United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 2008 No. 79

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Hank Wilkins IV, St. James United Methodist Church, Pine Bluff, Arkansas, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God of love and mercy, God of power and God of might, today we pray the understanding to always seek Your wisdom and justice. It is through Your authority, righteously administered, that our leaders are enabled to govern this Nation with laws enacted for our betterment.

And so today we pray for Your spirit, that they might be properly guided by Your divine charity and an unassuming faithfulness.

Give both counsel and courage to the leaders of this great body and its Members, as well as other government leaders of these United States of America.

May they always seek Your purpose and the well-being of this great people. Grant now Your unfathomable protection, that they lead our country with the honesty of providence and the integrity of high ideals.

We ask all this through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND HANK WILKINS, IV

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSS. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize my dear friend, Rev. Dr. and State Senator Hank Wilkins IV, of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, who just delivered our opening prayer and is our guest chaplain of the day.

Rev. Dr. Wilkins' deep faith and dedication to his community and State is an inspiration to all of us who know him.

Throughout his 31 years in the ministry, Rev. Dr. Wilkins has emphasized the need for faith in our daily lives.

I'm proud to have had the distinct honor to serve with Hank in the Arkansas State legislature. As both senior pastor of St. James United Methodist Church and as an Arkansas State Senator, Reverend Wilkins puts the people he represents first and is a true ambassador for Arkansas.

It's been a blessing for me to know Hank and his wife, Phyllis, and their family, and I hope that this message of compassion, this prayer of compassion and respect for others will be one that we all strive to achieve.

As we go about doing the work of the people, let us remember the prayer Rev. Dr. State Senator Hank Wilkins delivered on the floor of the United States House of Representatives on this day.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. Today is the day of Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the roll of committees.

The Clerk called the committees.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PASS THE FARM BILL

(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, during the past year, I had the high honor of working with Republicans and Democrats alike in the House Agriculture Committee to bring forward a new reform-minded bill, one that would be great for the health of the American people and Wisconsin's agricultural economy.

I'm pleased to be able to say the farm bill has the overwhelming support of Members of Congress, the farming communities everywhere, and business leaders alike.

The new farm bill we intend to pass today will be good for our health and our economy, and as a physician, I'm pleased to say that it will begin to move our children's diets away from carbohydrates and more towards the healthier choices, including fruits and vegetables.

It will also reward work instead of wealth by dramatically reducing income caps for those qualifying for direct payments.

More importantly, this bill will determine what farmers plant, what they grow, and ultimately, what we eat and what we look like.

The new farm bill also rewards the use of cellulosic biofuels which will help ease the strain on rising food prices.

I urge all of my colleagues to support it in the strongest fashion.

Printed on recycled paper.

COUNTY PAYMENTS FOR HARNEY COUNTY

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, by refusing to renew the county payments program, Congress, this Congress, has broken its pledge to rural areas all across this country, such as Harney County, Oregon.

County payments account for 70 percent of the road budget in Harney County, in part because 78 percent of Harney County is Federal land. That's an area nearly the size of New Jersey.

Now, imagine if the tax revenue from 78 percent of the land in New Jersey suddenly dried up. It would be paralyzing, just as paralyzing as the loss of county payments is proving in the rural West.

Harney County Judge Steve Grasty said, ''It is now so bad that we've got fewer road crew employees than snow removal equipment. Our road department is now 50 percent of its historic staffing level.''

H.R. 3058 would give some relief to this problem and would help keep the roads open in Harney County and schools open across the West.

Yet the Democratic leadership in the House has held this bill hostage on the Union Calendar since January 15. Today is day 120 that this bill could have been brought to the floor and voted on. It is a bipartisan bill. The lead sponsor is my colleague from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Keep the commitment to these rural communities. Pass H.R. 3058.

HONORING ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in honor of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. As a member of the Congressional Asian American Pacific American Caucus, and as the only Member of Congress with any Filipino ancestry, I'm pleased to speak on the floor today in honor of this great month.

Since the early 1800s, the AAPI community has played a vital role in the development and growth of this country. I'd like to take just a moment to highlight one of the many contributions that the AAPI community has played in American history, and that is, the accomplishments of the Filipino American veterans during World War II.

Members of the Commonwealth of the Philippines' military fought tirelessly for the United States during World War II. The invaluable service that the members of the military helped provide us the necessary support to defeat the Japanese empire in the Pacific.

Last year, Congressman FILNER introduced, and I cosponsored, the Filipino Veterans Equity Act, which will ensure that the Filipino veterans who served in World War II will receive the veterans benefits promised to them over 60 years ago. We need to pass this bill as soon as possible.

□ 1015

SECOND LIFE

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, Second Life, it's not just a new job or a new start, it's a virtual world online with over 6 million people. Run by the San Francisco company Linden Lab, Second Life allows anyone in their world to do anything. And the labs make $1 million each night.

And what is offered in Second Life? My staff found rooms leading people to commit suicide, satanic worship, buying assault weapons, leading human sacrifice, and rape rooms; game players choose to rape or be raped. This content is totally inappropriate and leads to the objectification lessons that are especially inappropriate for young boys.

Linden Lab claims that it provides a teen area, but the fine print of their user agreement clearly states that adults prowl in the children's area and children are in the adult area.

Second Life's K Street lobbyists say, ''Trust us,'' but I think we should trust informed and aware parents. I urge Members to join me in a letter to the Federal Trade Commission worrying about the dangers of Second Life.

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

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

Mr. FARR. I'd like to welcome our guests in the gallery today because this week is the 25th anniversary of National Tourism Week.

As co-chair of the Congressional Tourism Caucus, along with my co-chair JON PORTER of Nevada and nearly 100 Members of Congress, we recognize the importance of the tourism industry to our national economy and to our local communities.

It is the fastest growing industry in the world. From mom and pop restaurants to local unique shops to local State and national parks to this Capitol, which is a tourist attraction, there is so much to experience in this great country.

The tourism industry also shows America's best face. Travelers experience warm, friendly and compassionate people that make up our country. This person-to-person contact between different cultures can help dissolve stereotypes and misconceptions. As Mark Twain once said, ''Travel is fatal to prejudice, bigotry and narrow-mindedness.''

So remember that while our economy grows, tourism plays a multibillion-dollar aspect of that, employing more than 7.5 million people. I hope you will join me in welcoming the representatives of the tourism industry that are here this week and celebrating National Tourism Week.

The world is a book, and those who do not travel read only one page.

HONORING OUR WORLD WAR II VETERANS

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to welcome to Washington, DC, a special group of World War II veterans from Georgia's Sixth District. These proud patriots are here for one remarkable day as part of the Honor Flight Program.

Thanks to the generosity of the Roswell Rotary Club, these men and women will have the opportunity to visit the stirring World War II memorial built in their honor and to pay their respect to fallen comrades at Arlington National Cemetery.

As young Americans, these proud patriots showed courage and compassion, answering the call to serve at a time of great need. Through amazing sacrifice, they are responsible for the preservation of our treasured American way of life. Our community is extremely proud to be home to so many of the brave veterans who fought for freedom at a critical moment in our history.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Georgia's Sixth District, I offer our deepest appreciation. And I know that my colleagues will join me in welcoming our veterans to our Nation's capital and thanking them, these soldiers of the greatest generation, for their invaluable service.

MATERNAL MORTALITY

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the fact that more than half a million women die in what is the most natural of processes and what should be one of the happiest, pregnancy and birth, is totally unacceptable and should call everyone in this world to action. But for simple and inexpensive medication, adequate trained providers, and because of poverty and poor sanitation, but mostly from the lack of an adequate global response to this tragedy, a mother somewhere dies every 60 seconds.

These same factors, in addition to lack of access and other social determinants of health, also cause maternal mortality rates among black women in

the United States to be three to four times higher than that of white women. Because of this, the United States ranks 41st in the world, with many poorer countries having lower mortality rates.

Reducing maternal mortality is the fifth Millennium Goal and we are so far from reaching it. Last year, Johnson & Johnson and the Government of Norway stepped up in a big way to help.

Just having celebrated Mother's Day, this is a good time for other companies and other countries, especially ours, to make sure we meet this goal and keep our, and all, mothers alive.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK AND NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, as we take time to recognize the contributions of more than 900,000 Federal, State and local law enforcement officials who serve this Nation and the more than 18,000 who have lost their lives over the years, I want to express my deep appreciation to the law enforcement officials who keep the residents of the First District of Ohio safe and secure.

Each day, police officers put their lives on the line to ensure that our laws are enforced and our communities are safe. Too often their critical work goes overlooked and underappreciated.

I would like to thank those who dedicate themselves each day, as well as honor those who have fallen in the line of duty, for their sacrifices and dedication to our families, our communities, and our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the efforts of law enforcement officials in their communities and nationwide by supporting National Police Week and National Peace Officers Memorial Day.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATERNAL HEALTH

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice in support for keeping women around the world alive by ensuring they have access to basic maternal health care services.

We are blessed to live in a country where women can access prenatal and obstetric care, but that's not the case everywhere. In fact, more than half a million women die every year of pregnancy-related causes, along with nearly 10 million newborns and infants. Most of these deaths are preventable and needless.

All women deserve the right to go through pregnancy and childbirth without fear of losing their life. Basic access to maternal health care is a human right that must no longer be ignored.

I want to thank Congresswoman CAPPS for sponsoring House Resolution 1022, which recognizes the need for quality health care for moms in the U.S. as well as around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to honor mothers by investing in the necessary health care to keep them healthy and alive.

COAL

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's industrial revolution was powered by coal, and with the current state of our energy market, coal should receive the attention it deserves. It is an important energy source for our country.

Coal is the United States' most abundant and efficient fuel source, and we hold over one-quarter of the world's coal reserves. The energy content of the Nation's coal reserves exceeds that of all the world's known oil reserves. In my home State of Ohio, we have reserves that will last for 250 years.

Coal provides more than half the electricity consumed by Americans. And work is currently being done in my district to develop coal gasification, which is a process that increases the efficiency of coal within a closed system.

The current Democratic leadership in Congress refuses to invest money into the coal gasification process, while China at the same time is investing $24 billion into the same technology.

We must embrace all forms of energy to keep our economy and products competitive with the rest of the world.

IMPROVING MATERNAL HEALTH

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend we celebrated Mother's Day. I was fortunate enough to celebrate with my children and grandchildren. Sadly, many women never get the chance to celebrate this day with their family.

Throughout the world, a woman dies every single minute in childbirth. I think most of our congressional colleagues would be shocked to learn that this problem isn't faced by women in developing nations alone. The United States ranks 41st in the world, lower than all other industrialized nations, when it comes to maternal mortality. Let us use this opportunity, while Mother's Day is fresh in our minds, to renew our commitment to improving maternal health both at home and abroad.

I thank the 117 of our colleagues in the House of Representatives for cosponsoring House Resolution 1022, a resolution underscoring our challenges and urging us all to support the goal of a safe and healthy childbirth for every mother and baby here in the United States and all around the world.

DOMESTIC FUEL PRODUCTION

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

Mr. PITTS. On April 24, 2006, while campaigning to become Speaker of the House, the Democrat leader said, ''Democrats have a commonsense plan to help bring down skyrocketing gas prices.''

On the day the Democrats took control of Congress in January of 2007, gas in my home State of Pennsylvania was averaging $2.37 a gallon. Today, it's averaging over $3.75 a gallon.

Many people have taken to calling this $1.38 increase the ''Pelosi premium.'' This Congress has yet to do anything substantive to help American families who are paying nearly $4 a gallon at the pump.

The Democrats in Congress have been voting against increasing domestic oil and natural gas production as well as domestic refining capacity for years. This is a matter of supply and demand. We have billions of barrels of oil in Alaska and in the deep waters off the Outer Continental Shelf right here in the United States. Yet, due mostly to the Democratic opposition, we have been unable to access these vast resources. We should take steps now to increase production.

IN HONOR OF ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate May as Asian Pacific American Heritage Month.

There are over 15 million Asian Americans living in the United States, from the early Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Filipino immigrants to recent Vietnamese, Laotian and Hmong communities. The United States has benefited many ways from the contributions of these diverse cultures.

Through the telling of the Asian Pacific American experience, we illuminate the quality of opportunity that makes our country the wonderful place it is. From community involvement to business entrepreneurship, many Americans of Asian descent came to this country with very little and have been able to achieve the American Dream.

Asian Americans have also played a critical role in protecting our freedoms. During World War II, the Federal Government chose to intern 120,000 Americans of Japanese descent, including my mother and father and their entire families. The country learned the importance of balancing civil liberties

with national security, and today, more than ever, we must be aware of the significance of this fine balance.

I am proud to honor the courageous Americans who fight against injustice and recognize the strength and vibrance of our country.

FARM BILL

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, today we're going to be talking about the farm bill. There will be many criticisms of the farm bill, but I proudly stand in support of this farm bill. Rural America is looking to us to make sure that there is a safety net for agriculture in this country.

Reforms were asked for by our Speaker and by people on both sides of the aisle. This farm bill increases funding to food banks when they're suffering—dire need right now—it increases funding by $1.2 billion.

The farm bill increases funding to conservation programs. These programs are very important to people around the Nation. And we know that farmers are the very best stewards of the land. It provides incentives for them when they implement innovative soil and water conservation programs.

The farm bill increases investment in alternative energy research. We know that one of the number one concerns of America right now is that we lessen our dependence on foreign oil. But I believe the most important thing about this farm bill is that it does provide Americans with a safe and reliable food supply.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3121. An act to restore the financial solvency of the national flood insurance program and to provide for such program to make available multiperil coverage for damage resulting from windstorms and floods, and for other purposes.

ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a proud associate member of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus chaired by a great leader, Congressman MIKE HONDA of California, I rise today to join my colleagues in celebrating Asian Pacific American Heritage Month.

Countless Asian Pacific Americans have contributed to our history, culture and economy. We could not be the Nation that we are today without the contributions of the Asian Pacific American community.

My home State of California has the largest and fastest growing Asian American population with 4.6 million people. I represent a wonderful and diverse mix of Asian Pacific Americans who are proud of their cultural heritage and who share a strong link to people in their home countries. We have many festivals that share music, food, dance, culture, art and customs with the entire Bay Area.

On behalf of my constituents, I also want to take this moment to express my great sadness for the recent tragedies that just occurred in Burma and China. My heart and prayers go out to the millions of people who have been affected by these natural disasters.

