative Republican agenda implemented. We don't have to look anywhere; we are living it now. Now. So we don't have to look too far.

The other day the President said if the Democrats repeal the \$18 billion in corporate welfare for the oil companies, I will veto any bill that has that in it. Now can you imagine how screwed up the situation is. Consumer protection, toys, pet food, food coming over, medicine coming over from China without the proper folks checking the stuff out, mine safety has gone down so we have mining accidents because there wasn't the proper oversight. We know what happened with Hurricane Katrina and FEMA because we put political hacks in jobs. All of this happened under the conservative Republican agenda.

So I just would like to say we are working very hard to balance the budget, make investments in education and our vets, take care of the environment, and make these investments in alter-

native energy so we can have green collar jobs replacing the blue collar jobs we have been losing.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. RYAN and Ms. CLARKE. I am glad you both are in Congress.

IRAQ AND THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLISON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GILCREST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about Iraq tonight in the context in which historical incidents have created this most pressing and urgent situation, Iraq and the Middle East, to give the American people, Mr. Speaker, a frame of reference upon which to judge the way forward in this conflict. Are there solutions to this conflict? Is there something in our history or the history of the relationship of the international community that can resolve the present crisis that we are now experiencing?

So what I would like to do is during this next hour that I have is to break this topic down into a number of different areas, take a look at the United States and the Cold War, especially through the 1950s and the 1960s, take a look at what was happening in the Middle East during that same period of time during the Cold War, what was going on in the Middle East, and then look at the present crisis that we are now experiencing in Iraq and Afghanistan with a focus on Iraq. And then what are the solutions? Is there a way forward? Can we judge from past precedents, past crises, what we can do now to resolve this conflict. And I think there is a way forward.

□ 1900

So, to frame this discussion tonight, I would like to start off with a quote by a man named Norman Cousins, who was the editor of the Saturday Evening Post and wrote an extraordinary book, I believe it was about 1980, called "Human Options." Whenever there is a crisis, there are always options. There are always things that we, as human beings, with initiative, ingenuity, intellect and courage can figure out. Here are the two quotes: "Knowledge is the solvent for danger." "Knowledge is the solvent for danger." If you're faced with a crisis, the more information you have, the more likely it is that you will make competent decisions.

The second quote is, "History is a vast early warning system." There have been a number of crises in America's past where people said you have to wait 20 years to figure out what went wrong. People will always say, well, 20 years later we have hindsight that we didn't have during the incident or the crisis or the conflict or the war. Well, with this quote, knowing history, knowing where we were 10 years ago, 20 years ago, who lit the fuse that slowly

burned over decades to cause the present crisis, "history is a vast early warning system." And the more we understand history, the better we will be able to deal with situations that we are presented with today.

I want to give another quote from a man, a British writer, Rudyard Kipling, whose son fought in World War I, died in northern France in that battle, and the distraught father said this, "Why did young men die? Because old men lied." Let me paraphrase that today in the 21st century, nearly 100 years later. "Old men should talk before they send young men to die."

Let's take a look at the 1950s and 1960s, the Cold War, our successes and failures, just briefly. We know that the Soviet Union and the United States were Cold War adversaries. The Cold War brought about a nuclear arms race. The Cold War brought about a number of conflicts around the world. They separated the world into two camps, pro-Soviet, pro-U.S.A. We faced down the Soviet Union, they faced down us. Thousands upon thousands of nuclear weapons. There were crises and discussions and situations where we came close to a nuclear holocaust. It was a time when Khrushchev pounded his shoe in a podium at the United Nations and pointed his finger at the western diplomats and said, "We will bury you." That was not the only time he said that.

But what was Eisenhower's view of the Soviet Union during the Cold War? He knew we needed a strong military; he knew we needed the best intelligence services to be objectively analyzed in the world; but he also had an understanding of consensus and dialogue. So, what did he do with his most fearsome adversary on a number of occasions? Invite him to the United States to tour our farms, our schools, our cities. Consensus and dialogue was one of the ways in which we resolved these most difficult times.

What did President Kennedy do when Castro and the Soviet Union actually had deployable nuclear weapons? Did we attack? Did we shut them off from the dialogue or discussion? Did we have preconditions before we talked to them face to face? No. We had an ongoing dialogue which resolved the crisis and prevented a nuclear holocaust, prevented a war.

What did we do with communist China during the period of time when we were bitter enemies, when Mao Tse-tung said it would be worth it if half the population of China died if we could destroy the imperialists in the United States. What did we do? We worked for years to figure out how we could go to China and resolve these conflicts through dialogue. Those were our successes during the Cold War period.

And I will always wonder, maybe with a little more research I could figure this out, why the United States did not have a dialogue with Ho Chi Minh. We talked to Khrushchev many times,

we talked to many Soviet leaders. We talked to Mao Tse-tung, with no human rights etiquette, human rights violations that came close to some of the worst despots in the history of the world. We talked to them, we had a dialogue, but we didn't have a dialogue with Ho Chi Minh, and 58,000 Americans died, and their names are on a wall here in Washington, D.C. Thousands were wounded, and more than one million Vietnamese were killed.

What did he learn from that? Well, we learned that Ho Chi Minh wanted sovereignty from British colonial rule. He first approached the United States in 1918, and he relentlessly pursued the United States to be his ally to gain the kind of sovereignty, self-determination that the whole world fought for in World War II.

Let's take a look at the Middle East during the Cold War. The Middle East, throughout the Ottoman empire, throughout World War I, certainly after World War I, during World War II, but during the Cold War the Middle East continued to be a tangled web of complexity and intrigue, a difficult place to understand, tribal groups, religious groups, fundamentalists, moderates, secular leaders. 1953, the United States set a slow fuse that would erupt decades later.

In 1953, for a lot of reasons, John Foster Dulles said the Iranians may be toying with becoming communists with the Soviet Union. A number of other reasons. But the United States, along with the aid of Britain, pursued a very violent coup which overthrew an elected prime minister, a secular Muslim, Mohammed Mosaddeq, and installed Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, the Shah. We took away their officially, independently elected prime minister and put in the Shah, who was a dictator, and that lit a slow fuse that burned. And it exploded in 1979, when the Iranians took over our embassy in Tehran during the Islamic Revolution that put in power the Ayatollah, the Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. That was a slow fuse. That was a mistake that we made early in 1953 because of our fear of communism. We didn't pursue a dialogue with Mohammed Mosaddeq to talk about what his intentions were. We made a mistake, in a similar fashion that we did with Ho Chi Minh.

What was it like for the Soviet Union in the Middle East during the same period of time, the fifties, the sixties, the seventies? The Soviet Union was sometimes allied with the Egyptians, the Syrians, the Iraqis, and sometimes they weren't. This complexity, this intrigue ran in cycles. And Russia was almost never trusted. And sometimes they bought arms from the Russians, different Arab countries, and sometimes they chose to be allies with the United States.

Where was Israel during this period of time, and, let's say, the country of Iran, which is now considered a bitter enemy of Israel? From 1948 nearly to

1991, Israel, during the Cold War, was a quiet ally of the Iranians. Israel, during the Cold War in the Middle East, were quiet allies, the Israelis and the Iranians. Why? They were both enemies of the Soviet Union. They were both enemies of many of the Arab countries. They needed some form of economic viability in a very hostile region of the world. Israel needed oil, and Iran needed technology. And so, there was a constant trade between those two commodities for decades.

Now, Ruhollah Reza Pahlavi, the Shah, certainly seemed to condemn Israel at every point. That was the geopolitical way to survive in this region of the world. We know from 1980 to 1989, Russia was involved in a bitter war with Afghanistan which began to set the stage for more bitterness with presumed allies of the Soviet Union in the Arab world because of conflict with the Muslim world.

From 1980 to 1988, there was a terrible war between Iran and Iraq, as many as 2 million casualties between both countries. This is when Iraq began to use weapons of mass destruction. Given consideration you had two big oil-producing states at war with each other, where did the superpowers and where did European countries, where did the rest of the world ally themselves? They weren't going to stay out of this conflict, they were going to become a part of who was going to win this war, who was going to lose this war. Most of the big countries of the world, like Russia, the Soviet Union, European countries, including Japan and China, to a certain extent aided both of these countries. And as a result of that, the conflict went on for 8 years, and there were many, many, many problems, many casualties, and much bitterness that remains to this day.

1979 was a presumed bright spot when President Sadat and Prime Minister Begin of Israel got together and Egypt recognized the State of Israel. What happened with this in 1979, it pulled Egypt away from the Soviet sphere of influence. It brought more objectivity to how to deal with the country of Israel in a sea of hostile allies.

The Persian Gulf War in 1991, pretty much the end of the Cold War, was a conflict that the international community decided that they needed to get involved with, that is, if you recall, when Saddam Hussein decided that he wanted to invade Kuwait and take much of their oil and much of their land. But the international community, with the United States at the helm of leadership, saw the conflict, had very clear, defined objectives, created an international coalition, and some countries contributed troops, some countries contributed financial assets, and the conflict was resolved. But it was an international conflict that the countries made clear their objectives before they went in, they knew what the end result was going to be, and it was a success.

Now, that complex, brief history brings us to the present crisis in Iraq and the Middle East. This conflict started in 2003, it is now 2008. It has been going on for about 5 years. And what does it look like today? What does the conflict in Iraq look like?