I especially want to extend my condolences to the families who have lost loved ones. The people of my district and I will do everything we can to help with the relief and recovery efforts during this tragic time.

□ 1030

MAJOR GENERAL CHARLES D. BARRETT

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

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and astounding contributions of Major General Charles D. Barrett, a resident of the 29th Congressional District of New York, who recently died.

Major General Barrett began his military career early in life, enrolling in the ROTC program while a student at Cornell University. He entered active duty in 1956 and served as a shop officer and company commander for 17 months with the Eighth Army in Korea.

During his four-plus decades of service to this country, he accumulated many honors, including the Distinguished Service Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal, and the Army Commendation Medal. These medals exemplify the service, sacrifice, and the courage of this hero and represent Major General Barrett as a man who put his country before himself, a man who answered the call when the Nation needed him most, and a man who represented the best that America had to offer.

Major General Barrett served his country with pride, with honor, and with bravery, and there is nothing more noble than a person who is willing to commit themselves to a cause as important as defending our country.

Today I honor Major General Charles Barrett and all the brave men and women who volunteer to fight for what is good and right about our country.

FUND SCIENCE, NOT WEAPONS OF WAR

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today or sometime this week, this House will vote on additional funds for the wars in the Middle East, Iraq and Afghanistan. I wish there was an opportunity for me to vote for funds to support our troops in Afghanistan, who are making an effort in defeating the Taliban and seeking out Osama bin Laden, the perpetrators of 9/11. However, the bills are drawn together; so I will vote ''no.''

And I feel at this time we know the war in Iraq is going in the wrong direction, but I also know that there are catastrophic illnesses and diseases on mankind and womenkind in our world, and a great country should use its resources for the best purposes, not weapons of war but use our science and our intelligence to find ways to conquer disease.

I had polio when I was a child, and if we had put more money into helping Jonas Salk, maybe I would not have had polio. It was months after Salk's vaccine was introduced.

I lost a friend to cancer last week, Thomas Boggs. There will be a time when people lose friends to cancer that could have been cured if we had put more money into research earlier. Diabetes, Parkinson's, heart disease. In Memphis we have St. Jude Children's Hospital looking for cures to illnesses and diseases.

A great country should do great things. I encourage us to not fund war but to fund science.

ISRAEL'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, it was 60 years ago today that nothing short of a miracle occurred. A nation arose in a day seemingly in fulfillment of the words of the Prophet Isaiah. That nation is the State of Israel.

In 70 A.D., Rome sacked Jerusalem, and the diaspora of the Jews occurred. History teaches that when a people are five generations removed from their homeland, the nation ceases. Yet after 2,000 years, Israel was reborn and today has reclaimed its language, people, and has once again become a land flowing with milk and honey.

May God bless Israel. Happy 60th birthday to the State of Israel and many, many more.

RECOGNIZING ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, as Chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I rise today to recognize

Asian Pacific American Heritage Month, the month of May.

As we celebrate the contributions and achievements of our community, I also want to pay special attention to the 250,000 Filipino World War II veterans President Roosevelt called into military service on July 26, 1941.

Of the 22,000 surviving Filipino veterans, I want to highlight Faustino ''Peping'' Baclig. Peping was one of the 75,000 Filipino and U.S. soldiers subjected to the 90-mile Bataan Death March. He survived the Japanese atrocities and fought side by side with the Americans only to have his service as a U.S. national and a veteran denied by the 1946 Rescission Act passed by Congress.

We now have a unique opportunity to undo the injustice of that act and give them recognition of a grateful Nation that their service to our country is just as equal as the soldiers with whom they stood shoulder to shoulder on the field of battle.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Filipino Veterans Equity Act.

ISRAEL'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my heartfelt congratulations to the State of Israel on the occasion of its 60th anniversary. Since its declaration of independence, Israel has stood as a strong ally and friend of the United States. This friendship stems from the commonalities that led to our respective foundings and our shared hopes for the future of the global community.

In forging a new nation, Israel established a home for people that were targeted for extermination and ostracism in other lands. From an arduous beginning, Israel's rise has come to mirror our own. Hailing from more than 100 countries on five continents, Israel's population exudes a diversity of culture and ideas. Israel has flourished through the development of a diverse and technologically advanced economy and has come to exemplify the best of what a democracy can be.

Our countries have stood by one another in peace and in war. And we will continue to stand together in fighting terrorism and threats from stateless actors and rogue nations.

I congratulate and celebrate with Israel and am proud to be part of the continued friendship between our countries.

THE FARM BILL

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I didn't plan to take any time today, but we will be debating the farm bill later today, and the rule that has come to the floor does not allow anyone to claim time in opposition to the bill; so those of us who are opposed to this $300 billion piece of legislation cannot even stand up and oppose the bill unless we get time, if they are generous enough to give it to us, from those who support the bill. Now, if I were wanting to hide what's in this bill, that's what I would do too.

This legislation allows multimillionaires to still collect farm subsidies. Under this legislation you can still make $2.5 million as a couple in farm and nonfarm income and still collect subsidies. I would have a closed rule or a highly structured rule as well if I had this in a bill and wanted to hide it.

This bill needs to be rejected today. I hope we will all vote against the farm bill.

HONORING ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Asian Pacific Heritage Month in which our Nation pays a special tribute to the contributions of some 15 million of our fellow Americans who are of Asian Pacific descent, I want to honor in particular the thousands of our Asian Pacific Americans who serve in the Armed Forces of our Nation. In particular, Mr. Speaker, the sacrifices of some 10,000 nisei or Japanese American soldiers who fought for our Nation in the field of battle during World War II.

It was a time in our Nation's history when there was so much hatred, bigotry, and racism placed against Japanese Americans; yet despite all this, leaving their parents, their brothers and sisters, their wives behind barbed-wired fences in these concentration camps that were established, the White House accepted the request of over 10,000 Japanese Americans who volunteered to join the Army. As a result, two combat units were organized, the 100th Battalion and the 442nd Infantry Combat Group.

Mr. Speaker, the military records of the 100th Battalion and the 442nd Infantry are without equal. A 314 percent casualty rate, receiving over 18,000 individual declarations, most of them posthumously: some 20 Congressional Medals of Honor, 33 Distinguished Service Crosses, 560 Silver Stars, 9,480 Purple Hearts. That's quite a record, Mr. Speaker.

President Truman was so moved by their bravery in the field of battle as well as the contributions and the courage of the African American soldiers who fought during World War II that President Truman issued an executive order to finally desegregate all branches of the armed services.

MATERNAL MORTALITY

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

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enthusiastically support House Resolution 1022, a resolution recognizing maternal health as a basic human right of all women. How appropriate it is to stand here a week after Mother's Day in support of this commonsense initiative.

One in eight women in Afghanistan die due to complications resulting from pregnancy in childbirth. One in eight. And it's the same story in many countries around the world.

But, unfortunately, this is not just a Third World problem. Although the United States is a leader in medical technology and innovation, it has one of the worst rankings for maternal mortality in all the industrialized nations. We come in at a dismal 41st place, which means that a mother and her baby have a greater chance of survival in Kuwait or Croatia than they do in the United States.

In a relatively wealthy country, pregnancy should not be a death sentence. There are inexpensive and effective solutions that can significantly reduce the rates of maternal mortality, and I look forward to working with the Women's Caucus.

CELEBRATING BOTH MOTHER'S DAY AND ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I feel very fortunate today to be able to celebrate both Mother's Day as well as the Asian Pacific American Heritage Month.

My mother-in-law was born on Molokai, has Filipino Hawaiian and Chinese ancestry and has 14 brothers and sisters spread from Hawaii to the Philippines. And she helped instill in my daughters the heritage and the values of family, hard work, and indomitable spirit. And I feel blessed to have those particular values from the Asian American community instilled in my children.

This is a great country. To have that kind of heritage and that kind of ancestry in my family now is what makes this country so great. So I get to celebrate Mother's Day and I get to celebrate Asian Pacific American Heritage Month.

IN SUPPORT OF ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month, and some of the things I

want to talk about are personal and some are of a public policy nature.

I never cease to admire the courage of my parents in bringing our family to this country, to a new country, a new language, a new culture. And interestingly enough, I have never been really able to say that to them in person across the kitchen table, and it's easier for me to say it right here on the House floor.

There are other lessons that are important, and one of them has been referred to earlier, the internment of the Japanese Americans during World War II. It is not an old, cold, dead issue. We passed the Military Commissions Act just before the 2006 elections. It substantially restricted habeas corpus for all Americans. And just as we apologize to Japanese Americans for the internment during World War II, someday we'll be apologizing for actions taken under the Military Commissions Act.

So some of the lessons learned from the Asian Pacific American experience are positive ones, and others are cautionary ones that we should continue to remember.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2419, FOOD, CONSERVATION, AND ENERGY ACT OF 2008

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1189 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1189

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2419) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report without intervening motion except (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and (2) one motion to recommit.

□ 1045

UNFUNDED MANDATE POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 1189 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the conference report which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden to identify the specific language in the resolution on which the point of order is predicated. Such a point of order shall be disposed of by the question of consideration.

The gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA), each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

After that debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration, to wit: ''Will the House now consider the resolution?''

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I raise this point of order realizing that it is a bit of a stretch. The reason that we have this point of order in law is to guard against unfunded mandates being levied on the States. In this case, there are a lot of unfunded mandates being heaped upon taxpayers. I realize, as I said, this is a stretch. But I have to do this today because the rule that is before us does not allow anybody opposed to the bill to claim time in opposition to the bill.

Now how is it that a bill of this import, a bill that will spend over the next 10 years about $300 billion, is not important enough to allow those who are opposed to the bill to claim time in opposition to it? Instead, the structured rule before us today allows time to be split between the majority and the minority. Now those who will be controlling that time are people who are in support of the bill. How is it that we can discuss a bill this large, this important, that spends this much money, and that heaps this kind of burden on the taxpayer, yet again, without having a real discussion?

When we have a bill before the House, we have time called ''general debate.'' In this case, general debate is between those in the majority who support the bill and those in the minority who support the bill. Now how is that debate? Why is it that the Rules Committee can't see fit to actually allow people who are opposed to the bill to claim time in opposition to it?

With that, I would love to hear an explanation from the Rules Committee why we have a structured rule that does this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This point of order is about whether or not to consider the rule and ultimately the underlying conference report. In my opinion, it is simply an effort to try to kill this bill without any debate, without an up-or-down vote on the conference report itself. It is nothing more than procedural roadblocks, something the other side has been using a fair amount recently. I don't believe it will work.

The gentleman has talked about the fact that he is not able to speak in opposition. The gentleman had an hour's worth of debate the other day on a motion to recommit. It is also my understanding that the chairman is working with the opposition to allow them time to discuss the bill within the rules that were set up.

This conference report is far too important, Mr. Speaker, to be blocked by a parliamentary tactic. We have worked on this bill for nearly 2 years and have accomplished what many of us thought was an impossible feat by bringing it to the floor.

Make no mistake about it. The Republican obstruction will ensure that a farm bill will not pass during this Congress. So despite whatever roadblocks the other side tries to use to stop this bill, we will stand up for America's hardworking farmers, for the hungry and for the millions of other Americans who will benefit from this farm bill.

We must consider this rule, and we must pass this important conference report without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding I have the right to close. But in the end, I will urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' to consider this rule.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Again, I realize this bill has been in discussion for a couple of years. And I will come to that a little later as we talk about why earmarks had to be airdropped into the bill at the last minute. If we have been discussing this bill for 2 years, then couldn't we actually discuss these earmarks that were to be added to the bill instead of airdropping them into the conference report when nobody in the House or nobody in the Senate had even seen them? So it is hardly a defense to say that we have been discussing this for 2 years, nor is it a reason to deny those who are opposed to the bill an opportunity to actually claim time in opposition.

Let me read from the House rules. If the floor manager for the majority and the floor manager for the minority both support the conference report or a motion, one-third of the time for debate thereon shall be allotted to a Member, Delegate or Resident Commissioner who opposes the conference report or motion on demand of that Member, Delegate or Resident Commissioner.

We waived that. And we are not doing it. And let me tell you why I think that is the case. Now if I were supporting this bill, and I had been touting this bill as some big reform to our farm programs, I would flat be plumb embarrassed to bring this bill to the floor in its current form. I would be embarrassed.

What has got most of the attention, the problem that we all note, that everybody across the country realizes, is how in the world can we have a situation where multimillionaire farmers are collecting subsidies courtesy of the taxpayer?

And the real effort in here, what the President wanted, what others wanted, and what many of us here in the House argued for, was to put a cap on how much income you can have and still receive subsidies. The President suggested $200,000 adjusted gross income.

Remember, adjusted gross income is your income minus expenses. All of us here collect a salary of about $169,000. By the time we deduct things for mortgage interest, medical expenses and charitable contribution, it brings that down by at least one-third, maybe even one-half. Under this legislation, a farm couple can have farm income and nonfarm income totaling $2.5 million and still receive direct payments under this legislation.

Now, if I were bringing a bill to the floor and had touted this bill as reforming, man, I would want to hide that as well. I would not want somebody to be able to stand up and say, how is it that a multimillionaire farm couple can still collect subsidies from the taxpayers? So I commend the Rules Committee and those who are in support of the bill for actually putting a rule together that minimizes opposition that can be raised and that the only way people can stand up and oppose and be guaranteed time in opposition is to use a maneuver like raising a point of order against the bill.

I should mention there are other problems with this and other reasons why this rule should not go forward. We are waiving PAYGO rules. Now one thing the majority said when they came into power is we will not waive PAYGO. We are going to live by PAYGO. When we give money out, we have to make sure that that many money is in the Treasury or we won't do it.

This waives PAYGO because there is simply no way you can be in compliance with PAYGO and pass a $300 billion farm bill. And in this case, the writers of the legislation did something very creative. They actually went baseline shopping. What PAYGO says is that you have to take the current baseline, the most current baseline of spending, and total up your spending in the bill based on that current baseline.

Instead, what the authors of this legislation did was said, oh, let's go to last year's baseline because we spent less money then and it means we can spend more money in this legislation. Baseline shopping. It is as if I were to say, I don't want to pay so much in taxes this year. So I am going to use last year's wages that I was paid, and I am going to report that instead. Now if I did that, I would be thrown in jail. But we are allowed to do this here. We are allowed to say, we will take whatever baseline we want as long as it allows us to spend more money in the legislation. And then when the bill comes to the floor, we will just waive the rule that required us to be honest in terms of bringing legislation that complies with PAYGO.