It is a place where the three great religions of the world were spawned, Judaism, Christianity and Islam. It is a place in the world where faith is a very important part of an individual's life. If you're a Jew, if you're a Christian, if you're a Muslim, you adhere strongly to your faith. It is a place where oil exports are extremely vital for economic viability. And every one of those countries knows it, whether it's Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Oman, Qatar, you name it, oil exports is a vital part of economic viability.

Right now, however, as that economic process continues, the Middle East, as far as the balance of power is concerned, is fractured. And nobody in the Middle East, as a result of this conflict, knows which direction that balance of power is going to lead to.

Now, the Middle East became an extreme focus for the United States as a result of 9/11. America responded; we sent troops to Afghanistan. The conflict there is still hotly contested. NATO forces are contributing troops, financial assistance. A number of allies outside of NATO are trying to work to resolve the conflict in Afghanistan. But Iraq became a focus because there was some question of whether or not Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, whether or not Saddam Hussein was connected with al Qaeda, whether or not Saddam Hussein was actually going to deploy these weapons of mass destruction, was there a danger that the United States security was in jeopardy? And so, it was recommended in the beginning that America send between 300,000 and 500,000 troops into Iraq because this was going to be a very difficult conflict. And so, with 300,000 to 500,000 troops, you could resolve the problems of convoys, you could resolve the problems that would inevitably come as far as looting was concerned, chaos was going to be dealt with, ammo dumps that proliferated the countryside would be a problem, border security was going to be a problem. A whole range of issues would be resolved if you could send in 300,000 to 500,000 troops. Not to mention the fact that, I would recommend a book called "Fiasco" by Thomas Ricks, that many of the military planners in the Pentagon did not want to go into Iraq in the first place. They saw the same kind of issues that they dealt with back in 1991, when many of the military people did not want to go to Baghdad after the first Persian Gulf War ended. They simply didn't want to go. That discussion was ended and military was asked to come up with a plan. They came up with a plan of 300,000 to 500,000 troops, but that was reduced to 180,000 troops. The 180,000 troops were not sufficient to deal with the looting, with the con-

voys, with guarding prisoners, with border security, with eliminating the ammo ducts, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

And so, the U.S. has been fighting a protracted war in Iraq for the last 5 years. What are the specific defined objectives?

□ 1915

Where is the international coalition that can deal with this conflict in a much more cogent fashion?

Who are we fighting? Are we fighting al Qaeda? Are we fighting a criminal element? Are we fighting the different factions within the Shiite groups? Are we fighting the Sunnis? Where do the Kurds enter into this picture? What is the defined end to this conflict? These are all questions that are really not resolved yet. It's a very difficult place.

Let's take a look at Iraq's neighbors. We have a tendency to look at Islam or the Muslim world as being all the same. And yet there are very, very distinct differences between the different factions in the Shiite world, in the Sunni world, in the Allawi world, in the Wahabi world. There's many, many different sects within Islam. Some are moderate, some are secular, and some are more fundamentalists, and some are terrorists like al Qaeda. Some are brutal like the Taliban.

If we look at Saudi Arabia, they're a fundamentalist country. If we look at Iran, which is a Persian country, not an Arab country, but a Muslim country, Iran, if you are a woman, you can drive a car. But if you're a woman in Saudi Arabia, you cannot. If you're a woman in Iran, you can run for political office. You can own property. You can be educated. You can be a doctor or a lawyer or a schoolteacher, or a member of their parliament. That's our enemy. In Saudi Arabia you cannot do those things.

Syria, it's a secular country. Syria, women can be educated. They can drive cars. In Saudi Arabia, our ally, that's a completely different situation.

In Qatar, the U.S. has a massive military base there, provides security. It's a good arrangement with the small country of Qatar. Oil is an important commodity for them. The U.S. has a base there; it's convenient for us and our relationship with Afghanistan and Iraq, and it's a mutually agreeable situation.

But what's interesting about Qatar is that they own al Jazeera. Most of us have heard of al Jazeera, the news media outlet which predominates the Middle East, and which pokes their finger in the eye of the United States just about every single day. It's a pretty strange relationship. It's the conflict without a resolution.

Is there a resolution for the conflict in Iraq? Is there a way forward?

U.S. troops are stunningly competent at what they do in Iraq; stunningly competent, whether it's in Mosul, Anbar province, the ancient city of Babylon, Kirkuk, Baghdad, you name

it, U.S. troops are stunningly competent. And what they deserve and need and must have from us, the Government, the Congress, the people that make the policy, which, to a large extent has been flawed in the past, they need for us to be knowledgeable in order to be competent to create a policy that is also worthy of those soldiers that have put their lives on the line and continue to do so every single day.

So where are we in Iraq? Is there a way forward? Let's take a look at the present crisis, the present situation. And what do we see?

We know that in Iraq right now, the U.S. military is the skeletal structure upon which the entire Iraqi society depends. Would it be a good idea to withdraw our troops precipitously? Absolutely not. We have a responsibility to the Iraqi people and to our soldiers.

Iraq. What is Iraq's position within the region? What is Iraq's position within the region as far as its relationship with its neighbors is concerned? Does Iraq have any security alliances with any of its neighbors?

Remember, after World War II we created NATO, North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We created the Organization of American States in Latin America. We created Southeast Asia Treaty Organization in Southeast Asia. The United States reached out for regional security. The United States reached out to integrate our security needs with friends and allies.

What is the European Union doing right now? Besides NATO, the European Union is creating a region in the world that provides security through an integrated economic system.

Now, I'm not saying that the Middle Eastern countries should or may form a North Atlantic Treaty Organization. But I'm saying it's important for Iraq to begin looking with, certainly our help, at security arrangements within the region of the Middle East.

The United States is the skeletal structure upon which all of Iraqi society rests. We're integrated with Iraqi society, with their economy, with their culture, with their educational institutions, with their military, with their political institutions. So for us to begin to break away from that, slowly leave, we must do it in a very responsible fashion.

And we can't just focus on Iraq, because the region is one region, and it's interconnected in a very complex web. So let's take a look at the region in the context of the present crisis.

The United States needs to be an objective arbitrator, and I mean objective, in the Palestinian-Israeli question. And the Middle Eastern countries and the rest of the world need to see that the U.S. is an objective arbitrator in that particular conflict. And when we are seen that way, the reduction of al Qaeda recruits will drop like a stone.

Our discussions with Saudi Arabia have to be as far as a regional resolution to this conflict in Iraq is concerned. And Saudi Arabia has some

fear of Iraq being an Iranian satellite. That's a real fear.

The geopolitical balance of power in the Middle East right now is fractured, and no one knows in which direction it's going to go, who's going to have more influence, where the military power will be, where the economic power will be, and so Saudi Arabia needs to have a discussion with the United States, where they see the United States having some integrity and objectivity in that part of the world.

Syria needs to be brought into the loop of conversations about what's happening with the Palestinian-Israeli problem, what's going on in Lebanon, what are our objectives in Iraq. The Syrians can be a positive element in our conversations. The Syrians can be a positive element. If they would sign a non-aggressive pact with Israel and have all the parties sign it, they could get the Golan Heights back.

The Iranian historic fears. Iran has a fear of Iraq. They lost about a million people in that 8-year conflict. So Iran has a natural fear that if certain elements in Iraq come back to power, they could have security concerns. So we need to have conversations and dialogue with the Iranians, a conversation and a dialogue with no preconditions, we just sit down and talk.

Did we have preconditions when we talked to Mao Tse-Tung? We didn't. They were established after the conversation started.

Did we have preconditions when we talked to Khrushchev or Brezhnev or Kosygin? No, it was an ongoing dialogue. The conditions were set after the conversation started.

So it's important for the Iranians, I think, in this region to begin resolving some of these conflicts, to begin talking, especially to the Syrians and the Iranians.

No one in the Middle East wants Russia to have a sphere of influence there. No one in the Middle East wants the Chinese to have an economic sphere of influence there. The objective history of the United States in this region is one that still is respected.

Eisenhower, during his administration, said we need a strong military. We need a strong intelligence service with their analysis being objectively viewed. But we need consensus and dialogue.

What is in America's arsenal? We have a strong military. We have the best intelligence services in the world. But as Eisenhower and Nixon and Ford and Kennedy and past presidents saw, it was more than just a strong military, more than just good intelligence, it was diplomacy, it was trade. It was exchanges of education, science, technology, social and cultural exchanges. These are the things that brought countries together. These are the things that integrated nations.

The way forward in Iraq is to begin setting up a string, a series of dialogue with all of Iraq's neighbors, including

Syria and Iran, with no preconditions. The conditions can come as soon as the best diplomats in the world begin those conversations, and that's American diplomats.

And Iran was an enemy of the Soviet Union for years. They were enemies of many countries in the Middle East, many Arab countries. They had a strong, quiet, but strong relationship with Israel. It's a country that can be a part of the solution in this troubled part of the world.

Knowledge is the solvent for danger, so said Norman Cousins. And knowledge, in this instance, can help us resolve the danger in the Middle East.

History is a vast early warning system. What is the history of all these countries? Whether it's Israel or Egypt or Lebanon or Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran and so on, if we understand how they view the world, and we understand our place in that region, we can go a long way to resolving the conflict.