I would love an explanation from the Rules Committee as to why PAYGO was waived in this regard.

And I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to respond to my friend from Arizona with regard to the PAYGO issue, even though that is going to be addressed in the rule and not in this motion that he has brought forward now.

I didn't raise a point of order in your motion so you can have plenty of time to speak.

Let me tell you also that the chairman and the ranking member have, in my understanding, provided 10 minutes to both the Republic and Democratic opposition to this bill out of their time today. So we will be complying with the rules of the House. It is my understanding there will be 20 minutes in opposition.

With regard to PAYGO, the Senate and the House have adopted different rules. In the 1990s when the House and Senate had statutory PAYGO, both Chambers had the same rules with regard to PAYGO. The House rules talk about one issue with PAYGO. The Senate rules with another.

In this rule, we have tried to reconcile, we started this bill and actually passed it in a conference report, or we passed it out in chief from the Agriculture Committee to this floor and to a conference committee in 2007. That work was not completed in 2007, and thus we have this bill on the floor today.

There are many reasons why this bill didn't get finished in 2007. But because we have different rules in the House and Senate, we have decided that in order to make this bill work and achieve a conference report that we can bring to this floor that we will be discussing this further as we discussed the rule. But we have dealt with that in the rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. May I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 3 minutes. The gentleman from California has 6½ minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. I will gladly yield to my colleague from California on the Rules Committee for a question.

Did we waive the PAYGO rules in this rule?

Mr. CARDOZA. We have accommodated the Senate PAYGO rules as we have moved forward. And it is my opinion that this is a technical situation because we started this bill and passed this bill off the floor in 2007.

Mr. FLAKE. Reading from the House rules after the beginning of a new calendar year——

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order.

I believe we are supposed to be talking about the unfunded mandates in this bill. If the gentleman would like to talk about the PAYGO rules, we should talk about this when we bring up the rule which that is germane to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman should confine his remarks to the question of order.

Mr. FLAKE. I can well understand why the other side does not want to talk about PAYGO and why I should confine this debate to unfunded mandates because PAYGO was, in fact, waived here. PAYGO was waived. And were it not waived, it would be subject to a point of order, the same point of order that the gentleman is lodging against this debate right now. So I can understand that. And I guess we will have to go with the flow.

There is another point of order that will be raised shortly with regard to the waiver of the earmark rules that we have in place as well.

So let me get back. This is an unfunded mandate on the taxpayers, of course. According to the Environmental Working Group, the Federal Government handed out $13.4 billion in farm subsidies to 1.4 million recipients, $11.2 billion of which related to various commodity support programs, programs that the underlying bill simply does not change.

The taxpayers have a huge unfunded mandate here that we are going to be paying off for a very, very long time.

With that I will gladly yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank my friend and colleague for yielding me a little bit of time to speak on his motion.

There is one, I think, serious concern that many of us who have been advocating reform under the commodity title, the so-called commodity subsidy programs, and that is what was done with the two subsidy programs now where funding currently isn't going out. And the reason it is not going out under the loan deficiency program and the counter cyclical program is because market prices are high.

□ 1100

That's a good thing, because farm income is good, debt to asset ratio has never been better in farm country.

But what this bill proposes to do, instead of holding those programs constant, they are actually increasing the loan rate under the loan deficiency program and the target price under the countercyclical program, which means that if things do turn south in farm country, if prices do drop—and we know how cyclical agriculture can be, and these are safety net programs—those programs will trigger much sooner and at a much greater expense than what I fear is being accounted for right now in this bill.

That, I think, speaks to the unfunded mandate concern that the gentleman from Arizona and myself, and others included, have in regards to the so-called reforms that we are just not seeing under the commodity title, not when they go in the opposite direction with the LDP and the countercyclical programs by dialing up the loan rate and the target prices of those two programs and triggering them at a much earlier time and at a much greater expense for the taxpayers of this country.

There is a whole lot of other reform that we felt were justifiable and reasonable under the commodity title.

Quite frankly, we don't get there. In fact, if you look at the payment limitation caps that exist under the direct payments, it would only affect two-tenths of 1 percent of farmers in this country, hardly the type of reform we would like to see.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that we will deal in the debate on the bill chiefly with regard to what the level of reforms is.

I would just like to tell my colleagues and my friends from both Arizona and Wisconsin that there are, in fact, significant reforms. In fact, if you take the ratio when this bill was first brought up in 2002, you have a situation where the nutrition part of this bill, versus commodities, was by a ratio of 2–1, $2 for nutrition for every dollar of commodity payments.

In this particular act that we are going to be bringing to the floor later today, it is my understanding, and my work with regard to the reforms, that there have been so many reforms put into this bill that the nutrition title versus the commodity payments is actually a 5–1 ratio at this point. I would say that indicates, as just one of many indicators, that you will see as we conduct this debate the significant reform that has happened in this bill.

I believe this is good work. I am very proud to be a part of bringing this bill to the floor. I believe it complies with the House Rules, and, I, again, want to urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this motion to consider, so that we can pass this important piece of legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and ask for an ''aye'' vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 1189 under clause 9 of rule XXI, because the resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against the conference report and its consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona makes a point of order that the resolution violates clause 9(b) of rule XXI.

Under clause 9(b) of rule XXI, the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from California each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

Following the debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as follows: ''Will the House now consider the resolution?''

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, this second point of order, and I will be calling for a vote on this one, is raised because of earmarks that have been airdropped into the legislation.

As the gentleman mentioned, this is not a new bill. This is not something that just popped up last week and that there was a need to add $1 million for the National Sheep and Goat Industry Improvement Center, but that was something that had to come up at midnight and be dropped in when nobody had seen it in either the House or the Senate.

This bill has been under consideration for a long, long time, and yet, still, we have earmarks that have been airdropped into the legislation, a number of them. Now, the gentleman may say in defense, we have listed the earmarks that have been airdropped in.

It is true that some have been listed. If all of them were listed, why would we waive all points of order against the bill? If the majority was confident enough that all earmarks have been listed, then we wouldn't have waived the points of order against it. I will speak specifically about a few of these earmarks.

But let me just mention some of them that are in the bill. There is authorization language for a National Products Research Laboratory. Again, this was airdropped in at the last minute when it hadn't been in the House version of the bill, hadn't been in the Senate, it was airdropped into the conference report. There is authorization language for a Policy Research Center, authorization language for Housing Assistance Council.

Now, what that has to do with the farm bill, I am not sure, and the problem is, we will never know until the bill was passed because it was airdropped in at the last minute.

That's the problem that the majority party correctly identified when they took control of this body, that we have a problem with earmarks, and they are being dropped in at the last minute without notice.

That's why decent rules were actually put in place to try to curb this abuse. The problem is, in this rule, we are waiving those rules. We are waiving those rules so the old practice can continue on just like it always has.

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

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

As my colleague knows, this point of order is about whether or not to consider this rule and the underlying conference report for the farm bill. This point of order today is just another effort, in my opinion, by the other side of the aisle to block this critical legislation that we have worked on for nearly 2 years.

They don't want to debate, and they don't want to vote on this conference report. They simply want to obstruct through a parliamentary tactic.

I want to make it very clear that the farm bill fully complies with the earmark disclosure rules contained in clause 9 of rule XXI. I would suggest to those raising the point of order that they look in the statement of managers, and they will see a list of the earmarks. If they can't find that list, we will be happy to provide it for them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' and to consider this important rule.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I find it ironic that we are being accused on this side of trying to stifle debate on the bill, that we don't want debate on the bill when I am here to argue against a rule that waives these points of order and a rule that also does not allow opposition to claim time.

Now, the majority will say, well, we will yield you time now. Now that we have been caught on this, we will yield you some time. That's not the same as controlling time.

When I control time, I can yield time to my colleagues. If I am yielded time, I can't do that. I don't control time in opposition.

Our House Rules say that if both the majority and the minority are in favor of the bill for the leadership, that somebody opposed to the bill has a right to claim time in opposition.

That was not done here. With a bill this important, you wonder why that has happened.

Back to the earmarks, the gentleman mentioned that there is a list of earmarks that was listed, it's right here, a number of them. Now why in the world we had to have more than a dozen earmarks airdropped into a bill that has been under consideration for the past 2 years, I simply don't know.

But when you read some of them, you kind of wonder why, like I said, Housing Assistance Council, Sun Grant Insular Pacific Sub-Center, Desert Terminal Lakes, Nevada. This is all we know about them.

If you dig into them, you might find something untoward, you might not, but the fact is we don't have time to do that. That's why we have earmark rules that give us time to actually vet them. Those rules are being waived here, and we should not be doing that.

Let me mention also, the gentleman said they are all listed. They aren't. There is quite a controversial earmark in this legislation that does not show up on the list. It's a $250 million tax refund to the Plum Tree Timber Company. Now, this is an earmark that allows the Nature Conservancy to purchase that from the Plum Tree Timber Company.

Now, the Plum Tree Timber Company, as I understand, is not mentioned in the legislation, it is simply described. It would be like saying I am going to give a subsidy to the gentleman who stands 6-feet tall, weighs 175 pounds, has blue eyes and his middle name is John, but we won't say the rest of it.

That's exactly what we are doing here. In an effort to get around the scrutiny that might come if somebody actually said now why is a subsidy actually going to the Plum Tree Timber Company.

It is no wonder that the rules have been waived here. If I had something like this in this bill, I would waive the rules too, because I wouldn't want anybody to talk about it. I would also not want anybody who is opposed to the bill to claim time in opposition to it.

If I were sponsoring this legislation that I said reformed the farm subsidy program to make sure that multi-millionaire farmers don't continue to get subsidies on behalf of the taxpayer, I would hide it as well. I would do exactly what the Rules Committee has done here and the supporters of the legislation have done.

Because under this legislation, a farm couple earning as much as $2.5 million in adjusted gross income, that's your income after expenses are taken out, can still receive direct payments under this legislation.

Also, the other subsidy programs, rather than reform or to get rid of the loopholes that were allowing people to get extra subsidies, we simply waive the limits there. This is called reform?

I mean, is it any wonder that the rules have been waived and debate has been stifled here on this critical legislation?

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the committee, who I believe has done a fabulous job in bringing this bill to the floor, COLLIN PETERSON of Minnesota.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen the entire list that's being talked about here, but a couple of the things that have been mentioned are not earmarks, and I don't know why the gentleman continues to characterize them as such.

First of all, this is not an earmark, it does not define Plum Creek. What it says is that these bonds can be used for any habitat conservation plans that protect native fish or any forest land covered by these habitat conservation plans.

We know of at least seven habitat conservation plans that would qualify under this provision. So, therefore, it's not an earmark. The Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan in King County, Washington, the Plum Creek Timber plan, which is also in Washington, the Washington Department of Natural Resources Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan in Washington, the West Fork Timber plan in Washington, the Plum Creek Native Fish Habitat Conservation Plan in Montana and Idaho, Green Diamond and Pacific Lumber, both in California.

So this is not an earmark, because any of these would qualify. There are probably more that we don't know about. Now, this was in the Senate bill, so I don't know what you are talking about airdropped.

A couple of the others that I heard you mention were also in the Senate bill, and there is another one that you characterize as an earmark, which is not an earmark, and that's the salmon recovery disaster plan which was a plan that was actually first passed in the 2006 Congress by the Republican majority, was implemented in 2006. Fifty million dollars at that time was put out to the people that were in the commercial fishing industry, primarily off the coast of California.

At that time there was a partial shutdown of the salmon season. Now, this year, we have a complete shutdown of the salmon season all along the coast from California to Oregon to Washington State. So it's much broader, and it not only shut down the commercial fishing, it shut down the recreational fishing in those areas.

What we are doing is replenishing this disaster fund with money that is exactly similar to what was done, what was in the statute and it was actually disbursed in 2006, because the disaster is much bigger this year than it was in 2006 because we had a partial shutdown. Now we have an entire shutdown of three States.

So this is clearly not an earmark, this is in the disaster title of the farm bill that goes along with the other disaster provisions that are in the farm bill. You know, I don't know, I guess because apparently some people think that being against earmarks is popular and, whatever, they try to make this into an issue.

But a number of the provisions that were raised by the gentleman are clearly not earmarks. The House bill that passed out of here had no earmarks.

We had to deal with the other body, and we took some provisions from the other body, because that's how a conference works. You know, there is a lot worse stuff that was in that bill that we took out. I just want to clear the record that a number of things being talked about here are not earmarks, and I would encourage my colleagues not to support this point of order.

□ 1115

Mr. FLAKE. The gentleman mentioned the National Marine Fishery Service earmark. It was added at the last minute. It may have been in a 2006 bill, but it wasn't in this bill until it was air dropped into the conference report. Now $170 million, that may well be a disaster there, but why in the world, if it is a disaster, why isn't it covered?

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I would.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. The House bill didn't have a paid-for disaster provision in it, the Senate bill did. And so when we molded these together, we put these disaster provisions in, and we paid for them, the first time that we actually paid for a disaster with pay-as-you-go money, and we included the California disaster in the process and paid for it.

This is not a new program. As I said, it is not an earmark, and it was brought in because we were dealing with a disaster. This is clearly a disaster. Any place that you have a complete shutdown of a commercial fishery, they are going to be in asking for help from the Federal Government. That is appropriate. This was brought in, the permanent disaster program from the Senate, and funded when we molded them together.

Mr. FLAKE. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for the clarification. I still would point out we have a $3.8 billion permanent disaster title added to the bill; and still, in addition to that, we are funding these kinds of programs directly and specifically.

The gentleman can argue that it is not an earmark. I think that a casual or a tortured reading of this would both say this is an earmark when you are naming a specific entity to receive a specific amount of money and when it wasn't in the House bill, that is an earmark. So there is a good reason for this point of order.

The gentleman said, and let me go back to the PAYGO issue. The gentleman mentioned that this rule he thinks is in compliance with PAYGO. Let me read what this conference report says and see if anybody can decipher this.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman raised a point of order with regard to earmarks, not with regard to the issue of PAYGO. That will be discussed in the rule itself. It will be germane to that later discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman may confine his remarks to the question of order.