Sam Rayburn, famous congressman, the building that I work in is named after him, said an interesting thing while he was a Member of Congress, this great institution. Any mule can kick a barn door down; but it takes a carpenter to build one. And we need carpenters now. We need the best carpenters, the best diplomats, the best people with an understanding of the history of this region to begin, in a political, diplomatic fashion, taking the burden off the 1 percent of Americans who are now, almost alone, fighting the problems in the conflict there in Iraq.

Remember Rudyard Kipling. Why did young men die? Because old men lied nearly 100 years ago in Northern France. To paraphrase Rudyard Kipling today, old people should talk before they send young people to die. That's a pretty urgent message.

In the landscape of human tragedy, in the history of the human race, who has been our enemy almost all the time, almost exclusively? Who is the enemy on the landscape of human history? Ignorance, arrogance and dogma.

□ 1930

Ignorance, arrogance, and dogma inevitably leads to monstrous certainty. And monstrous certainty from any source leads to conflict, leads to war.

And so how do we resolve the enemy on the landscape of human tragedy? How do we resolve that?

We replace ignorance with knowledge. We replace arrogance with humility. And we replace dogma with tolerance. It takes courage to do that, but those young men and women fighting in Iraq deserve nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from New

Hampshire (Mr. HODES) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HODES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm glad to be here tonight. I will soon be joined by a number of my colleagues in the historic class of 2006, the Majority Makers. And we are here tonight to talk about the economy.

There certainly is a lot to talk about. We've come back recently from 2 weeks at home in our districts where we've all made observations and talked to our constituents, talked to the people we represent. We've gotten out and visited people in their homes. We've been out shopping, we've been to the malls, we've been all over and hearing the way the sorry state of the economy is having an effect on middle-class families and working-class families, and things are not right.

Hard times are here, and unfortunately, those hard times may be with us for a while. Some have been seeing this coming, and I would like to say that certainly my Democratic colleagues, including people I serve with on the Financial Services Committee, have been seeing this coming for quite a while. We have been working on it, talking about it, passing legislation to deal with these issues.

Others have come a little bit late to the table and are just beginning to see that middle-class families in this country are facing rising costs, difficult times. We've had a feed-the-rich policy and a squeeze-the-middle class, and it's time that we did something about it.

I recall that about a year ago, maybe a little more than a year ago, when I had just joined the Financial Services Committee, I had the opportunity to talk to the Federal Reserve Chairman, Ben Bernanke. He came before our committee and testified about the state of the economy. Now this was before we'd seen the mortgage crisis and the credit crunch and the bailout for Bear Stearns and all of the other things that are now making headlines in what are fairly arcane policy matters but now take up the front pages of our newspapers.

And we asked Mr. Bernanke about the state of the economy and what he saw then, and it was very interesting. At the time, he was reporting that corporate profits were in good shape, that corporate productivity was in good shape. In other words, that corporate productivity was on the rise. Corporate profits seemed to be okay. It meant that people who were working were working a lot harder and helping the corporations earn profits, and their productivity was good.

But we saw troubling signs. Back then, we saw that real wages in income for middle-class families were stagnant or had been slipping backwards in real dollar terms. We saw that we had had a record trade deficit, \$758 billion. We've seen tax cuts for 7 years under this administration which mostly benefited the very wealthy. In fact, last year, the 500 top wage earners in this country

earned about \$18.8 billion and paid about 17 percent of their income in wages. That's not what they were supposed to pay, apparently, according to the tax rates, but that's what they've ended up paying. They're doing pretty well.

So while middle-class families were experiencing slippage in their real wages and income going backwards and facing ever-increasing costs, we had gasoline prices rising, home heating oil was about to start zooming up that winter, costs for education were going up. We asked Mr. Bernanke whether or not the increase in corporate profits and the higher rates of corporate productivity necessarily were the best indicators of the health of the economy. Because we also pointed out at the time there was a troubling issue on the horizon, and the issue was that there had been many loans made to people over the past few years, let's call them subprime loans, which meant loans that were given to people with rates that started out being very good but then kind of rose precipitously and that we saw a problem with these subprime mortgages which may not have been given with the right kinds of appraisals which had been given to people who couldn't pay them back, whose incomes weren't sufficient to own homes, whose assets weren't sufficient, for whom there were no requirements to put money down like there used to be in the old days.

We took all of this in, and many of us had just come to Congress. We asked Mr. Bernanke whether or not that was a true measure of the health of our economy. And I do have to report that Mr. Bernanke is an expert economist and a very smart man who runs the Federal Reserve. He's the chairman, and his job, along with the other members of the Federal Reserve board, is to help control the money supply, among other things, in this country. It's like turning on the spigot for money that flows into the economy and helps make more credit available and deals with interest rates, and they deal with whether or not to cut interest rates or raise interest rates which then affect consumers who want to borrow money for mortgages on their houses or second equity lines, as many people have, also, on their houses or credit cards or to buy a car. So that credit and the flow of money, in large part, is controlled by the Federal Reserve.

His answer was he thought things were in pretty good shape.

Well, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, today, the chickens have come home to roost on 8 years of this administration's fiscal policies. I just pulled this off of the AOL service before I came down here to speak about these matters, and today, for the first time, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke acknowledged that the U.S. could reel into a recession from the powerful punches of housing, credit, and financial crises. Yet, he didn't have much to say at this time about what the Federal Reserve is going to do next.

I have to tell you, after a couple of weeks at home, Mr. Bernanke doesn't have to tell us that we are in a financial crisis. There are neighborhoods in some of the cities in New Hampshire where you go on a street and we are seeing four and five houses foreclosed. We are seeing the "bank owned" signs. And what that means is there is nothing worse to a family than losing a home. And what happens when a family loses its home is not only are they in peril, are they in distress, but whole neighborhoods are in distress. Because when homes are foreclosed in a neighborhood, it puts pressure on the housing prices in the neighborhood, it puts pressure on the other financial indicators in the whole community. So there is a huge ripple effect from what has turned into a housing problem.

At home in New Hampshire we are seeing it. In fact, by the end of 2009, Mr. Speaker, we anticipate seeing more than 4,900 foreclosures in the small State of New Hampshire alone. That's a huge rise. In some places we are seeing a hundred percent foreclosures. We've seen mill closings up north. We are seeing the job market beginning to soften in New Hampshire and around the country. Things are getting tough. Rising costs, credit problems, home mortgage foreclosure crises, the war in Iraq goes on at the rate of \$12 billion a month. Nobody has to tell the middle-class families of this country who have been squeezed by 8 years of this administration's policies that we are having hard times.

So tonight we are going to talk about what those hard times are, how we got there, and what we are doing in Congress, what my colleagues are doing, what we are trying to do here, especially on the Democratic side, to deal with these crises, and how we got here; and we are going to hear about what is going on in some of the other parts of the country as well.

I'm joined tonight by my other colleagues, as I said, from the Majority Makers, the class of 2006, Mr. Speaker, of which you are a part, which we are very proud of.

And I would like to introduce now and turn it over to my distinguished colleague from the State of Florida, the Sunshine State, where things are, frankly, much warmer than they are back home for me in New Hampshire where there is still snow on the ground and people are still digging out from a record snowfall.

So I will turn it over now to my distinguished colleague from Florida (Mr. KLEIN).

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Thank you very much, Mr. HODES, the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire, who really has been a great leader in our class. He was the first president of our class this year. And I am also joined by JOHN YARMUTH from Kentucky, who is our current class President. That's an honor that's bestowed, elected by the members of our freshman class on both of you. So I'm

glad to be here with both of you tonight. We are going to be joined by a few other people.

Yes, I do come from the Sunshine State, and the sun does come out every day, and it's a wonderful place to live. My wife and I have lived there for many years, and a lot of people in your districts come down and eventually retire there. Maybe you will be part of my constituency some day. Although the sunshine is out and it is warm there and beautiful, we have also had our trials and tribulations as of late with the economy.

We in Florida have actually been blessed for a number of years, 15 years straight, until just recently with growth and appreciation of home values, expanding businesses, a lot of international trade and agriculture production and things like that. Yet, we now are facing the same problems that most other States in the United States are, and that is our real estate industry has just stopped. People are having a great deal of difficulty selling their homes. If they're trying to downsize, they're retired and want to move to something smaller, or if they're a family growing and want to get into something a little bigger. There is nothing that is selling right now. Despite the great efforts of our realtors and people who are in the development business, they're having a difficult time.

And as a result of the real estate industry, which is a big part of Florida's economy, as a result of that having stopped, retail, and all of the service businesses and all of the businesses that relate to an economy which is growing and people are moving, coming and going, they have also stopped.

So we are now facing a very, very difficult time in Florida, and our Florida legislature is meeting, as we speak, and deciding how they're going to take \$3 billion-plus out of a State budget that funds education, health care, and all of the other things that our States do.

So we obviously understand that up here in Washington because all of us live at home. We live in our districts. We go to church and synagogue with people and go to our local supermarkets, and neighbors and friends are telling us what they're dealing with right now. And what they're dealing with is what people all over the United States are dealing with.

In Florida right now, gas prices are averaging about \$3.40 a gallon despite the fact that we live very close to a port. As a matter of fact, I have Port Everglades right in my district. That's a fuel farm where large tankers come in, bring the fuel right there, and it's \$3.40 on average per gallon of gas.

Food prices. Anybody who has been in the supermarket lately, and I know all of us have and our families have and people on the floor here have all been to the supermarket, a dozen eggs is \$3.50. A dozen eggs. Milk prices. And it goes on and on and on. Things that are manufactured in your States, the cost

of transporting things, the oil prices. These things add to the cost of living in all of our communities and I know in Florida.

I find it very interesting, and Mr. HODES and I serve on the Financial Services Committee, which is a committee that deals with the economy, that deals with the Federal Reserve. It deals with banks and credit and insurance and housing. All of these things are part of this committee.

So we have been hearing from Mr. Bernanke and Mr. Paulson, the Treasury Secretary and others. It's very interesting. When the information is presented to us and you hear this debate, is there a recession or is there not a recession; people back in my district are saying, What are you talking about? Who cares if there's a defined recession or not? We know what's going on. My job is not as secure as it was a year ago. I know what my food prices are, my energy costs, my insurance costs, my taxes. All of these things are weighing very heavily on me, and things are not good.

People have lost that confidence, that swagger that Americans have. And, of course, we know we can get it back, but it is a question of what we can do about it.

□ 1945

Well, in the discussion with Financial Services, when they present the inflationary numbers to us and say, well, inflation is in check, that maybe it's moving a little and we have to watch it but it's in check, guess what the inflationary factors do not consider: energy and food prices. And they say that the reason they're not considered is because they fluctuate wildly and they are really not a determining factor of whether there's an inflation. Well, you know something? They certainly are a big factor on my budget and my neighbor's budget and my parents' budget and everyone else who lives in the United States because those two factors are things that affect us. Every time you go to the gas station and you spend \$50, \$60, \$70 for a tank of gas, that's a lot of money. And whether you can afford it or not, you feel like something's wrong here. We're sending money overseas to countries that are not our friends and are supporting our enemies or these oil companies are creating the largest profit in American company history. And nobody's out there criticizing the entrepreneurial system, but let's have a little fairness here, a little investing in renewable energy, which is what this Democratic Congress has been focusing on, which is a good thing. And food prices, our farmers and people who produce, this is a big factor to American families when they go to the supermarket. When all of a sudden it costs \$175 for your weekly bill instead of \$130, that adds up. People that are on fixed incomes, we have a lot of seniors that have retired to my community that are on fixed incomes. These are real issues that I think we are concerned about.

And the good news is there are some things coming out of this Congress that are going to begin to help deal with everything from energy prices, both short and long term; food prices, of course. And nobody's looking to control the economy, but we are saying we need to work together to help reduce the costs of the materials that make up these products. And, of course, the mortgage crisis and the credit crisis, and I know we're going to talk about that as we get into our discussion tonight. Fortunately, we have some great people. Congressman BARNEY FRANK, chairman of Financial Services, probably one of the smartest people, he's working every day with Mr. Bernanke and Mr. Paulson to try to find things that we can do to help people stay in their homes. We're not talking about land speculators. We're not talking about people who have five homes. We are talking about the families that got in a little bit over their heads here, and they need some help and those communities need some help so you don't have this cascading of foreclosures in any one area.

So I'm looking forward to being with our colleagues here tonight to talk about some of these things. And with that if I can yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, I will do that.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my good friend for yielding.

And you raised a very important point, and that is that while much of the headlines today talk about a recession and the debate over whether we are technically in a recession, those of us who campaigned in 2006 and were talking to our constituents at that point knew that this was on the way. We saw the gathering storm, if you will. We saw the ripples in the ocean that became the tsunami. We talked to our constituents. We knew that they were hurting. We knew that their standard of living was not increasing even though they were working harder and harder. We knew they were scared about their retirement and scared about their ability to afford health care. That's what I heard throughout my campaign in 2006.

Yes, people were concerned about the war in Iraq. But, Mr. Speaker, that wasn't really what they were talking about on a day-to-day basis. It was, "I'm really having a hard time." And while the President wasn't talking about it at that time and the majority leaders and the majority party in the Congress weren't talking about it, they were talking about it. They were saying, My friend, his company just went out of business or his plant was moved overseas and he had a pension that had accumulated \$150,000 and now it was down to \$30,000 because his company hadn't adequately funded it; so now what's he going to do? So we heard these problems day after day after day.

And I'm proud to say that when we came to the Congress in January, 2007, we didn't wait for somebody to declare that there was a recession. We started

immediately. We said the middle class is hurting. We have people at the very lowest ends of the income scale who are working very hard, who are working at or near minimum wage, and we haven't raised the minimum wage in 10 years in this Congress. That's an outrage. And within the first few days of this 110th Congress, we raised the minimum wage. We put it on track to get to the point where, hopefully, there will be a living wage for everyone who works in this country.

And we set about looking at college costs. We said that college costs have been inflating at a very, very dramatically high rate, in my State 8 or 9 percent each year for the last 4 or 5 years. People trying to put their kids through college or people trying to put themselves through college are having a harder and harder time. No increase in the amount of financial aid that was available. No increase in the Pell grants. We passed the College Cost Reduction Act, \$21 billion in additional aid to help college students get their degrees. So we understood the problem. We were dealing with it early on.

It has not been an easy fight. It has not been an easy fight because we have an administration that has this theory that the marketplace is sacrosanct, that it's infallible, that nothing ever goes wrong, that everything will even out, and that we just need to get out of the way. We just need to get out of the way and let these big corporations do whatever they want to do because the marketplace will force them into doing the right thing. And we now, of course, know that's not the case. We now, of course, know that, as we looked at, in kind of the aftermath of the Bear Stearns situation, an astounding fact coming from Wall Street that one-third of all the income in New York City was on Wall Street. One-third. The average wage, including all of the clerical help and all of the support staff on Wall Street, was \$380,000 a year. Those are enormous salaries. And when something goes bad to deflate that bubble, it doesn't just hurt those people, as we have seen; it ripples through the entire economy.

So, yes, we have some problems that have just hit us now because, again, the bubble has burst. But it wasn't that we were asleep at the switch because, again, we heard these complaints, we sensed these signals 2 years ago when we were out in the campaign trail. I certainly did in my community, a wonderful community that never quite experiences all the booms but never has the busts. We have two Ford plants making vehicles that consume a lot of gas. There's a lot of stress on those because sales are down for those vehicles. We knew that then. We knew that they were negotiating constantly, the company with the union, trying to drive those wages down. People who were making \$25, \$30 an hour negotiated down so that they were making \$15 an hour because they said that they're having hard times, that the company is

suffering. Well, yes, we know the company is suffering. But, meanwhile, the same people doing the same hard work day after day with the same expenses, the same obligations in their life, and now their income has been cut by 10, 20, 30 percent.

So we have been at this battle for now 15 months, since we have been in Congress, and we are going to stay in this battle because this is a battle for the very essence of American society. And I'm very proud to be part of a Congress that is committed to making sure that this economy works for every American and not just for the very elite Americans. And that's why I came to Congress. That's why my colleagues came to Congress. And I think over time, given the commitment that we have, we are going to make a difference for the American people.

Mr. HODES. Thank you, Mr. YARMUTH. I really appreciate hearing from both of you about your perspectives about what's going on.

And the discussion we've had brings to mind a quote that I read by Abraham Lincoln, who was a good Republican. Today he might not be a Republican. Today he might be a Democrat. And it really addressed some of the fundamental underpinnings of the debates that we are having about how to fix things. What Abraham Lincoln said was that "the purpose of government is to do what the free markets cannot or will not do so well for themselves." And today in Congress and around Washington and around the country, we are beginning a debate at one level about what kind of changes we need to make and what kind of help we need to offer to struggling middle-class families. And those are two separate questions really.

One of the questions is, what kind of changes do we need to make to the regulation of our financial systems? That integrated big financial system that, as Mr. KLEIN pointed out, deals with banks. It deals with stocks. It deals with housing. It deals with real estate. It deals with insurance. It's a complex system that is now regulated in Washington. It's regulated at the State levels because there are regulators in the States who regulate all these industries. And Washington, what we are now seeing is that we've had Depression-era regulatory systems that really took their eye off the ball over the past 8 years certainly. While things for the middle class were squeezing tighter and tighter and tighter and those at the very top were doing okay, the regulators didn't seem to notice. And a lot of people are asking questions: Well, why not?

The interesting thing here is to hear how the tunes of some people in this Chamber have changed. It used to be that some of our colleagues across the aisle who were saying don't regulate, deregulate, and that was a huge push for this administration and many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and, in fact, many have said just

let the free markets take care of it. Well, what we are seeing in this boom-bust cycle is that the free markets need some control from government. It's got to be balanced, of course, because you don't want to go too far with the free market. But what we have seen, for instance, just in the housing crisis is this: When I go home to talk to my community bankers in New Hampshire, what they tell me is that their foreclosure rates aren't really any different than they were before we got into the crisis we are in. They're not seeing a huge spike in foreclosures. They are regulated very closely. They have to follow strict standards. And they have been making loans the way they always have. They've been requiring down payments. They've been asking people what are their incomes? They've been verifying those incomes. They have been appraising properties accurately. They have been making sure that the loans they make in their communities are the kinds of loans that a lot of people are familiar with. Unfortunately, there were a lot of lenders who weren't regulated in the same way and they were making loans to people who probably shouldn't have loans, maybe people who were speculating. And then what was happening was those loans were being packaged. And they were going to Wall Street where they were being packaged into huge kinds of packages of loans and sliced and diced into securities with very odd names and securities that many of us don't even understand: "Credit Default Swap Exchange Opportunities," not listed on any stock exchange, traded sort of desk to desk on Wall Street, essentially where people were taking air and risky loans and slicing them up and selling them around the globe because we're in a global economy. There are global markets, especially on the financial side. So I read articles where pension funds from municipal employees in towns in Norway were going underwater because of the mortgage crisis here.