Mr. FLAKE. If I might respond, the gentleman, after he raised his last point of order went on to talk about the reforms in the bill which clearly didn't have anything to do with the unfunded mandates language that I had raised or that I had talked about or that he had raised a point of order for. Clearly, I understand that they don't want to talk about this. I understand that. That's why the rules are waived. But to stand now and to raise a point of order against my point of order because I am not addressing specifically the question that they want to address or that they would rather dispose of is, I think, a little spurious.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes and the gentleman from Arizona has 1 minute.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman says we talked about other issues in the last point of order, I was trying to be gracious with regard to the time and the discussion and allow the gentleman to speak. I raised an issue on the point of order on PAYGO because we are going to discuss that in the rules discussion, in the discussion of the rule.

I would just remind the gentleman that in the time he has taken on these

two points of order, he will probably have discussed this bill more than any other Member on the floor, even after we agreed to give him 20 minutes of debate on this topic. So I think that the gentleman thus protests too greatly, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the other side. You notice the words used, that we have graciously agreed to give them. Under the rules, the House rules, those who are opposed to the bill are required to be given the chance to claim time in opposition, not to be at the whims and graciousness of those who support the legislation. That's why we have rules, and that's why in this case the rules have been waived.

I understand completely if I had waived the PAYGO rules, when so many on that side of the aisle, bless their hearts, have been diligent sometimes on raising the issue of PAYGO and saying we shouldn't violate it, if I had violated PAYGO and waived it like this, I would want to waive every rule as well and stifle all the debate I could because it is embarrassing, frankly.

I don't have time to yield.

I would just say in my remaining 15 seconds, we have a bill that deserves a lot more debate than it is getting. This is important legislation. We are waiving PAYGO rules, and let me just say what this rule says: Therefore, while there is a technical violation of clause 10 of rule XXI, the conference report complies with the rule. It says there is a technical violation, but we have complied. It simply doesn't make sense.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that this conference report fully complies with the earmark rule. In my opinion, it fully complies with the spirit of PAYGO.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield to the chairman who would like to respond on that question as well.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman, and I wasn't going to prolong this, but just like I had to take issue with saying earmarks were there that aren't there, I take very much issue with your saying we are waiving PAYGO. We are not waiving PAYGO. We are not waiving PAYGO in this bill. We are meeting PAYGO requirements based on the 2007 baseline which is what we started the bill under. This is what the rules are in the Senate.

Let me explain my point first, and then I will be happy to yield.

So the Senate has a rule that says under whatever baseline you start off with, that you continue under that baseline with the bill until a new budget resolution is passed by both the House and the Senate. For whatever reason, the House has a different rule when we adopted that, and it says once you file the Budget Committee report in the House, not when it is passed, if a new baseline comes along, you are supposed to use that. But clearly, we cannot write a bill of this magnitude and this scope having two different baselines. We can't have one baseline in the Senate and another baseline in the House. That is number one.

Number two, the common practice around this place has always been to follow this rule, that we always use the baseline that we started off with. That is what we have done for years. So all we are doing is complying with what the Senate rule is because we have to do that and it makes sense. We are not trying to waive anything. We are not trying to get around anything. This bill, it meets PAYGO requirements and it meets it under the 2007 baseline which is what we started the bill under. And we are not waiving PAYGO.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I would just like to make this point. This rule provides for waivers of other rules. Last night when we were up in the Rules Committee——

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I control the time under the remainder of my motion, and I believe the gentleman is discussing the rule.

I don't yield, and if the gentleman from Washington would just suspend for a moment, I just would like to say that I do not yield because we are talking about a whole different topic here. I would like to make sure that we consider the point of order that has been raised directly by the gentleman from Arizona and not make this a wide-ranging debate with regard to the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each side receive an additional 2 minutes so we may discuss this issue.

Mr. CARDOZA. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on consideration on this point of order, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 189, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

YEAS—228

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

NAYS—189

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
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
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg

Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
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)
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Bonner
Bono Mack
Carney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cummings
Gerlach
Hinojosa
Lewis (KY)
Mack
Myrick
Rush
Sali
Sullivan
Weller

□ 1151

Messrs. HELLER of Nevada, CULBERSON, ADERHOLT, McHENRY, DOGGETT and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) is recognized.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Clause 10 of rule XXI, the so-called pay-as-you-go point of order says that it is not in order to consider a bill if it increases the deficit if applied today over a period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 and the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018. The effect on the deficit is determined by the Budget Committee relative to the most recent baseline supplied by the Congressional Budget Office ''used in considering a concurrent resolution on the budget.''

Mr. Speaker, according to the Congressional Budget Office relative to its March 2008 baseline, the Farm Bill will increase the deficit by $2.9 billion over the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018. But if using last year's outdated 2007 baseline, CBO states that it would decrease the deficit by about $100 million over that same period, 2008 through 2017.

Mr. Speaker, under clause 10 of rule XXI, which baseline provided by CBO is the most recent and should therefore be used by the Budget Committee in order to determine pay-as-you-go compliance, the March 2007 baseline or the March 2008 baseline?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Whichever one is required under clause 10 should be the one used by the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

Does the rule not state that it is the most recent CBO baseline?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Whichever one is required under the alternate branches of clause 10 shall be the one used by the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, according to clause 10(a) of rule XXI, in advising the Chair, the Budget Committee must use ''the most recent baseline estimates supplied by the Congressional Budget Office . . . used in considering a concurrent resolution on the budget.''

Mr. Speaker, has Congress considered the concurrent resolution on the budget this year?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The answer is ''yes.'' The House has considered a concurrent resolution on the budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Isn't it true that the concurrent budget resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009 considered by the Budget Committee and considered and passed by the House uses the most recent baseline which is the March 2008 baseline?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not aware of which baseline is current.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The rule providing for the consideration of the conference report to accompany the Food Conservation and Energy Act of 2008 includes a waiver of all points of order against consideration.

Does that waiver include a waiver of clause 10 of rule XXI, the pay-as-you-go point of order, and in addition, to all points of order under the Congressional Budget Act? And does this mean that a Member of Congress may not raise a point of order against consideration of the bill even if it is in violation of the PAYGO rule, Budget Act points of order, or the concurrent resolution on the budget?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That calls for an advisory opinion. The pending resolution proposes to waive any point of order, so this is a matter for debate.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

Does this waiver of these points of order mean that the PAYGO rule and the Budget Act points of order are also waived and therefore, a Member may not raise a point of order against consideration of the bill on those grounds?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the pending resolution were adopted, then any point of order would be waived.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The Rules Committee report accompanying the rule provided for consideration of the conference report contains an explanation of waivers and states: ''While there is a technical violation of clause 10 of rule XXI, the PAYGO rule, the conference report complies with the rule.''

Mr. Speaker, my inquiry is this: Is it possible to be in violation of the PAYGO rule yet comply with the rule at the same time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may engage his colleagues in debate on the pending resolution on that point.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. We plan on doing that, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARDOZA. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1189.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1200

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1189 provides for consideration of H.R. 2419, the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, the continuation of the Farm, Nutrition and Bioenergy Act of 2007 which we passed off this floor in September of 2007.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, and it also provides one motion to recommit.

It should also be noted that despite the blanket waiver, the conference report does not violate clause 9 of rule XXI.

Furthermore, I want to point out that the conference report uses the CBO 2007 baseline, the year in which the bill passed both the House and the Senate, and under that baseline, CBO has determined that this conference report will not increase the deficit in either of the years 2008 through 2012 or in the years 2008 through 2017 scoring window.

Therefore, while there is a technical violation of clause 10 of rule XXI, this

conference report complies with the rule by remaining budget neutral with no net increase in direct spending. In other words, Mr. Speaker, this bill does not increase the deficit and it is PAYGO compliant.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of a subcommittee on the House Agriculture Committee, and as a member of the Rules Committee, I'm pleased to offer the Farm, Conservation, and Energy Act conference report for consideration today. This bipartisan conference report represents the blood, sweat and tears of many Members of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees, including myself. I would be remiss if I did not single out a few individuals at this time.

First, I must recognize Chairman COLLIN PETERSON, without whom this farm bill would have never been completed. His unwavering dedication to seeing this bill through to completion should be an example to us all, and I am indeed grateful for his commitment, especially in the face of tremendous adversity.

I also want to thank Ranking Member GOODLATTE, Leader HOYER, and certainly, not least, our Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI, for their steadfast commitment to creating a farm bill that we can all be proud of and to stand behind, and because of her leadership, there is, in fact, significant reform in this bill.

It is hard to believe, but we actually started this process nearly 2 years ago, starting with traveling to nearly every corner of this country to hear directly from farmers and ranchers from all walks of life about what they needed in a modern farm bill. We took these wide-ranging comments to heart and crafted a fiscally responsible, equitable and unparalleled farm bill.

I wish I could say that it was all a walk in the park. The House and the Senate passed their respective bills in 2007, and since January of this year, Members of the House and the Senate have been hammering out a compromise. There have been many battles, but in the end, this conference report is something I believe this House should be very proud of.

While people didn't get everything they wanted, the country got what it needed. That speaks volumes about the quality of this bill and tells me we ended up in exactly the right place.

The Farm, Conservation, and Energy Act builds upon the past successes of Federal farm policy by maintaining the farm bill's safety net, while at the same time providing for substantial increases in conservation, nutrition and energy.

However, I'm most proud of the $2.3 billion in new Federal investments for specialty crops, an industry that has been uniformly neglected in previous farm bills despite comprising nearly 50 percent of total farm gate value.

Furthermore, this farm bill contains unprecedented reforms to commodity programs by revising program eligibility and strengthening payment limitations.

Through major changes to the crop insurance program, we have also increased government efficiency and reduced the waste, fraud and abuse identified in the current farm programs.

More importantly, this bill is completely paid for. Through PAYGO, Democrats are fulfilling our promise to live within our means like every household in America is forced to do, and I believe the PAYGO rules, Mr. Speaker, made this a leaner, meaner and better bill, despite the complexities that the new rules presented at times.

We pledged to stop writing blank checks with reckless abandon and shouldering our country's needs on the backs of our children and grandchildren. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, this legislation adheres to the spirit of PAYGO, proving that it can be done.

Mr. Speaker, our farmers have the capacity for immeasurable innovation and success, and they deserve the Federal Government's commitment that's included in this bill by supporting this farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to telling my constituents of the 18th District of California that the United States Congress has accomplished what many thought was an impossible feat in coming to an agreement on a farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly and wholeheartedly urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of a final farm bill, a farm bill that is over 7 months late. It was supposed to be completed last September when the old farm bill law expired. It's long past time for Congress to be voting on a final farm bill, and the one the House will consider today is far from perfect.

It spends billions more than it was supposed to. Mr. Speaker, in fact, despite this being called the farm bill, nearly 75 percent of the spending in this bill doesn't even go to agriculture or farming. It goes to pay for government food assistance programs. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that. In fact, despite this being called a farm bill, nearly 75 percent of the spending in this bill doesn't even go to agriculture or farming. It goes to pay for government food assistance programs. To me, that is very concerning.

There's also considerable dissatisfaction with the income limitations being too high for farmers who may receive payments under this bill.

There are also concerns that while commodity prices in the marketplace have risen since the last farm bill, the guarantees in this farm bill have also gone up.

There are also special interest provisions that are unrelated to farming or food stamps that have been stuck on this bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I agree that this farm bill is very far from perfect, but like many of my colleagues in the House, I must measure this bill by the impact on my constituents in my district.

And as the representative of one of the most diverse and productive agricultural areas in this country, I will vote for the farm bill because it does more to support the specialty crops that are grown in my district than any other farm bill in history.

I must point out that the assistance provided for the specialty crops grown in my district are not direct subsidy payments or handouts. What matters most to farmers and growers in central Washington are research dollars and help in opening up new markets abroad. Specifically, I'm pleased that the farm bill includes a new initiative to fund research projects for these specialty crops.

The conference report also expands the successful fresh fruit and vegetable SNACK program to children in all 50 States. This worthwhile program provides fresh fruits and vegetables for schoolchildren.

The Market Access Program is also very important in central Washington and something that I've worked very hard on to support for many years. The Market Access Program, or MAP, assists our agriculture community in expanding access to markets overseas.

For far too long, American farm products have had difficulty getting into foreign countries, and sometimes are unfairly blocked outright. Fair market access and fair trade agreements help our farmers compete, and the MAP program has proven this to be very successful.

While I will vote to pass this farm bill, Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this unfair rule because it shuts down fair opportunities for debate and votes on the House floor and because, Mr. Speaker, it waives new anti-earmark and PAYGO rules written just last January, a year ago last January, by the Democrat majority.

And already today, Mr. Speaker, we have had a great deal of discussion on PAYGO and the ramifications. We heard it says it complies with the spirit of PAYGO and so forth.

Let me just make a point of what happened last night in the Rules Committee. In the Rules Committee, there is a provision in this rule that waives all points of order. We had discussion up there on PAYGO. So the ranking member of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER, offered an amendment to keep all the waivers, all the waivers in the farm bill with the exception of the

PAYGO provision that was adopted just a year ago last January by the new majority. That amendment simply said if there's no problem with PAYGO, then why not keep that provision in there. It was voted down, Mr. Speaker, on a direct party-line vote.

So it appears what has happened here in this instance—because I think the rules are very clear. I think Mr. RYAN from Wisconsin pointed out exactly where we are on this and what the procedures are. Apparently what we have done—and this to me I think is probably unprecedented—we have adopted Senate rules in the House for consideration of the farm bill. Maybe that's a pattern that we will see hopefully in other things that we'll debate, like, for example, maybe having more debate on issues because the Senate does have unlimited debate under their house rules. So, if we're going to start adopting Senate rules, maybe we ought to do that on the debate area.

Mr. Speaker, a conscious decision has been made to break the PAYGO rules to increase spending by several billions of dollars.

The farm bill, Mr. Speaker, is long overdue, and I'm disappointed that a bill that provides new levels of recognition to specialty crops, as I pointed out in my earlier remarks, from central Washington is coming before the House with so many other questionable provisions within the bill.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington complains that nearly 75 percent of this bill goes to a nutrition program. I would submit to the House that if Republican policies with regard to the economy weren't what they were we wouldn't have to be increasing the nutritional support for our citizens.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California for yielding me time.

I rise today in strong support of the rule we are considering on the conference report to H.R. 2419, the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act.

Mr. Speaker, this important conference agreement outlines the funding for our country's agriculture policy, its conservation approaches, and its nutrition programs. These initiatives touch each of us in some way. Whether we're from a rural area, suburban or urban area, the farm bill has impact on every single one of us.

As a farmer's daughter, I understand how the food we produce is truly the backbone of our country. I am proud of our Nation's commitment to a strong farm economy and a long-standing tradition of providing a safe and secure food supply, not only for our country but for the world.

That is why I support this bill. From the $10 billion increase in nutrition programs to the $7.7 billion increase in conservation funding, this legislation provides for our entire country. I've spoken to our producers, and this legislation gives them the safety net they need to continue producing the food supply our Nation relies upon. I am pleased with the balance and vision in this bill, and that is why I will strongly support it.

I'd like to thank Chairman PETERSON and Ranking Member GOODLATTE for all of their work on this bill. The chairman has shown exceptional leadership and patience through this process. This bill turns the page and helps start a new era of farm and nutrition policy.

I also want to thank Chairman PETERSON and the committee for their inclusion of provisions of the House-passed Regional Water Enhancement Program. By including the Sacramento River Watershed as a national priority in the conference report, my region will be able to preserve farmlands, as well as provide a comprehensive approach to ground and surface water.

Our initial focus should be on building a strong consensus on conservation and its value for our region. We have a truly unique opportunity to shape the vision for the watershed from the beginning. This will help ensure that we build upon solid, local input.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be standing here today in support of this well-crafted bill. I ask my colleagues to support the rule and the final passage of the farm bill conference report.

□ 1215

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the ranking member of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER of California.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. And I thank him for his very thoughtful statement, as always, in his management of the rule.

I want to begin by extending congratulations to all of those who have worked long and hard on this important conference report, Mr. CARDOZA, and I see Mr. HASTINGS here, I know are strong supporters of it. And I know that there is, in fact, some bipartisan support for this measure, but I will say that I personally am troubled with it and I am going to be voting ''no'' on the conference report when we get to that point for a number of reasons.

I do feel very strongly that as we look at the international food crisis that exists with over a billion people on the face of the Earth facing either malnutrition or out-and-out starvation, it seems to me that we need to take very strong and bold steps to address that. I don't think that dramatically expanding the food programs and feeding is the solution to the problem of a billion people who are facing malnutrition and starvation. I happen to think there are a number of very important factors that unfortunately this farm bill doesn't address.

First and foremost, it's key, as we look at the fact that developing nations in the world have failed to open up their markets so that they can get onto the first rung of the economic ladder, they are preventing us from having the opportunity to address that crisis of starvation and malnutrition. Similarly, we in the United States and the European Union have unfortunately provided two-thirds of the farm subsidies that exist in this world. And guess what? That creates a great distortion and further diminishes the opportunity for those developing nations to address this very important malnutrition and starvation crisis facing one billion human beings. And so I just don't believe in any way that this measure effectively addresses that.

And I think, again, as a number of people have said, if we were to see the European Union diminish its level of subsidization, then we would do that. I was very happy in the Rules Committee last night that for the first time our good friend from Minnesota, the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee, did indicate that he would ultimately support that. In the past he hasn't, as I know he has said publicly and in conversations that I've had with him privately on that.

But nevertheless, it's imperative for us to show leadership on the issue of dramatic taxpayer subsidization of the agriculture sector of our economy. It is just plain wrong. And I hope very much that my colleagues, based on that, if they sincerely want to address this starvation crisis facing a billion people, they will oppose this measure.

Now, there was an interesting debate, Mr. Speaker, that took place earlier on and has been going on. And Mr. HASTINGS made a very, very compelling argument. Now, this is all inside baseball. I know our colleagues understand it, and there are maybe some outside of this Chamber who are following this debate. And it looks like it's very arcane. I mean, we've got copies of the rules manual and we're looking at this whole question of PAYGO and 2007 versus 2008. Well, this comes down to a very simple and easily understood issue, and let me put it this way:

Yesterday we had a debate on whether or not we should, in fact, prevent 70,000 barrels a day of oil from going into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. And the idea behind that was, of course, if we do increase the supply of energy, prices might come down. Well, guess what? The people whom I represent in southern California would very much like to be able to pay maybe $2.50, $2.75 a gallon. And you know what? If you go to last year, they were able to pay significantly less than $4 a gallon for gasoline.

Well, how does that relate to the debate that we're having right here? Very simply. What is it that our colleagues in the majority are calling for? And that is, to use last year's numbers, to

use last year's numbers, not this year's numbers, in this debate. So that's what it comes down to, Mr. Speaker. It is just plain wrong. I would like to pay 2007 prices when I go to the pump and fill up, and unfortunately I can't. And you know what? This majority should recognize their responsibility in the exact same way.

Now, as Mr. HASTINGS said, last night in the Rules Committee I offered what I thought was a very thoughtful amendment to the rule. Everyone continued to say this is PAYGO-compliant, this complies with PAYGO. Well, in one single sentence in the report, Mr. Speaker, they, in fact, provide the most confusing explanation. It says, ''Therefore, while there is a technical violation of clause 10 of rule XXI, the conference report complies with the rule by remaining budget neutral with no net increase in direct spending.'' What does that mean? So it begins by saying there is a violation, and then it says there isn't. I mean, it is so confusing.

Now, the amendment that I offered said, okay, if the majority is, in fact, complying with the PAYGO requirements, what they should do is they should say that they don't need to protect the item, clause 10 of rule XXI, which very clearly states that they must be using this year's numbers. And so, Mr. Speaker, as you said in your ruling—or your predecessor in the Chair said, Mr. PASTOR, who was serving as acting Speaker at the time, we're having a debate on this. And it's obvious that it can be confusing. But I bring it right back to the issue of the desire that the people who we represent, that they would love to pay last year's gasoline prices, but it can't be done. And in the exact same way this is being mishandled. It is just wrong.

And so procedurally we're bringing up a bad conference report. And so I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule, which, also, is a lockdown rule, I should say, and very, very unfair in its treatment of the rights of the minority—not that anyone cares about that. But procedurally and institutionally I think that there should be some concern about the fact that it's a lockdown rule, and if it does pass, it will allow us to bring up what I think is a bill that has some good things in it, but on an overall basis will not deal with the very important challenges that we face.

So I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule and a ''no'' vote on the conference report.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from California. I would just like to reiterate that this bill and this rule fully complies with the Senate PAYGO rules and it is totally in keeping with the spirit of PAYGO by complying with the 2007 PAYGO baselines as my Republican colleague, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, said last night when he presented the rule to the committee as the Republican ranking member at that time, and his words were that this bill is fully PAYGO compliant.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, from my point of view the farm bill conference report is a mixed bag. There are many things in this farm bill that I don't like. I don't like what I consider to be an extravagant disaster assistance program. I don't like the minuscule cuts to direct payments, and I don't like the unnecessary subsidies. And I don't like the fact that this bill reduces the mandatory funding for the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition program by $756 million.

This is a program that is close to my heart, Mr. Speaker, a program that is proven to work. Named after George McGovern and Bob Dole, this program feeds hungry children around the world in a school setting. The only thing crueler than not feeding a hungry child is to feed that child for a while and then stop. And that's what has happened, unfortunately, in this process and it's flat wrong.

I would like to insert a recently published Washington Post Op-Ed written by both Senators McGovern and Dole into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the end of my statement.

Let me be clear, this is not the end of our fight for funds for McGovern-Dole. And I look forward to working with the appropriators and the authorizers to ensure that there is proper funding for this program in the upcoming appropriations bill. I believe it is a moral imperative.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the bill that I would have written. And, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that I could find enough reasons to justify a vote against this conference report. But when I look at the whole bill, I have concluded that a ''no'' vote is the wrong vote to take today. And let me explain why I will vote for this bill today.

Thanks to the leadership of Speaker PELOSI and Congresswoman DELAURO and Chairman PETERSON, this bill includes the most sweeping expansion in the domestic anti-hunger safety net ever. This bill will do more to fight hunger in America over the next 5 years than anything Congress has done in decades. Over $10 billion will go to improve the food stamp benefit, to provide fresh fruits and vegetables to children in schools around this country, and to invest in America's food banks.

Over 73 percent of the spending in this bill will fund the anti-hunger safety net. Damage that has been done over the years, the erosion of both the food stamp benefit and the emergency food assistance system, for example, is fixed in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the nutrition title of the farm bill is not perfect, but it is very, very good. I'm voting for this bill on the strength of these improvements, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

These enhancements will improve the lives of real people around the country, people who desperately need help putting food on their tables in this time of spiking energy costs and rising food prices. This bill will help more than 10 million people afford an adequate diet, including over 200,000 people in my home State of Massachusetts. Unfortunately, though, it will not end hunger in America, and it won't end hunger around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I believe strongly that hunger is a political condition. And I believe we can end hunger here at home and around the world if we find the political will to do so. But ending hunger will take leadership, leadership to stand up to the powerful special interests that don't care about ending hunger, leadership to stand up for the people whose interests aren't always represented here in the halls of Congress, leadership to simply do the right thing. And ending hunger is doing the right thing.

The face of hunger here in America is not one of sunken eyes and swollen bellies. No, the hungry in America are our neighbors, our children's classmates, and the seniors we see every day. Some serve in the military, and others take their kids to soccer and baseball practice all over this country.

The face of hunger is the face of too many in America, but that doesn't have to be the case any longer. This bill, the effort put forth by the anti-hunger community, that deserves such great credit, and by many Members of Congress is just a start. With a continued and dedicated effort, this can truly be the beginning of the end of hunger.

This bill is a solid down payment on our efforts to end the scourge of hunger in America once and for all, and for that reason alone it deserves our support.

[From the Washington Post, May 6, 2008]

A SLAP AT SCHOOLCHILDREN

(By George McGovern and Bob Dole)

How can the world's hungriest schoolchildren be denied meals while the farm bill being debated in a House-Senate conference provides millions in subsidies for wealthy farmers? That's what Congress proposes. In all fairness, it should not become law.

We are puzzled that Congress wants to increase overall farm bill spending by billions of dollars yet reduce by more than 90 percent the mandatory funding to feed hungry children. The program at issue saves lives and has a proven ability to break the cycle of poverty and hopelessness in poor countries.

We are not expressing disagreement because the program, supported by Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush, bears our names. We believe, simply put, that a costly humanitarian mistake would be made. Funding for the program would go from $840 million over five years to $60 million this coming year. After that, there would be no guarantee of funding at all. The $840 million in funding represents less than 1 percent of the proposed total spending in the farm bill. At a time when increasingly high food prices are pushing millions of families around the globe deeper into poverty, we must step up, not reduce, our efforts to feed hungry schoolchildren.

For just a few cents a day per child, the McGovern-Dole Program has made a critical

difference in the lives of children and communities worldwide, promoted American values in the most positive terms, and helped achieve U.S. foreign policy and national security goals. By providing meals to children who attend school in the poorest countries, the program increases attendance rates and student productivity and gives hope to a new generation of impoverished children around the world. The impact on young girls is particularly important. As their school attendance increases, they marry later and birth-rates are reduced.

During our careers in public service, we were honored to assist U.S. efforts to reduce hunger at home and abroad. Americans should be proud of the bipartisan progress our country has made. As a nation, we must not retreat from the compassion we've shown when the world's poorest children needed us most. We respectfully ask farm bill conferees to restore the $840 million in mandatory funding for the McGovern-Dole Program. Our nation must not turn its back on the world's poorest. On the contrary, we must demonstrate again that the United States will continue to be a nation of compassion.

As former senators, we both know how difficult it is to put together and pass sound farm legislation. We also know, as does every member of Congress, how important it is to help take care of the world's neediest and most vulnerable children. We believe that a vast majority of the proposed farm bill beneficiaries share our view. Americans care and will respond positively if this needed change is made.

George McGovern, a Democrat, was appointed a U.N. global ambassador on world hunger in 2001. Bob Dole, a Republican, is a former Senate majority leader.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased my friend from California said we are complying with Senate rules, but I believe this is the U.S. House of Representatives, and the fact is we have waived the House PAYGO rules.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule.

I find it fascinating that our Speaker, when she became our Speaker, said that we were going to have the most open democratic Congress in the history of America, and yet we have a rule coming to the floor that doesn't even allow dissenting voices to speak in general debate.

Our Speaker also at one time said the 110th Congress will commit itself to a higher standard, pay-as-you-go, no new deficit spending. But instead, we waive the PAYGO rule. And we baseline shop. I know that's inside baseball, but as the gentleman from California said, it's kind of like deciding you're going to pay last year's gasoline prices. Well, I wish we could do that.

And now we have the whole question of earmarks. Our Speaker at one time said that she would just as soon do without earmarks. Instead what we have are airdropped earmarks, secret earmarks coming in in a conference report that nobody can challenge, including one, apparently, according to press reports, that was requested by none other than the Speaker of the House.

And so for all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, this rule ought to be defeated. This is too important of legislation to come before us to be treated in such a frivolous manner.

Now, let's talk about the matter at hand, the actual substance of the bill. At a time when we're looking at some of the worst food inflation in the last two decades, what do we have coming before us, Mr. Speaker? A bill that will pay out billions of dollars of taxpayer subsidies to a select group of farmers. You know, it kind of begs the question, Mr. Speaker: Why do we have a farm subsidy program?

You know, I'm thinking about all the people who are going to have to pay these billions of dollars in taxes to subsidize a select group of farmers. You know, I think about the auto mechanic in Mesquite, Texas; I think about the guy working at the grocery store in Mineola, Texas; I think about the school teacher or the factory worker in Garland; where is their government subsidy program? Why are we bestowing billions of dollars in subsidies on this one select group?

□ 1230

This is a relic of the New Deal. We are paying out money to millionaires. We are teaching more people to be reliant upon government programs. Now, Mr. Speaker, we need a farm program. We just don't need a farm subsidy program.

Let me tell you what farmers in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas that I have the honor of representing need. They need some relief in their energy cost. The energy that it takes to run their tractors, their combines, their farm equipment, and the cost of diesel, they need some relief there.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HENSARLING. And yet there is absolutely nothing that our friends do on the other side of the aisle to produce any American energy, to get us any more independent, to have independent American energy.

Also, we benefit one set of farmers at the cost of another. This continues the ethanol mandates. It continues the tariff on imported ethanol. Now, if you've got a bunch of corn growers, it may be very good for them. I would say they're in high cotton, but I guess they're in high corn. But it's not too good for the cattle raisers, not too good for the poultry people. It's not too good for the hog farmers or the other livestock people who are all of a sudden seeing their feed prices almost triple. What are we doing for them?