And so one of the fundamental questions that we have got to ask is how are we going to fix this regulatory scheme? Because really if you think about it, over the past 8 years, we have had the Bush tax cuts, which advantaged the very rich; and as you said, Mr. YARMUTH, pay for CEOs has gone through the roof, 350, 400 times what the average person is making. So while we had tax cuts that were advantaging the very rich and the middle class was being squeezed, we were spending \$800 billion on the war in Iraq. And while that was going on, the Federal Reserve was keeping interest rates very low. And mortgages were being handled in a different way, packaged, sliced and diced into stocks, and sold by unregulated lenders. So with very low interest rates, what people were lulled into thinking was that the prices of their houses would just keep going up and up and up and up, and people began to treat their houses like it was a revolving ATM machine.

I know that I got calls from people offering to rewrite my loan. I have a 30-year fixed loan. I'm very glad about it now. They were offering to rewrite my loan. They gave me all kinds of incredible deals. They were so incredible that I couldn't understand them, and I figured if I can't understand them, thank you very much but I'm going to stick with something simple. They were talking about a rate here and then in 3 years the rate would go there, and don't worry, when the rate goes up and if it goes up, you won't have to worry. Don't worry because your house will be worth more, and when your house is worth more, you will be able to refinance it again. So for the past 8 years we have seen that spiral. What happened was when the housing market crested and began to come down, everything began to unravel down the line, not only housing prices but then the credit crunch. It meant that people couldn't borrow for their businesses. They can't borrow to get out of their problems with their housing prices. We have seen at the same time a huge rise in energy prices. Jobs are now under real pressure in terms of people losing their jobs. And this has exploded into a crisis that we now have to deal with in Congress.

□ 2000

But we haven't been silent about it. Some of the things we have done, I am just going to talk really briefly, then hand it over to you, Mr. KLEIN, we took action. One of the things we did was we expanded affordable mortgage loan opportunities through the Federal Housing Administration for families who are in danger of losing their home by increasing the loan limits that the Federal Housing Authority administration could make to help with the fact that house prices have gone up. It's a very important part of the economic stimulus package which this Democratic Congress passed to put money into the hands of consumers through rebates that will come when people file their tax returns this year. Instant money. We address the housing piece, and we also helped small businesses in lots of significant ways.

So we haven't been sitting around. We are working on helping people. That was just a one-time shot, a shot in the arm for the economy. We are going to do other things because this is really once in a lifetime, in some way, kind of a problem.

People are using words like recession and other words like that. But as Mr. KLEIN said, let's just say that hard times are here. They are hard times that we haven't really had to face in this country in this way in a long, long, long time. And we are going to take action to make sure that we are helping squeezed middle-class families and hurting working families to get on their feet. We are going to offer a hand up. It's not going to be a handout, but it's going to be a hand up of the kind that the American people expect.

The last thing I will say before I turn it over to you, Mr. KLEIN, is that so far, the administration at the other end of the mall on Pennsylvania Avenue has set up an 800 number for homeowners. But so far, I am not sure that the administration really understands and is really feeling the depth and breadth of what our folks are facing back at home. I would say Mr. Bush ought to get out a little more and maybe he would see that some steps are necessary to help the middle-class families and working families. Because we are going to have to soften the hard landing that's coming.

With that, I will turn it back over to Mr. KLEIN.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Thank you for laying out as you did. It's very easy to understand the way you just explain it. I will just mention another item that we did pass last year as we saw this coming on. The question is what is Congress doing. What are we doing to help our neighbors and friends. This is a community issue. Sure, it's a national issue. But it boils down to what is happening in my community in Delray Beach and Boynton Beach and Lauderdale by the Sea and places that are close-knit communities and close-knit families that have lived together for a long time and they are seeing house after house after house with a sign that says Foreclosure, that notice on the door. It's not very troubling. It's not just that homeowner him or herself, it's the community that gets affected. It has a downward pressure on home values, which is what we want to avoid.

Another thing that is very important that this Congress, the two gentlemen here and others supported, and we are all very proud to do this, it was a bill called the Mortgage Forgiveness Debt Relief Act. It did something which is very important. It prevents homeowners from facing a tax bill at the same time they are losing their homes. Here's how it works. This is a problem with the current Internal Revenue Code. Basically, it says if you have a debt, a mortgage, and somebody releases you from that debt, they cancel the debt, or they reduce the amount, that is considered income to you. You actually have to pay tax on that, which is pretty ridiculous. But that is the way the current tax law is set up. It's not just for homes, it's for other things as well. It's called "phantom income." It's the worst kind of income you can have because there is no cash in your pocket to pay for it.

So this Congress under the leadership of NANCY PELOSI and others, in a bipartisan way, it was the right thing to do, we passed a law that said no, that is not going to be the case. If you're foreclosed on or there is a problem and there is a release of this debt, that is not going to be income to you, and you don't have to pay tax on it. It's bad enough your losing your home, but you certainly shouldn't have to add insult to injury by paying income on that as well.

We also passed a bill which expanded financial counseling for families in danger of losing their homes. A lot of it is information. If you're getting this notice and you can't afford that mortgage payment, what can you do? As Mr. HODES correctly said, this isn't the old days when you went to your local banker, in many cases, and it was a man or woman you knew, it was someone in the community, and they took down your application, they knew where you worked and what your income was and everything else, and that bank was going to hold that mortgage.

Today, that is not the way it works. Many banks, not all banks, but many banks, they take that mortgage and it's sold within 30 days in the package that Mr. HODES mentioned. Packaged and sold again and again, and most people don't even know who's holding their paper. They send a mortgage payment to some P.O. box somewhere. They won't even know who to call if they were late on their payments.

One of the things this Congress said is let's help people, get them information, and this counseling process is one which you bring people together and say listen, maybe I can't afford this, but I can afford this. It's not in the bank's best interest to foreclose on a piece of property. They lose all the way around. It's certainly not in the best interest of the homeowner. So we are very proud that that was the right thing to do. But there's so much more to do.

This past week, the Treasury Secretary, Mr. Paulson, released a series of proposals. He called them short, intermediate, and long-term views on the financial markets. Unfortunately, the short-term really wasn't much of anything. The way I read it, it was sort of we are going to reinstate this commission, put some new people on it, and study it.

Well, time for study is over. People are in real need right now. We are not into bailouts. We are not into bailouts of banks or investment groups that made bad investments, and we are not into bailouts of land speculators. But there is a narrow group of people that are homeowners, family owners. It's their primary home, their only home. It's where they live. They are raising their kids, or they are senior citizens. This is the group of people that may have got caught short. This is the group of people that I think there are some strategies being discussed right now in Congress just to give them some relief to encourage the lenders to work with them and create some ways that the financing can be stabilized.

So I think that is a very good thing. But, again, it's not in the President's proposal. I am not saying that he is not prepared to work with us, but I think the ideas are going to come out of this Congress.

The second thing I will mention quickly and turn it over to my colleague from Kentucky is the notion that these organizations at the Federal

level, SEC, Securities Exchange Commission; CFTC, another group that regulates commodities, and the groups go on and on in evaluating and regulating banks. They call it the alphabet soup of regulators.

It's pretty clear that these organizations have failed or not had the legal authority to do what they need to do. I think what this means to all of us, and the President and through the Treasury Secretary has said let's merge some of these together. That may be a good idea for efficiency purposes and it may be a good idea in term of creating a better form of regulation. But it's like reorganizing the chairs on the Titanic, or even creating the Department of Homeland Security by putting Immigration and FEMA in there. It isn't always necessarily a better idea to just merge everything together.

I am all for efficiency, I am all for saving money, I am all for the better regulatory side without, as Mr. HODES, said over regulating. But I think there has to be a mission clarification here to understand that a whole lot of things that were being sold on Wall Street are not understandable, not only to the average investor, like any American that buys stocks or investment vehicles, but even to the most sophisticated people.

There are a lot of things being traded that nobody real understood what they were trading, and the result of that is no transparency and a whole lot of businesses and a lot of people have lost a lot of money. Again, I think I am mostly concerned about the average investor and our markets being creative and innovative. That is all a good thing. But at the same time, we want to make sure that there's a regulatory scheme that doesn't stifle innovation, but it's that side of capitalism, that capitalism unregulated results in the Depression, as we had in 1929, and certainly there have been pitfalls along the way. This is obviously a pitfall, and we need to fix it and learn from the mistakes of what got us here in the first place.

So I am hopeful that this Congress in a bipartisan way with the leadership of Chairman BARNEY FRANK will be able to come up with some good ideas, work with Federal Reserve Chair, work with the Treasury Secretary, work with the Bush administration. America is depending on us. Our families are depending on us, our neighbors are depending on us. We are all optimists. That is why we are here. As Americans, we are optimists. Let's not repeat these mistakes again.

With that, Mr. HODES, if it's okay, I will turn it back to you.