Then let's talk about trade. Ninety-six percent of the world's consumers live outside of America, and yet this is an anti-trade Congress under Democrat leadership. You had the Colombian Trade Agreement totally one way. Farmers and ranchers want to export, and they're being disallowed the opportunity to do that.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. HENSARLING. So we need a farm bill that promotes trade, Mr. Speaker.

Next, we need death tax relief for our farmers and ranchers. Somebody in the Fifth Congressional District worked his whole life building a farm and told me, ''Congressman, after the government takes theirs, there's just not enough to go around.'' You shouldn't work your whole life building a family farm only to have Uncle Sam take 55 percent. We need income tax relief. That's what a farm bill needs to help the true agricultural producers. Not a subsidy program, an assistance program for those who work hard.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my good friend from California for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in vigorous support of this rule. I would like to thank Chairman PETERSON, Chairwoman DELAURO, Chairman RANGEL, and Mr. GOODLATTE, who I feel have crafted a sound bipartisan compromise bill for all of us to support, and they are to be complimented for their hard work during these fiscally challenging times.

The underlying legislation makes important reforms that benefit farmers across our Nation and assist many industries which are the economic engine of the congressional district that I'm privileged to serve. The bill before us today is an important achievement for the State of Florida and for the constituents that I serve.

As many of my colleagues know, I represent, along with my colleague from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY), the second largest sugar-producing district in the country. The Florida sugar industry has a $3.1 billion economic impact on the State of Florida, and I thank the committees for including the provisions that assist this important industry.

I also thank the committees for including the Pollinator Protection Act, which I authored and which was carried by Mr. CARDOZA, who is carrying this rule and working with me. This act authorizes funding to conduct research on colony collapse disorder to prevent the continuing decline of the pollinator population. People, if there ain't no bees, there ain't no food.

Finally, this bill addresses rising food prices here at home and overseas by substantially increasing funding for nutrition programs and food banks and promoting duty-free imports in the

Caribbean, thanks to Mr. RANGEL, and to Haiti, where citizens are forced now to eat mud cakes to survive.

Having worked as a boy in farms, I understand firsthand how food gets to the table. I am proud to say that this bill serves our farmers well.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we've detailed many of the problems with this rule, one of the worst aspects of which is that, as has been mentioned, it allows a bit of time travel here for the purpose of going back and choosing another baseline that allows you to actually comply with PAYGO rules. That should not be allowed under the rule, and that's why the PAYGO rules are actually waived in this bill. For all the talk on the other side about PAYGO compliance, if this bill was PAYGO compliant, the PAYGO rule would not have been waived.

The same goes with earmarks. More than a dozen earmarks were added, airdropped into the bill; yet we still have a waiver because we know there are likely other earmarks added in the bill as well. So we want to protect against that.

Also, I mentioned about the rule. It stifles debate. I don't know of another example where a conference report has come to the floor, particularly one of this magnitude, where those who are opposed to the bill have not been given the opportunity to claim time in opposition. Instead, we have to rely on the good graces of those who support the bill to actually be yielded time to actually speak in opposition to the bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we have a real problem in this country in terms of entitlements. We're going to have to reform Social Security and Medicare. Tell me how, tell me why anybody out there, outside of the beltway, should believe that we are capable of doing that kind of reform when we can't tell a farm couple making up to $2.5 million in adjusted gross income every year, that's income after expenses, if we can't tell them that the subsidy party is over? How are we ever going to reform entitlements? I asked that of my party; I ask that of the Democrats. How in the world can anybody take us seriously here if we can't have a farm bill that reforms the subsidy program?

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), a member of the Ways and Means Committee, without which we could not have done this bill.

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the pride I want to express is, as being a member of the Agriculture Committee, which I also serve on, a day like today makes me especially proud of that membership because what is before us is a collaborative product, the majority, the minority, arm in arm, working this through to build the best farm bill we possibly could. A bill that attends to the nutrition needs of our country; a bill that provides the safety net for family farmers; and a bill that safeguards the highest quality, most affordable food supply in the Western world. This collaborative effort would not have been possible but for the leadership of Chairman PETERSON, who, at every step of the way, wanted to be inclusive in his leadership style, having not just the majority but the minority fully involved in writing this bill.

I also salute BOB GOODLATTE, ranking member of the committee, because he could have walked away, could have said we're just going to do the partisan thing on this bill, but, no, instead played a very important role substantially improving the product of this bill, by virtue of BOB GOODLATTE's contribution and the contribution of the members of his caucus on the Ways and Means Committee.

Our farmers are putting into the ground the most expensive crop in the history of U.S. agriculture. I had a farmer tell me last week that running three tractors to get his crop in was running a $10,000-a-day fuel bill. They've got horrific exposure. They need the protection of this farm bill. Please adopt it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am at this time pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague in a little colloquy.

I understand you're going to offer a previous question on this rule?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentleman would yield, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can amend the rule, not replace the rule, amend the rule so that we can discuss energy prices and legislation to bring the price of gasoline at the pump down.

Mr. SHIMKUS. And I would assume a way in which we would do that would be to bring in more supply?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. It would be based on supply and demand. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I want to thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, one of the best things we can do for the family farmer in this economy is to lower energy costs. And that's why I'm coming to the floor because I am excited about my colleague's previous question to bring on more supply.

Now, I was pleased to see that my friends on the other side have accepted the supply debate, and we did that yesterday with great acclamation, saying that bringing in 70,000 barrels of crude oil onto the market would lower gasoline prices, your quote, not mine, between 5 cents to 25 cents.

Well, just imagine if we brought a million barrels of crude oil onto our market, a million barrels from U.S. territory. And I think that's what my colleague is going to bring in the previous question, because 1½ years ago, the price of a barrel of crude oil was $58. Today the price of a barrel of crude oil is $125.09. I'm telling you the public is starting to wake up. I'm hearing it from soccer moms. I'm hearing it from labor individuals. They understand that the cost of energy is too high. The price of diesel has doubled.

In an agricultural country, my farmers are trying to get their corn in. It's been really wet. And it's diesel fuel. Diesel fuel has doubled. We've got small local truckers going on strike because they can't afford to fill up the tractor-trailers because diesel costs are too high. Why are diesel costs too high? Because we won't open up any supply.

I think the previous question will be an opportunity to open up supply on U.S. soil, and maybe we will get a chance to talk about opening up supply on the Outer Continental Shelf.

You all agreed to it. Supply will lower prices, based upon our vote yesterday. But that was 70,000 barrels. Our challenge is to bring a million barrels, locally produced crude oil and natural gas. Because we can't sustain these high prices. We can't sustain them in the family farm.

And that's why I'm excited to be here today to continue to raise this debate on the price of a barrel of crude oil.

Another thing we could do is take our locally produced coal——

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I want to thank my colleague for yielding.

Because we want to highlight the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, a coastal plain the size of South Carolina, a drilling platform the size of Dulles Airport. We want to address the Outer Continental Shelf, both on the east coast and the western seaboard and the eastern gulf. We want to address coal-to-liquid technology, where we take coal underneath the soil or on our upper plain, build a refinery, U.S. jobs; operate a coal mine, U.S. jobs; build a pipeline, U.S. jobs; and lower the cost for jet fuel so that we can have U.S. jobs.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who absolutely has been an undying advocate on behalf of those who need it the most, those who are going hungry in our country.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding, and I thank him for his perseverance in this effort as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule and the underlying bill, historic change that will meet the nutritional needs of all Americans.

I want to thank the Speaker for her vision and clear priorities on this bill and Chairman PETERSON for his tireless leadership and perseverance. Thank you for welcoming my input on something so critical as the nutrition title.

Today, as the country faces rising food costs, food banks cannot handle the demand, and families struggle just to keep up. Today 35.5 million Americans live in households where not everyone has had enough food in the United States of America.

With this bill we are finally taking the right steps to provide people with a fighting chance, ending the erosion in food stamps by increasing the standard deduction and the minimum benefit, which has been frozen at $10 for the past 30 years, then indexing them to inflation. Commitments to help almost 11 million people, families with children, seniors, and people with disabilities.

Yet the current administration is looking for ways to undermine the legislation. The administration has argued against expanding eligibility by excluding retirement, education savings, and combat pay when determining that eligibility.

□ 1245

What does it say when our soldiers who fight so bravely for our Nation abroad are forced to scrape and scrounge for food upon their return?

And this bill does more. It increases funding for the Emergency Food Assistance Program, including an immediate infusion of $50 million to address supply shortages as more families than ever are relying on food banks, soup kitchens and food pantries for help. There is also a dramatic increase in funding for the fruits and vegetables snack program for our schools giving more children greater access to healthy fresh fruits and vegetables at school. And we are providing $84 million in funding for the McGovern-Dole program which helps reduce child hunger, promotes education and represents a powerful opportunity for our Nation to export goodwill around the world.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. For too long we have failed to meet our obligations as a Congress and as a Nation, failed to act while too many Americans have gone without adequate food, healthy food, and are facing hunger in our Nation today. Today, we can begin to do something about it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire again how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I will reserve my time to allow more equity in the time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I was remiss when I introduced my colleague, ALCEE HASTINGS from Florida, for his undying support and work with regard to specialty crops. He was joined in this effort by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY) who has been just a stalwart in helping me get the specialty crop title into this bill. And I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY).

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Thank you, Chairman CARDOZA.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking Chairman PETERSON and thanking Chairman CARDOZA for their tireless resolve to bring this historic legislation to a vote today. I also want to thank Commissioner Bronson and my good friends and colleagues, ALLEN BOYD and ADAM PUTNAM, for their work in delivering to the ranchers, farmers and growers of Florida the best farm bill in history.

This farm bill, in combination with the energy bill already signed into law, completes the foundation upon which Florida will build a biofuels industry that will power America's engines and make us more secure. It means more jobs for our State. It means our children will be able to stay in rural Florida and have jobs for the future. This farm bill, after more than 70 years, begins to give Florida's growers and farmers parity with commodity crops.

In Florida, we grow over 270 different varieties of specialty crops. I welcome this $1.3 billion investment in new programs that supports research, pest management, trade promotion and nutrition for the industry.

Finally, this bill makes an investment in our environment by making an additional $7.9 billion available for conservation programs. This bill brings farmers and environmentalists together to protect our land, our waters, and one of our Nation's greatest treasures, the Everglades.

As a Blue Dog Democrat, I am especially proud that we have been able to accomplish all of the above without having to raise taxes or go into debt. We don't have to mortgage the farm to pay for this farm bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, Chairman CARDOZA, for all of your work on behalf of the farmers and growers of Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Once again I will continue to reserve, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES).

Mr. HODES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the rule on the farm bill. Chairman PETERSON and Ranking Member GOODLATTE have worked hard to put together this bipartisan bill that helps working class families struggling with the soaring cost of food. On balance it is a good bill for nutrition and for the small farmers of the Northeast.

The bill will also help my home State of New Hampshire because it includes the Northern Border Regional Development Commission Act. I introduced this bill to help the struggling communities in the north country of New Hampshire and the region. The commission will help bring investment, leadership and focus to the north country's economic development efforts.

Thirty-six counties in four States that would become part of this commission have poverty levels above the national average, median household income that is more than $6,500 below the national average, persistent unemployment fed by constant layoffs in traditional manufacturing industries, and a significant out-migration and loss of younger workers.

The recent announcements of mill closures in Groveton, Gorham, Berlin and Littleton, New Hampshire, confirm a clear, persistent pattern of economic distress in this region and across the northern border.

The people of the north country need a new start and more resources to rebuild their communities for a new economy. The northern border commission, coupled with other efforts, will help revitalize the region and rebuild communities which need our help.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this rule. The people of New Hampshire's north country, and the northeast northern border region are counting on us.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I will continue to reserve, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SPACE).

Mr. SPACE. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding his time. I would like to thank our chairman, COLLIN PETERSON, and Ranking Member GOODLATTE for their hard work on this good, bipartisan piece of legislation that does a lot of good things.

It enhances conservation. It provides a safety net that our farmers need to do the work that is so important to this country. It does some very exciting things with energy. And in the end, it allows these small family farms that make up most of southern and eastern Ohio to meet their margins in a very difficult profession. But it does something more than that. It helps meet the growing needs associated with poverty; rising food prices, a diminishing manufacturing base, rising costs of living.

Seventy-five percent of this bill is devoted toward nutrition, being mindful of the fact that most of those who will be fed pursuant to the nutritional programs of this bill constitute the working poor. In my district many of the counties have poverty rates exceeding 20 percent and unemployment rates at 6 or 7 percent. This means that thousands of people in my district alone are working full-time but can't afford to feed their families. This bill will help mitigate that crisis.

This bill is good for farmers. It helps diminish the effects of poverty and fight the ever-growing fight against poverty in this country and will allow for the farmers of this country to continue to provide the safest, cheapest

and most abundant source of agriculture on the planet.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about the energy issue also. There are some good things in this bill for our farmers. I especially think the dairy provision was well done. Dairy is very important to Pennsylvania.

I was in the food business 26 years of my life. I know how people struggle with their family budgets. But let me tell you, the farmers are reeling with fertilizer costs. Why are fertilizer costs doubling and tripling year after year? And why is 50 percent of our fertilizer now being imported? Because of natural gas costs. Ninety percent of the cost of ammonia fertilizer is natural gas, clean, green natural gas. This Congress refuses to produce natural gas in this country. There has never been a gas well that polluted a beach. Look at this chart. Off-limits. Off-limits. Off-limits. There should be another one in the middle. There should be one up here in Alaska.

We have said that we are not going to produce fossil fuel. Natural gas is a fossil fuel. We are not going to produce oil.

Our farmers need relief. They need affordable energy to drive their tractors, to dry their grain after they harvest it, and to buy their fertilizer.

Folks, this country's economic future, not just farming, but our ability to manufacture, our ability to heat our homes this winter—right today, we are putting $11.50 natural gas in the ground for next winter's use. Last year at this time, it was $6.50 to $7. Do the math. That's a 40 to 50 percent increase in natural gas costs.

We have lost half of the fertilizer factories in America. That's why our farmers are now using foreign fertilizer. That's why it is costing them 300, 400 and 500 percent more than it did just several years ago. Folks, we have to produce energy in America if we are going to farm and have affordable food, if we are going to manufacture products and if we are going to have an economy that competes in the global economy.

We are not in a sole economy any more. We are in a global economy. We have to compete.

In America, we pay $125 for oil. Everybody does. But we have had the highest natural gas prices in the world for 8 years. And the margin is increasing because we refuse to produce energy for America. All of these other debates are going to be academic. We won't have factories. We won't have successful farmers. We'll be buying foreign fertilizer to grow products in this country. We'll be buying foreign tractors to produce our farms. We'll be driving foreign cars because we won't have a manufacturing base left.

Clean, green natural gas is the answer.

And we need to open up. And we need to drill for oil, too. There has never been a natural gas well that has harmed us economically and environmentally. Clean, green natural gas.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

The committee has taken this bill as far as they can. There are some modest reforms, as they nibbled around the edges. But the fact is, with the passage of this bill, most farmers will still get no help. Most conservation needs will be unmet. And we are going to continue to give money to people who don't need it, up to $2.5 million of farm and unrelated farm income and as over the last 12 years, 75 percent of the direct payments went to just 10 percent of the largest farmers. We don't need to that.

To add insult to injury, section 1619 will hide information under the Freedom of Information Act so the American public won't even know the facts. This is wrong. We can do better. We can stop giving assistance to the richest of farmers. We can redirect it to further strengthen nutrition and the environment.

I strongly urge a rejection of the rule and the bill. And if the President has the fortitude to veto it, I hope people will join us in bipartisan support to sustain the veto.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask how much time is remaining on either side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CARDOZA. At this time I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, despite a President that has been unwilling to negotiate in good faith, the Agriculture Committee, on both sides of the aisle, has produced a solid compromise. And for the first time, under Chairman COLLIN PETERSON's leadership, this House has provided authority for the agricultural interests of this country to lead America forward into a new energy age.

The committee also has provided $1 billion to secure specialty crop production in America for a change, to try to stunt foreign imports, while also providing critical increases for farmers markets to help empower local family farmers. And while there are some trade provisions that were airdropped into this bill, not by the Agriculture Committee that should have been considered in a different manner, the agriculture provisions of this bill are critical for transforming our economy into the 21st century.

In a world of increasing trade deficits and economic instability, the production of food, fiber, forestry and now fuel, are all critical for protecting America's economic independence, and her food security.

I want to congratulate Chairman PETERSON for his incredible leadership. He is the right man at the right place at the right time. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and on the base bill. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I reserve my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman without whose leadership on the bill we simply would not be bringing the bill to the floor today, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

□ 1300

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bill. This has been a long, drawn-out process. It has been a long time since last July when we first passed this bill out of the House.

I want to first of all commend my ranking member and good friend and colleague, Mr. GOODLATTE, for the tremendous work that he did on behalf of this bill and his caucus. As was said earlier, this bill is a much better bill because of the involvement of Mr. GOODLATTE and the great work that he did. I very much thank him for sticking with us here to the end.

We obviously would have preferred to have been here earlier, but this was a difficult bill to work out because of all the competing interests, and the fact that we started off with $58 billion less in baseline than we had back in the 2002 bill.

In order to make all the accommodations for the different folks that were interested in improvements in this bill, we had to find additional resources outside of the Agriculture Committee, which caused additional problems. We had to deal with a much different bill in the Senate, where you had a lot of powerful committee chairmen that brought issues into the bill that were not in the House bill.

We have worked through all of that, and we have produced a product here that I think it isn't perfect, but satisfies, in most cases, the different interests in this bill. We maintain a safety net for farmers along the lines of what we have had in the past.

I, personally, would like the safety net to be stronger than it is, but it's what can be accomplished at this point. We have $10 billion of new spending above the baseline in this bill, and that $10 billion is—I guess money is fungible, but the increase in this bill for nutrition is $10.3 billion. You could say that we have improved the nutrition funding to the amount of new money that's put in the bill. This is money going into the food shelves, food

banks that right now are empty and very much needed. There is a new fresh food and vegetable snack program for kids in low-income schools, and there is improvement in food stamps.

We have a good bill that has a lot of other components. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and support the underlying bill.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I realize how difficult it is to put a farm bill together in this place, but this truly represents a missed opportunity. The so-called reforms that are being advocated under the commodity subsidy title would only affect, at best, two-tenth's of 1 percent of farm entities throughout the country.

With an adjusted gross income limit of $2.5 million, these income limits don't even apply to the loan deficiency program or the countercyclical program, two of the three subsidy programs that exist today. At the end of the day we should produce a farm bill that's less market and less trade distorting and more responsible to the American taxpayer.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee, who, along with the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, their persistence was such to bring this product to the floor.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to say to all of my colleagues that this has been, as the chairman described, a very long and arduous process that began more than 2½ years ago by listening to farmers and ranchers and other people all across the country and holding a multitude of hearings there, and here in Washington as well. It began under my chairmanship. I have never seen anybody who has pursued the passage of legislation as tenaciously and with such dedication, but also listening to so many different people, as the chairman of the committee has done.

Mr. Speaker, as a result, this is not your father's farm bill, nor is it even the farm bill that passed out of this House last summer. This farm bill has more reform than any farm bill that the Congress has ever taken up. It imposes payment limitations on farmers and those who own land and have substantial nonfarm income alike and is well worth consideration in this body, and I urge its passage.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for a farm bill that is 7 months overdue, and I want to again commend Chairman PETERSON and Ranking Member GOODLATTE for their persistence in bringing this product to the floor.

But there is another concern for farmers in our country that this Democrat Congress is totally neglecting, and that's addressing skyrocketing gasoline, diesel and energy costs. The cost of running a tractor, trucking products to market, and running a farm has risen dramatically since Democrats took control of Congress, and they have done nothing to help farmers, truckers or millions of Americans hurt by rising fuel costs.

One of the principles of the farm bill is ensuring that America does not become dependent on foreign nations for our food supply. We, as a country, have fertile fields that can produce as much food as our country needs to eat and even export billions of dollars of foodstuffs overseas. But we, as a country, are not using our energy sources like farmers use our fields.

For decades, our country has been handicapped by not tapping into our existing oil reserves. The effort to develop just a tiny portion of ANWR has been fought and blocked to the detriment of America's energy independence and with high prices that we are now paying at the pump.

Today I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so this House can finally consider solutions to rising energy costs. By defeating the previous question, I will move to amend the rule, not rewrite it, just amend it, to allow for consideration of H.R. 5984, the Clean Energy Tax Stimulus Act of 2008, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, as well as ''any amendment which the proponent asserts, if enacted, would have the effect of lowering the national average price per gallon of regular unleaded gasoline and diesel fuel by increasing the domestic supply of oil by permitting the extraction of oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.''

With diesel and gasoline prices going up and American farmers having to cope with these skyrocketing costs, it's time for Congress to act. The Democrat majority has refused time and again to act. We can act by defeating the previous question.

Defeating the previous question will be simply to allow the House to debate rising energy prices. The farm bill will still be considered and voted upon.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do something about rising fuel costs, and the way to do that is by voting to defeat the previous question.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will note that the gentleman from California has 90 seconds remaining.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, this is a once-in-a-lifetime bill that will meet our country's needs. Every major group, commodities, specialty crops, nutrition groups, conservationists and others support this bill. A ''yes'' vote on this rule and the underlying bill is a vote for America's hungry, a vote for our environment, a vote for United States' energy independence, and a vote to deliver on our long-standing commitment to rural America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of our colleagues to support this rule and to support the underlying bill. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and on the previous question.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1189 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. That upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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. 5984) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the limited continuation of clean energy production incentives and incentives to improve energy efficiency in order to prevent a downturn in these sectors that would result from a lapse in the tax law. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall not exceed one hour equally divided and contolled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except any amendment which the proponent asserts, if enacted, would have the effect of lowering the national average price per gallon of regular unleaded gasoline and diesel fuel by increasing the domestic supply of oil by permitting the extraction of oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Such amendments shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for thirty minutes 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. 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.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 1189; motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 1134; and motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 1176.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 188, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—232

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

NAYS—188

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

NOT VOTING—13

Bono Mack
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Gerlach
Lewis (KY)
Mack
McDermott
Myrick
Rush
Schmidt
Stark
Weller

□ 1335

Messrs. LAMPSON and TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. INGLIS of South Carolina, SHAYS and JOHNSON of Illinois changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 310, I missed the vote because I was talking to military officers from the U.S. Army War College. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 193, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

YEAS—228

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

NAYS—193

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

NOT VOTING—12

Bono Mack
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Gerlach
Lewis (KY)
Mack
Myrick
Paul
Rush
Schmidt
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain on this vote.

□ 1345

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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.

MENTAL HEALTH MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1134.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1134.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin

Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
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
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
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)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Bono Mack
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Gerlach
Lewis (KY)
Mack
Myrick
Paul
Rush
Schmidt
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes are remaining on this vote.

□ 1353

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL TRAIN DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1176.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1176.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
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
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
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)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews
Bilbray
Bono Mack
Braley (IA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Hooley
Kagen
Lewis (KY)
Mack
Myrick
Paul
Rush
Schmidt
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes are remaining on this vote.

□ 1401

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING A MINORITY MEMBER TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1196

Resolved, That the following Member is, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committees:

(1) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Mr. Scalise; and,

(2) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Mr. Scalise.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5534

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 5534.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2419, FOOD, CONSERVATION, AND ENERGY ACT OF 2008

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2419) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1189, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 13, 2008, at page H3409.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1189, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it's been a long road to get to this point, and I want to start off by thanking Mr. GOODLATTE, the ranking member of the committee, again for his great work; my subcommittee chairmen, who started this process off; the ranking members on the Republican side; my friends on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL especially, Mr. POMEROY, for their hard work to get to this point; the Speaker for backing us up and helping us keep on track here to get to a final consideration; and for all of my colleagues in the House for being patient and working with us and giving us your input.

We have come to a point where I believe we have a good bill that should be supported by all Members of this Congress from both urban, suburban and rural areas.

I have here a chart that shows how the current farm bill spending is going to be allocated on a 10-year basis, which is what we have to go by.

Nutrition in this new Food, Conservation, and Energy Act is 74 percent of the spending over the next 10 years in this food bill, commodities are 16 percent. Back in 2002, these numbers were 65 and 35 or something. Conservation is 7 percent; and energy and the specialty crops, the other items, are 3 percent.

This shows on another chart how we got to those numbers. We had a $58 billion reduction in our baseline. What happened, before we started because the prices were up and the amount of money going out to farmers was down, so we started off $58 billion in the hole. We were provided $10 billion from our friends in the Ways and Means Committee of additional spending over the baseline, and this is how that spending was allocated out.

Nutrition was more than the $10 billion of new money that was put in the bill, $10.3 billion; conservation, an additional $4 billion; specialty crops, $2.3 billion; and in the commodity title, we actually had a reduction. In addition to the $58 billion that we reduced, we had another $3.6 billion that we took out of the commodity title to help put money into these other areas.

Having done that, we still have an adequate safety net for farmers. It's very much like the current law that we have been operating under. We have made some minor changes, and we have brought the AGI limits down from $2.5 million to $500,000 on non-farm income, $750,000 on farm income. So we've made some reform, not as much as some people would like, but more than others would like. We got both sides a little bit upset so I think we're doing something pretty close to what we should.

And to show you how the allocation is based on what the 2002 bill was and what the current bill is, this shows in yellow the 2002 bill and in the kind of purple color the current bill. In nutrition, you can see there's a substantial increase. Conservation, the commodity title is down, and energy is up a little bit.

So we have I think a balanced bill that maintains a safety net. It includes a new disaster program that is paid for. This bill is paid for. The $10 billion comes out of a custom user fee extension which is not a tax increase, which has allowed us to have a bipartisan bill.

We've put a bill together here that I think addresses what people are concerned about in this country. It has a loan guarantee program for cellulosic ethanol.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

It has a bioenergy reserve program to allow us to learn how to grow switch grass and how to harvest it and store it and move it; woody biomass so we can get cellulosic ethanol going.

We have for the first time significant money in for fruits and vegetables, which are 50 percent of the agriculture in the United States.

We have country-of-origin labeling. It's going to be mandatory on fruits and vegetables and meats starting September 30. We have interstate meat shipment, another issue that's been hanging on for 20 years.

We've solved a lot of problems in this bill. We have a bill I think that covers all the interests in the country, and we have a bill that we should all be proud to vote for in this House.

Again, I want to thank all my colleagues for their hard work and look forward to having a strong vote on this and encourage you all to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes of the time allocated to me be granted to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) so that he can manage that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of the farm bill conference report. I thank the chairman and all of the other members of the Agriculture Committee on both sides of the aisle for working in such a bipartisan spirit to produce good legislation. I also thank my staff and the majority staff for their hard and, I know to them, seemingly endless work on this legislation.

This farm bill contains solid reforms while addressing a variety of issues including forestry, rural development, renewable energy, nutrition, conservation, research, specialty crops, and livestock and still maintains the safety net necessary to ensure a safe, reliable and affordable domestic food supply. This farm bill is a good work product, and I am proud of the work we have done.

The bill contains more reforms than any previous farm bill, eliminating payments to millionaire farmers, eliminating the three-entity rule, and increasing the efficiency of the crop insurance program among numerous other reforms.

It's 100 percent PAYGO-compliant and is fiscally responsible, scoring $4

billion less than the House bill and $5 billion less than the Senate bill. I think you would be hard-pressed, Mr. Speaker, to find a conference report in the history of this body that came back scoring less than the House and Senate bills. That is a significant achievement, and I think it would be foolish to overlook the positive changes this farm bill has undergone.

When we talk about the farm bill, many believe that the Congress is voting on a $288 billion bill that goes directly to farmers. The truth is that only 17 percent of the farm bill spending is devoted to farm programs, while nearly 70 percent goes to the nutrition title alone. In fact, there is very little farm in a farm bill anymore.

In 2002, the farm program funding comprised just three-quarters of 1 percent of the Federal budget. Today, farm program funding accounts for just one-quarter of 1 percent of the Federal budget, a twofold reduction in just 5 years.

Agriculture policy is essential to the lives of every American, and it is important that the policy we formulate is responsible, effective and at a low cost to the taxpayer.

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

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

This bill meets those requirements. I support the farm bill because I believe American agriculture is vital to our national security, health and way of life, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it's planting season back home in Wisconsin. I still represent one of the largest agricultural producing districts in the entire Nation. Our farmers need a new farm bill. They need to know what the rules are that they have to work and live under.

But we need to do a farm bill the right way, not the wrong way, one that maintains an important safety net for family farmers across the country and is also responsible to the American taxpayer.