Mr. HODES. It's very interesting to think about. One of the great things about the Financial Services Committee under Mr. FRANK is that very often we are able to work in a bipartisan way in the kind of spirit that the people of this country really are hoping that we will take to deal with these complex financial matters. Because

while we are dealing with try to fix the regulatory scheme and figure out exactly what measures, which we will talk about, are the kind of measures are going to help people on the ground who are losing their homes, it's really important that we are able to come together.

So there may be different philosophical approaches. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle on the Republican side, Mr. Bush in the White House may say, no, no, no. They may say to keep hands off. Let the free markets do everything.

But now people I think are beginning to come along and see that this is exactly the kind of situation where some appropriate government intervention to fix fundamental problems in the financial schemes and help with this mortgage crisis are going to be necessary. I am hoping that the President is going to come along. I am hoping that he is going to come on out of the Rose Garden. I am hoping that he is going to see that we need more than a 1-800 number, 1-88 I AM IN TROUBLE.

I am hoping that Secretary Paulson will continue to have what I think has been a pretty good dialog with the White House about what we have to do and that we are going to see the cooperation between the regulators, Mr. Paulson, the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the President to move things forward.

Mr. YARMUTH. Will the gentleman yield? We have been joined by another colleague. But I just have to follow up on something that Mr. KLEIN said because I almost thought he was telepathic there when he talked about the Great Depression.

None of us wants to be alarmist here. But when I was in college, I did my senior thesis on speculation in the 1920s. In fact, there is some remarkable parallels between the situation today with the housing crisis and what happened in the 1920s that led to the Great Depression.

The similarity is that back in the 1920s, if you wanted to buy stock, you only had to put up 10 percent of the price of the stock. You could borrow the rest of the money. The theory there, because the stock market was going higher and higher and higher, and everybody thought it was going to continue to get higher, happy days are here again, before they disappeared, and that was the psychology. So nobody ever thought about regulating that. Everybody thought that was an endless gravy train. So people would keep buying stock, paying 10 percent down, 10 percent down.

When the stock dropped 10 percent, their equity was gone. This happened time after time after time. The same thing has happened now with the housing market when people are lured into markets with low interest rates and then they borrowed against the equity and then when the value started to slip a little bit, they were in a negative equity situation, and that is what precipitated this crash.

I am hoping, and I don't believe that the situation in terms of the overall economy is as threatening as that situation was. The parallels are the same. After that situation in the 1920s, we created the SEC, we went to an environment, because the pendulum had swung over to the side of absolutely no regulation, and we saw the problems with that.

I listened to Senator OBAMA today on the campaign trail, and he made I think a very profound statement, and that was: Things go wrong when nobody is looking. That is what we have had over last 8 years, maybe more than that. We decided we didn't need to look at all that stuff. We found out now we need to pay attention. We need to hold all these institutions accountable. We need to set up certain rules.

We don't want to swing the pendulum to the other side, as my good friend Mr. HODES said, but there is a happy medium. In order to avoid the pitfalls that we have experienced in the past, this is the time. I think this Congress is committed to that.

I yield back.

Mr. HODES. Thank you for that really important point. I know my mother and others who lived through the Great Depression and its aftermath would be very interested to hear the analysis and the parallels, because they are not lost. Our job is going to be to try to deal with the 21st century realities and make the landing softer than it was then.

I would now like to turn it over to a distinguished colleague and an extraordinary leader, Mr. ELLISON, from Minnesota, who serves on both the Judiciary Committee and serves with us on the Financial Services Committee, someone who has been a leader in his commitment to protecting consumers, dealing with the problems that people are facing every day in their lives, who understands that hard times demand from the Congress imaginative action, and has a way of addressing things in a head-on way that has been a great example for all of us here in Congress.

With that, I am very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

□ 2015

Mr. ELLISON. Let me thank my friends from New Hampshire, Kentucky and Florida.

My dad likes to say, "people respect what others inspect. If you don't inspect, you are not going to get any respect." So it is important that we have oversight. It is important that we have a regulatory system.

The market and the public sector should work in a balanced way, should compliment each other. That has not happened, and, as a result of the lack of regulation, as a result of deregulation, Gramm-Leach-Bliley in 1999, and I would like to talk about that in a moment, we have got ourselves into quite a situation.

Let me share with you what the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

issued recently. You probably would not be surprised to know that between 2005 and 2006, the average income of the top 1 percent of households increased by \$73,000, after adjusting for inflation, while the average income of the bottom 90 percent, that is us based on our pay here, increased by \$20. I am talking about a twenty-spot. You know, bam, that is your pay increase between 2005 and 2006 if you are in the bottom 90 percent of the income distribution.

Now, you might be thinking, gee, that is not good. But let me just tell you, what this means is that the share of the Nation's income flowing to the top 1 percent has increased sharply, as a matter of fact rising from 15.8 percent in 2002 to 20.3 percent in 2006. That means that people in the top 1 percent of our income distribution make one-fifth of the money. That is not good.

Now, you might be thinking, that is kind of bad there. But the fact is that it hasn't been this bad since.

Mr. YARMUTH, when was the last time the top 1 percent were making this much of the money in America? It did happen before, Mr. YARMUTH. I want to ask you if you know?

Mr. YARMUTH. I will defer.

Mr. ELLISON. I know you have an idea, because you were already talking about the era.

Mr. YARMUTH. Obviously in the Robber Baron Era of the 1920s.

Mr. ELLISON. The 1920s. It starts with "Great." In fact, Mr. HODES, your mother was born and lived during this era. When was the last time the top 1 percent made 20 percent of the money in America?

Mr. HODES. 1929.

Mr. ELLISON. The Great Depression. I am telling you, the signs are not good. We need bold, decisive action which puts the public sector and the private sector in a partnership to look out for the American consumer. This is what we have to do.

You know, Mr. YARMUTH, let me talk to you a little bit about some things you inspired me to think about.

When we had Chairman FRANK out to Minnesota, we had a hearing on the foreclosure crisis. One of the pieces of testimony that came out is that a lot of folks actually could not find rent at the amount that they could buy into a subprime mortgage. In other words, they could get into a 228 or a 327, which means you have a low rate for 2 or 3 years and then it jumps way up. The teaser rate was lower than the market rent they could find. Since nobody was checking income, they got into that. Then when the 2 or 3 years expired, they were in a mess. The mortgage jumped up, there was not enough equity in the house even to refinance it, and they were foreclosed upon.

Now, that speaks to another thing we have done in this 110th Congress, and that is invested in a National Housing Trust Fund so we could truly invest in affordable housing, which is part of the equation here.

In America, we need an overhaul of our economic system. We need real progressivity in our Tax Code. We need

real regulation in the financial housing markets, we need to have a real aggressive attempt to support affordable housing, and we need to make sure that people have livable wages to live on. We need a new vision for an economy which puts economic prosperity at the very center dot of what we do around here.

So I yield back at this time.

Mr. HODES. Thank you very much for that perspective.

Before I introduce another colleague from the class of 2006, The Majority Makers, I do want to point out that we have not been quiet about what we think is necessary. Some of the things that we have done here in the House of Representatives, back in November we saw what was coming. We have been ahead of the curve.

We saw what was coming on this mortgage crisis and we passed the Mortgage Reform and Anti-Predatory Lending Act to strengthen consumer protections against risky loans. We wanted to make sure that going forward, the kind of lending practices that we have seen causing this mortgage and housing crisis would not be repeated.

That bill is sitting now somewhere across Statuary Hall, across the Rotunda on the other side of this building in the United States Senate, hopefully going to be passed by the United States Senate. But it is being held up there, like much legislation that we have passed here in the House to help middle-class families, to help working families, which has been held up in the Senate.

So I am hoping our colleagues are going to see the wisdom of making sure that we have loan standards in this country that really help to ensure that people who shouldn't get loans aren't getting the loans, that lenders who are taking advantage of people aren't taking advantage of them when they make the loans.

It goes along with what we have done to expand affordable mortgage loan opportunities for families in danger of losing their homes through the FHA reform. That is also being held up over in the Senate by Senator SHELBY, who apparently is upset about the economic stimulus package and has taken it out by refusing to deal with that loan.

We have strengthened Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to increase their loan limit size. We are hoping that that goes through. And we have increased the supply of affordable rental housing to address the current shortage with the bill you talked about, the National Affordable Housing Trust Fund, which we have to get through the Senate, across the way. It has to go up the Mall to the President. We have got to pass these kinds of measures.

We have done our job here in the House on those kinds of measures to help middle-class families and working families and people who are being struck. There are some other things that are coming from Mr. FRANK and

the Financial Services Committee in a couple of days as we hold hearings and pass things through.

But now what I would like to do in about the last 10 minutes that we have got is to introduce another colleague and turn it over to my esteemed, distinguished colleague from New York, a gentleman who understands small business, a gentleman who has been working hard for veterans, a gentleman who understands the problems that he is seeing in his community in Upstate New York, the distinguished gentleman from New York, JOHN HALL.

Mr. HALL of New York. I thank my colleague.

Madam Speaker, the last few months has certainly seen severe damage done to our economy and have left many Americans battered. As a parent, I wonder how many other people have had the experience that I have had of watching my daughter when she was in high school getting credit card offers from banks, or when she was in college, with me and my wife paying for her expenses, getting credit card offers from banks, and wondering how many college students or young adults are taking those offers and not realizing the interest rates that come with them?

Signs of economic turmoil are multiplying, and I don't think anyone doubts that we are either in or headed for a recession. Some academic economists may quibble over the technical terms, but the bottom line is that our economy is headed in the wrong direction, and for many Americans, tough times are either here or lie ahead.

Stock markets around the world have behaved as if they are a roller coaster, alternating huge increases and dramatic declines. Wall Street traders don't seem to know what to make of each contradictory economic indicator. As a musician and songwriter, and now a Member of Congress, I have had hedge fund traders and stock market advisers and financial experts come to me and say, what do you think is going to happen, and that is a sign I think of the confusion and the general uncertainty that we see in the market.

While the cost of everyday expenses like food and fuel continue to rise, most people have seen their wages stagnate. People in my district make little more than they did a decade ago, yet their costs continue to rise dramatically.

People I represent in the Hudson Valley have been particularly hard hit. Oil has long passed the \$100 a barrel mark, making it more expensive than ever for people to heat their homes and drive their cars. In suburban communities in the Northeast, like the area I represent, home heating bills increased more than 30 percent just between last winter and this winter.

While personal debt has skyrocketed to a record level, investment for the future has become all but nonexistent. As a result, families struggle to pay their everyday costs, more people have made incalculable personal sacrifices,

lost their homes, and went hungry. As necessities become outrageously expensive and more and more employers are moving overseas to take advantage of the cheap labor and complacent regulations in places like India and China, as always, it is the American families who pay the price.

Ultimately I believe these troubles are a direct result of President Bush's disastrous economic policies. After years of the President and his enablers in the previous Republican Congress mismanaging the economy, more Americans are looking for work than ever before, the housing crisis has caused millions of Americans to risk losing their homes, and the price of gas has hit an all-time high. Clearly it is up to this Congress to act soon and act decisively. If we do not, it may well take years for the country to recover from the last 7 years.

I am proud that this Congress has already begun to take steps to do what we need to do. First we enacted the 2008 Economic Stimulus Package, which provided tax rebates for most Americans to go out and spend, and raised the loan limits for mortgages backed by FHA, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, to make it easier to get a mortgage with better terms. Both of these measures have already begun to help.

But I hope none of us are naive enough to think that that alone will be enough. We still have a lot more work to be done, specifically targeting working and middle-class families, the true lifeblood of our Nation's success. Relief for these people will only come from a clear commitment to increasing assistance for unemployment insurance, food stamps, Federal Medical Assistance Percentage payments and Federal housing programs.

I am proud of the steps we have taken here in the House, but I know we have much farther to go. As you say, my friend, Congressman HODES, we need to not only pass these progressive and family oriented middle-class steps in the House, we need to persuade our friends in the Senate to approve them as well and then persuade the President to sign them. I hope together we can do that.

Mr. HODES. I thank the gentleman for his cogent and eloquent remarks.

I am going to turn it over to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky for some closing thoughts.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman. It is good to see our colleague Mr. HALL here as well, and I thank him for his comments.

You know, it becomes almost a cliché, and actually an overly used one these days since we have a big presidential campaign, to talk about the contrasts between Wall Street and Main Street. But it has never been more apt, and particularly with the situation we have seen on Wall Street very recently.

We have a very serious orientation problem in this country. For many

years, going back probably three decades now, we have taken the position in this country that we are going to let companies get as big as they can get because they say “we need to get big so we can function in the global economy.” But the ramifications of letting them get so big with no regulation has been that if they make a mistake, then it doesn’t just affect their stockholders and their employees, it affects the rest of the country. Now we have seen that. As you said early on in the opening remarks, the chickens have come home to roost. That is where we are.

This Congress, this government, has to start standing up for Main Street, not for Wall Street, understanding that Wall Street provides great benefits for this country at times. But we have to make sure that ultimately we protect the average American working family. That is what this Congress I think has been committed to doing since day one, and we will continue to be committed to that as we move forward.

I yield back, and thank you for your leadership, Mr. HODES.

Mr. HODES. Thank you, Mr. YARMUTH.

I appreciate the time we had, Madam Speaker, to talk about the economy. In the coming days, the Financial Services Committee will be presenting two very important proposals to help more on the mortgage crisis. One, we will provide some loan-ability and guarantee-ability through the Federal Housing Administration to lenders who are willing to write down loans and help people who are facing foreclosure and who may be in distress on their homes in order to make more money available to prevent foreclosures, and to help those, say at least 1 million, perhaps up to 2 million people who have been in foreclosures.

The second thing is we expect to propose a program of loans and grants to help States and cities acquire properties that have been foreclosed and facilitate returning them to the rolls as owner-occupied or rental units.

Taken together, these initiatives are going to be very important. They are going to allow millions of families to avoid disasters, they are going to help hard-pressed jurisdictions avoid the cascade of deteriorating neighborhoods and abandoned houses that follow the kind of crises we have seen, and they are going to help stem the steep and destabilizing decline in house prices that led to and is intensifying the financial crisis, because we cannot allow this crisis to continue unabated.

This Congress is ready to act. We are going to help middle-class and working families out of this hole.

I thank my colleagues for joining me tonight, and I thank Madam Speaker for her indulgence in allowing us to go over a short amount of time.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. YARMUTH, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. WEINER, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TANCREDO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, April 3.
- Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, April 9.
- Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, April 9.
- Mr. WESTMORELAND, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. WELLER of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today and April 3.
- Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, April 8.

(The following Member (at his request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker’s table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 980. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to address online pharmacies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o’clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 3, 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:

5807. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Community Facilities Grant Program (RIN: 0575-AC75) re-

ceived March 18, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5808. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the Corporation’s annual report on the provision of services to minority and diverse audiences by public broadcasting entities and public telecommunications entities, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 396(m)(2); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5809. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Alternative Fuel Transportation Program; Private and Local Government Fleet Determination (RIN: 1904-AB69) received March 17, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5810. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department’s report outlining the status of Exxon and Stripper Well Oil Overcharge Funds as of September 30, 2006, satisfying the request set forth in the Conference Report accompanying the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1988, Pub. L. 100-202; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5811. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting a copy of a report entitled “Emissions of Greenhouse Gases in the United States 2006,” pursuant to Public Law 102-486 section 1605(a); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5812. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department’s status of the report entitled, “Report on Uncosted Balances,” pursuant to Public Law 102-486; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5813. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a letter expressing the Department’s opposition to efforts to legislatively impose temporary or long-term suspensions on the acquisition of petroleum for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5814. A letter from the Comptroller General, Government Accountability Office, transmitting the Office’s report concerning GAO employees who were assigned to congressional committees during fiscal year 2007, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(b)(1)(C); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5815. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report for Calendar Year 2007, in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5816. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department’s final rule — National Park System Units in Alaska (RIN: 1024-AD38) received March 13, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5817. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; 2008 Scup Specifications; Correction [Docket No. 071030625-8130-02] (RIN: 0648-XC84) received March 13, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5818. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts,

transmitting the third annual report to Congress on victims' rights, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3771; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5819. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the Office's fiscal year 2008 update to the Long Range Plan for Information Technology in the Federal Judiciary and the Judiciary Information Technology Fund Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2007, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 612(h); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5820. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of a class of workers from the Mound Plant near Dayton, Ohio to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5821. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of a class of workers from the Combustion Engineering facility in Windsor, Connecticut to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5822. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of a class of workers from the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5823. A letter from the Director, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Annual Report of the Citizenship and Immigration Services for Fiscal Year 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5824. A letter from the Ombudsman, Department of Labor, transmitting the Third Annual Report of the Ombudsman of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5825. A letter from the Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Visas: Documentation of immigrants under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended. [Public Notice:] received March 10, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5826. A letter from the Executive Vice President/COO, National Security Council, transmitting the Council's 2007 Financial Report, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 463 Public Law 83-259; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5827. A letter from the Acting Chief Acquisition Officer & Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-24; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket FAR-2007-0002, Sequence 11] received March 18, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

5828. A letter from the Acting Chief Acquisition Officer & Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2007-004, Common Security Configurations [FAC 2005-24; FAR Case 2007-004; Item VI; Docket 2008-0001; Sequence 5] (RIN: 9000-AK88) received March 18, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

5829. A letter from the Acting Chief Acquisition Officer & Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2005-027, FAR Part 30-CAS Administration [FAC 2005-24; FAR Case 2005-027; Item V; Docket 2006-0020; Sequence 9] (RIN: 9000-AK60) received March 18, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

5830. A letter from the Acting Chief Acquisition Officer & Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2006-028, New Designated Countries-Dominican Republic, Bulgaria, and Romania [FAC 2005-24; FAR Case 2006-028; Item IV; Docket 2008-0001; Sequence 4] (RIN: 9000-AK77) received March 18, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

5831. A letter from the Acting Chief Acquisition Officer & Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2007-016, Trade Agreements — New Thresholds [FAC 2005-24; FAR Case 2007-016; Item III; Docket 2008-0001; Sequence 3] (RIN: 9000-AK89) received March 18, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

5832. A letter from the Acting Chief Acquisition Officer & Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2006-016, Numbered Notes for Synopses [FAC 2005-24; FAR Case 2006-016; Item II; Docket 2008-0001; Sequence 2] (RIN: 9000-AK70) received March 18, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

5833. A letter from the Acting Chief Acquisition Officer & Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2005-011, Contractor Personnel in a Designated Operational Area or Supporting a Diplomatic or Consular Mission [FAC 2005-24; FAR Case 2005-011; Item I; Docket 2008-0001; Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AK42) received March 18, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

5834. A letter from the Acting Chief Acquisition Officer & Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-24; Introduction [Docket FAR-2007-0002, Sequence 10] received March 18, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

5835. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Expansion of the Alexander Valley Viticultural Area (2005R-501P) [T.D. TTB-65; Re: Notice No. 61] (RIN: 1513-AB23) received March 14, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5836. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 61.-Gross Income Defined 26 CFR 1.61-21: Taxation of fringe benefits. (Rev. Rul. 2008-14) received March 18, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5837. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Issuance of Opinion and Advisory Letters and Opening of the EGTRRA Determination

Letter Program for Pre-Approved Defined Contribution Plans [Announcement 2008-23] received March 18, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5838. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Abandonment of Stock or Other Securities [TD 9386] (RIN: 1545-BE80) received March 13, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5839. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 26 CFR 601.204: Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting. (Also, Part 1, 446, 461, 481; 1.446-1, 1.461-1, 1.461-4, 1.461-5, 1.481-1) (Rev. Proc. 2008-25) received March 13, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5840. A letter from the Acting Regulations Officer of Social Security, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Revised Medical Criteria for Evaluating Immune System Disorders [Docket No. SSA 2006-0070] (RIN: 0960-AF33) received March 18, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. SUTTON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1071. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4847) to reauthorize the United States Fire Administration, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-563). 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. AKIN (for himself and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 5677. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to prohibit the importation into the United States of plastinated human remains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 5678. A bill to provide economic stimulus through emergency community development block grant assistance for the redevelopment of abandoned and foreclosed homes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 5679. A bill to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to require mortgagees for mortgages in default to engage in reasonable loss mitigation activities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 5680. A bill to amend certain laws relating to Native Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 5681. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives to improve America's research competitiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 5682. A bill to improve access to broadband service in rural and underserved areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5683. A bill to make certain reforms with respect to the Government Accountability Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN (for herself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

H.R. 5684. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the basic educational assistance program administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mr. MELANCON):

H.R. 5685. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to reauthorize the temporary mortgage and rental payments program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SIREN, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 5686. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a survey to determine the level of compliance with national consensus standards and any barriers to achieving compliance with such standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. GILCHREST (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. REYES, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H. Con. Res. 321. Concurrent resolution expressing the need for a more comprehensive diplomatic initiative led by the United States, Iraq, and the international community; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas (for herself and Mr. MOORE of Kansas):

H. Res. 1072. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that Members post on their websites all earmark requests made to the Committee on Appropriations; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. MARCHANT):

H. Res. 1073. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the

Nation during Public Service Recognition Week, May 5 through 11, 2008; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN:

H. Res. 1074. A resolution honoring the 60th anniversary of the commencement of the carving of the Crazy Horse Memorial; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 303: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 402: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 406: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WEINER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. RENZI, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 552: Mr. PETRI, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. REYES, and Mr. TANCREDO.
- H.R. 621: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 715: Mr. HINOJOSA.
- H.R. 728: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
- H.R. 772: Ms. BALDWIN.
- H.R. 989: Mr. DUNCAN.
- H.R. 1050: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
- H.R. 1105: Mr. BOOZMAN.
- H.R. 1110: Ms. WATSON and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
- H.R. 1157: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
- H.R. 1222: Mr. BOOZMAN.
- H.R. 1223: Mr. BOOZMAN.
- H.R. 1264: Mr. BOOZMAN.
- H.R. 1343: Mr. CULBERSON and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
- H.R. 1363: Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
- H.R. 1474: Mr. HALL of Texas.
- H.R. 1497: Mr. KAGEN and Mr. ELLISON.
- H.R. 1524: Mr. FARR, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. KILDEE.
- H.R. 1527: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. LAHOOD.
- H.R. 1535: Mr. CARSON.
- H.R. 1553: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 1589: Mr. RAHALL.
- H.R. 1609: Mr. MITCHELL.
- H.R. 1619: Mr. HOLDEN.
- H.R. 1665: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. KUHL of New York.
- H.R. 1738: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
- H.R. 1742: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. CULBERSON.
- H.R. 1888: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
- H.R. 1919: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. FERGUSON.
- H.R. 1938: Mr. CHANDLER.
- H.R. 1984: Mr. WU.
- H.R. 1992: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
- H.R. 2052: Ms. SUTTON and Mr. HARE.
- H.R. 2054: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. KAGEN.
- H.R. 2063: Mr. PAYNE.
- H.R. 2092: Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 2106: Mr. KELLER.
- H.R. 2123: Mr. SESTAK.
- H.R. 2232: Mr. ELLISON.
- H.R. 2267: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
- H.R. 2514: Mr. ROSS.
- H.R. 2585: Mr. CUELLAR.
- H.R. 2634: Mrs. BIGGERT and Mr. BACA.
- H.R. 2686: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs.

GILLIBRAND, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. SPACE, and Mr. CARDOZA.

- H.R. 2694: Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
- H.R. 2702: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
- H.R. 2790: Mr. BOOZMAN.
- H.R. 2820: Mr. BURGESS.
- H.R. 2885: Mrs. BACHMANN.
- H.R. 2897: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. ALTMIRE.
- H.R. 2933: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
- H.R. 3089: Mr. POE, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
- H.R. 3175: Mr. KIRK.
- H.R. 3229: Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. LEE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CARSON, and Ms. RICHARDSON.
- H.R. 3232: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. LAHOOD.
- H.R. 3298: Mr. FOSTER.
- H.R. 3404: Mr. CUMMINGS.
- H.R. 3513: Mr. TOWNS.
- H.R. 3533: Mr. BERRY.
- H.R. 3543: Ms. WATERS, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. ELLISON.
- H.R. 3658: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 3660: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
- H.R. 3797: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 3829: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
- H.R. 3846: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
- H.R. 3852: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
- H.R. 3934: Mr. CULBERSON.
- H.R. 3979: Mr. HOLT.
- H.R. 3980: Mr. SIREN.
- H.R. 4000: Mr. SNYDER.
- H.R. 4044: Mr. MCINTYRE.
- H.R. 4061: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. CANNON.
- H.R. 4088: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. HULSHOF.
- H.R. 4093: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. ESHOO.
- H.R. 4105: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. ALTMIRE.
- H.R. 4107: Mr. MARSHALL.
- H.R. 4138: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. KIRK.
- H.R. 4139: Mr. ROSS.
- H.R. 4157: Mr. PICKERING and Mrs. SCHMIDT.
- H.R. 4337: Mr. FILNER and Mr. LOBIONDO.
- H.R. 4355: Mr. BERRY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. FARR, and Mr. ELLISON.
- H.R. 4464: Mr. COBLE, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mrs. CUBIN, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. MCHUGH.
- H.R. 4544: Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 4651: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 4900: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. HERGER.
- H.R. 4930: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
- H.R. 5087: Mr. SALI.
- H.R. 5131: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 5143: Mr. McNERNEY and Mr. KIND.
- H.R. 5157: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
- H.R. 5176: Mr. COSTELLO.
- H.R. 5179: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 5235: Mr. LATTI.
- H.R. 5266: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 5267: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
- H.R. 5443: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. BOOZMAN.
- H.R. 5445: Mr. BUYER, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. SALI.
- H.R. 5464: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
- H.R. 5465: Mr. EMANUEL.
- H.R. 5467: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. DONNELLY.

H.R. 5481: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 5488: Mr. FILNER and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 5490: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. Fortuño, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. AKIN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. GINGREY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 5507: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5515: Mr. BONNER and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 5519: Mr. WALSH of New York.

H.R. 5532: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 5534: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 5546: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 5552: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H.R. 5610: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 5613: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 5618: Mr. INSLEE and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 5635: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 5640: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 5641: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 5668: Ms. FOXX.

H. J. Res. 12: Mr. HELLER.

H. J. Res. 53: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. ELLISON.

H. Con. Res. 70: Mr. KAGEN and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H. Con. Res. 244: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H. Con. Res. 249: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Con. Res. 294: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GORDON, Ms. SHEA-POR-TER, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H. Con. Res. 295: Mr. CARTER.

H. Con. Res. 305: Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. NOR- TON, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 318: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H. Con. Res. 320: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H. Res. 76: Ms. RICHARDSON.

H. Res. 259: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H. Res. 711: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H. Res. 758: Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H. Res. 820: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H. Res. 838: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FILNER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.

H. Res. 896: Mr. WYNN and Mr. WATT.

H. Res. 977: Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Res. 981: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H. Res. 984: Mr. LAMPSON and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H. Res. 987: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CHAN- DLER, and Mr. BARROW.

H. Res. 1002: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SMITH of Wash- ington, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HODES, and Mr. WALZ of Min- nesota.

H. Res. 1008: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SALI, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H. Res. 1011: Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. LEE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H. Res. 1026: Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. ROSS, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BAR- ROW, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Ten- nessee, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SPACE, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. RAN- GEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WAT- SON, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. CARSON.

H. Res. 1028: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 1037: Mr. BILBRAY.

H. Res. 1044: Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 1063: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Res. 1064: Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 1070: Mr. GILCHREST and Ms. BORDALLO.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolu- tions as follows:

H.R. 1108: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 1983: Mrs. EMERSON.

H. Res. 865: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.