Unfortunately, I kind of feel like Paul Harvey here in the well today about to give the rest of the story. This farm bill could be summed up in simple words, it's a missed opportunity. In fact, it could be summarized by the phrase: Where's the beef? Where's the real reform?

Why do I say that? Let's take a look for a second at the so-called reforms under the commodity subsidy programs. By the time you include off-farm and on-farm income and allow double entities, dual entities on the same farm, and their adjusted gross income, you have adjusted gross income up to $2.5 million and you still qualify for taxpayer subsidies. That would constitute approximately two-tenths of 1 percent of farm entities throughout the country that might be affected by these so-called reforms under the direct payments.

Now let's remind ourselves, these direct payments are $25 billion, that go out over the next 5 years, regardless of price, regardless of production. It's not a safety net. It's an entitlement program that each and every one of us will have to go home and look our taxpayers in the eyes and try to explain to them why some of their tax dollars are going to go to a farm entity with an adjusted gross income of $2.5 million.

□ 1415

If you look at the loan deficiency program and the countercyclical, the two other subsidy programs that currently exist, we went in the wrong direction rather than the right direction with reform.

There will still be allowed double dipping under the loan deficiency program. And the loan rates are being increased rather than decreased. And under the countercyclical, the target prices are going to be increased. What does that mean? It means that they will be triggered much earlier and will cost the taxpayer much more if prices start to decline.

One of the reasons there is less funding under the commodity title is because we're at a record time of commodity prices throughout the country. In fact, since the last time the farm bill was on the floor last year for consideration, you look at the five major commodity titles, and they have gone up tremendously since that time: Wheat, an additional 126 percent; soybeans up 57 percent; corn up 45 percent; cotton, 32 percent; and rice, 31 percent. Those are the main subsidized crops that we have throughout the country. Yet, instead of going forward with some reasonable and imminently justifiable reform to tighten up these programs so it is more justifiable to the taxpayer, they're going in the opposite direction.

I always believed that we had the capability, in light of current market prices, to produce a farm bill that maintains an important safety net for our family farmers but in a way that's less market and less trade distorting and is also justifiable to the American taxpayer.

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

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

Unfortunately, this farm bill falls short on that worthwhile goal. And unfortunately it's the American taxpayer who is currently facing increased costs of food and fuel that will be paying more over the next 5 to 6 or 7 years by the time we get a chance to look at the next farm bill and talk about the reforms that may be needed.

I led an effort 5 years ago under the last farm bill for some commonsense reforms. People back then said wait for the next one, it's coming. Well, I've been here long enough to understand that tomorrow never comes, and today is the opportunity we have, in light of current market prices, to do the right thing.

I would encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the farm bill.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am going to recognize my good friend, Mr. RANGEL, but before I do I would like to recognize Mr. HALL for a colloquy.

Mr. HALL of New York. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for recognizing me in a colloquy regarding this bill, which I do support.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I would be happy to engage in a colloquy with my friend from New York.

Mr. HALL of New York. I thank the chairman for his prior support of a muck soils conservation program. Unfortunately, this House language did not survive in conference.

Existing programs like CREP do not address the needs of muck farmers, like the black dirt farmers in Orange County, New York. In the Hudson Valley, this has led to full retirement of soil and rent inflation.

The needs that would have been addressed in the House bill remain. Proposed administrative changes in future CREP contracts will not address impacts of contracts that are in place today and will be for several years. These are ongoing challenges for farmers in my district and throughout the northeast, growers of specialty crops and producers of muck crops who have been thrice underserved by previous farm bills.

Again, I thank the chairman and ask if he would be willing to continue working with USDA on solutions that will meet conservation goals and address unintended economic consequences of existing programs.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I thank the Congressman from New York for his remarks and his work on this issue.

These are, indeed, some serious concerns about the implementation of the New York CREP and its impact on the gentleman's muck farmers. It is my understanding that USDA and the State of New York have taken steps to ensure that any new enrollments will not have such negative impacts.

The conference report under consideration directs the Secretary to work with the producers in New York's muck soil areas to use existing programs to help implement farm bill conservation programs on acres still under production.

I look forward to continuing to work with the Congressman from New York on this issue in the future.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, without whose tremendous work we wouldn't be here today. So, Mr. RANGEL, we very much appreciate, on the Agriculture Committee, your effort, and you, Mr. POMEROY, as well, to help us get this bill to the final end.

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

Mr. RANGEL. I know that some of you may wonder why an old man like me from Harlem would have an interest in the ag bill, but when I hear my distinguished colleague from New York talk about muck farming, it's very important to us as a farm State that we be involved in those type of things. But the truth of the matter is that, while I recognize there are times to be quiet and to listen and look intelligent, I had Earl Pomeroy right there at my side asking, what are they talking about?

I've learned a lot about trust funds that I didn't even know existed—and some of you didn't know. But the truth of the matter is that, while I recognize that Mr. KIND was looking for a bill that, as a person that concerned themselves in agriculture, that at the end of the day we have to play the cards that have been given to us. And so I do know the good that has come out of this bill and the pride that I got as a Member of this Congress and seeing the work that Mr. PETERSON has been able to do, working with the Republicans on the other side, in all parts of the bill, in all parts of the leadership on the House and on the Senate side and with them. And I'm telling you, if all of us could have the optimism that he has displayed in the last few years about the salvation of our country, we would have no problems.

It was like a big jigsaw puzzle, and each time he told me we got the last piece there, and when he plugged it in, something even bigger dropped out. We buried this bill so many times, but I'm glad to see that, through the bipartisanship, the friendship, and the cooperation, we will be able to give this country and the world a product that we're proud of, a product that our farmers have worked on to be able to be the food basket not only of the world, with special provisions, but of the many people in our great country that are so in need of food. I'm proud to be a Member and proud to be a part of this.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I say this regretfully, but this bill is an absence of leadership. This bill shows that we're not leading, that America is not leading, that the new majority is not leading.

Why do I say that? The new majority brought this bill to the floor and they waived PAYGO. They swept PAYGO under the rug and they're violating PAYGO in two places in this bill alone. They'll say, we're trying to conform with the Senate PAYGO rules. Well, that does so at the very expense of the House PAYGO rules. What I find interesting is, right after this bill is passed they're bringing up the new budget resolution, which if that passed before this bill passed would violate the Senate PAYGO rules. How convenient.

The point is this: We're sweeping money under the rug; this bill is hiding $23 billion in extra costs, it's not even measuring the amount of payment increases and price increases that are in here. But where this is really a loss in leadership is, I don't think the American taxpayer, who is having a hard time making ends meet today, who is stretching their paycheck really far with high gas and food prices, likes the idea that we're going to give couples earning $2.5 million subsidies for growing agriculture. Why are we giving agriculture subsidies to multimillionaires? This does not reflect the values that the taxpayers sent us here to achieve.

More to the point, Mr. Speaker, this will hurt the family farmers. That's what a farm bill ought to be about, helping family farmers, not corporate farmers. But by doing it this way, we're making it harder to open up markets for our family farmers so they can sell their corn, their beans, their dairy, and all their other products in foreign markets. Ninety-seven percent of the world's consumers don't live in this country, they're in other countries. We should open those markets for their products.

This bill, with its huge subsidies, closes those markets, it hurts the Third World from being able to lift their life out of poverty, and it wastes taxpayer dollars. And all you have to do is look at the rule that passed that says, ''Waive PAYGO one more time. The rules don't apply. Let's hide all this extra spending.''

This, among many other reasons, is why people should vote against this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), a ranking member of one of our subcommittees.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a few brief observations about H.R. 2419, the farm bill.

Now, let me preface my comments by noting that this is a representative democracy. And while I may not always agree with the actions of this body, I am obligated to vote the will of my Oklahoma constituents.

My farmers and ranchers want a farm bill. They know how important it is to have a comprehensive Federal farm policy for both producers and consumers of American's food and fiber. They've watched as the majority leadership of this body ordered the cut of $300 million of direct farm commodity support. And soon they will figure out that a single—maybe earmark is not the proper phrase, a single project in this package will spend almost $250 million to subsidize the land purchased by a private entity.

They know that the committee had no new money to spend on production agriculture when we started to write this bill. And they will be amazed when they realize that the majority leadership of the House demanded and received $10 billion in new government nutrition programs.

They thrived under the flexibility of the last two farm bills. They understand that raising target prices and loan rates is a step back to the old days of Federal Government making planting decisions for them.

Mr. Speaker, it's not hard to read between the lines. The elected leaderships of my farm groups back home fear that this is the best that this body is capable of with this House leadership. And they are frightened of all the leading candidates for President.

I understand the fear my fellow farmers and ranchers in Oklahoma have for the future of agriculture, and at their request I will vote for this, as we would say back home in Oklahoma, ''half a loaf.'' But this process and this policy, I fear, aren't good for American food producers or American food consumers.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my vice chairman and the distinguished chairman of the Conservation, Credit, Energy, and Research Subcommittee, Mr. HOLDEN from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLDEN. I thank the chairman for yielding to me and I rise in support of the conference report. But I also rise to congratulate and commend our chairman and ranking member for a job well done.

This is a bipartisan product. This committee, we very seldom have partisan disagreements, but we have regional differences, and this bill reflects those regional differences. It also reflects that all of us had to give, all of us had to compromise. Every title of this bill is a compromise that all of us worked together so that we can accomplish.

In title I, we were able to maintain the safety net at the same time to have reform written into this law. Title II on conservation, an increase of $4 billion of investment in conservation programs.

Everyone is talking about the price of energy in this country, and for the first time in an ag bill we have a significant investment in energy. We have a loan guarantee program for cellulosic ethanol that's going to allow us to begin to wean ourselves off dependency on foreign energy.

And the nutrition title in this bill is over a $10 billion increase in investment in nutrition programs in the Department of Agriculture. This is a good bipartisan agreement, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I represent one of the largest agriculture districts in the Nation, western Wisconsin. We do a lot of corn, a lot of soybeans, a lot of beef cattle, obviously a lot of dairy. I've got a 200-acre farm myself, and we rotate corn and soybeans, have some beef cattle on it. One

of the additional concerns I have with the subsidy programs is how skewed it is to the very biggest entities.

Over two-thirds of these commodity subsidy programs are going to the 10 percent largest entities in agriculture today. Why is this a problem where I'm from? Well, a lot of these big entities are using the additional subsidy money to gobble up the family farms that exist around them. It's driving up land prices in Wisconsin and making it virtually impossible for new beginning farmers to enter agriculture.

If you look at the reforms that are being touted in this farm bill before us today, they just don't meet the test of time. The income limits that apply currently to direct payments, by the time you count dual incomes on the same farm go as high as 2.5 million in adjusted gross income. That's after expenses. That's after all the cost of doing business is deducted out. And according to last year's tax returns, for those who filed a Schedule F Farm Income Report for tax purposes, these reforms that are being touted today might affect two-tenths of 1 percent of farm entities throughout the country, two-tenths of 1 percent. Give me a break. And the income limits have been lifted for the other two subsidy programs, the loan deficiency program and the countercyclical program.

And to top it all off, they've created the granddaddy of all earmarks in this Permanent Disaster Fund, which we all know, based on past history, is going to be a very targeted, very regional dispersion of this new Disaster Relief Fund.

□ 1430

Now, when you think about the fact you've got three existing subsidy programs already, LDP, counter-cyclical, the direct payments, you throw on top of that the crop insurance subsidization that goes on in the farm bill, why do we need to add another layer of entitlement funding with this new disaster relief program? But we all understand how these farm bills come together. They usually go above baseline. They have to come to the Ways and Means Committee to find offsets in order to pay for it.

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

They come up with enough money to throw at enough groups, at enough individuals, at enough programs in order to buy people off around here. And it's the reform effort that's the first casualty in this entire process. We saw it 5 years ago. We're seeing it today. My fear is we're going to see it 6 or 7 years from now when the next farm bill is up for consideration.

It is a missed opportunity. The President is right. We ought not be giving taxpayer subsidies to wealthy individuals at a time of record-high commodity prices in the marketplace.

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

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the chairman of the Specialty Crops, Rural Development and Foreign Agriculture Subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) for 1 minute.

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

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a victory for farmers, a victory for communities, a victory for rural America.

As chairman of the Rural Development Subcommittee, I'm pleased that this conference report contains strong rural development title that supports small business, expands access to broadband, and addresses the critical infrastructure backlog at the USDA. I'm very excited that this conference report also authorizes regional development economic commissions across the country to put a Federal focus on jobs and economic development.

At a time when our economy is struggling, the authorization of the Southeast Crescent Authority, or called the Southern Regional Economic Commission in this bill, represents a great opportunity to help our rural communities thrive for generations to come. It will also help small business through the new Rural Entrepreneur and Microenterprise Assistance Program that will provide technical and financial assistance to businesses employing less than ten people, which are the fastest generators of new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we have an opportunity to move rural America forward and no longer leave it behind with business and economic opportunity, and that's what this farm bill does. And may Congress follow suit to do the same.

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

Mr. Speaker, sometimes here in Washington, we tend to drink our own bath water and believe our own press releases. And to hear some of the debate here, you would think this is the best bill in the world and that everybody out there has got to support it.

Let me just read a couple of editorials from around the country to give you an idea of how this bill is being played outside of Washington:

The Columbus Dispatch: ''The current compromise version of the farm bill includes little retreat from the subsidy program that for decades has bled taxpayers, fattened the already fat, distorted market incentives, soured U.S. trade, hurt the environment, and done little for family farmers.''

The San Francisco Chronicle: ''From the fiscal watchdog perspective, this bill is a sign that the new Democratic leadership is as profligate as the Republican leadership it replaced. Make that more profligate . . . The $286 billion farm bill is good politics only because the millions of taxpayers who are paying the bill are not pushing as hard as the relatively few who benefit.''

The Albany Times: ''Corn prices are up. Same for flour. That means farmers are enjoying boom times . . . So why would Congress even think of giving more generous subsidies?'' That's a good question.

The Spartanburg Herald-Journal: '' . . . The fact that reform has failed, and Congress is about to pass a renewal of the same failed, wasteful subsidies, is a testament to all that's wrong with politics in Washington . . . Congress has reached a House/Senate compromise bill that will continue to take money from you and other families struggling with high food prices to further enrich big corporate farmers who are already earning record prices for their crops.''

The Dallas Morning News: ''The legislators negotiating the new farm bill evidently don't do their own grocery shopping. Otherwise, they'd have seen the dramatic rise in food prices. And they'd have done more than trim only $400 million from the $26 billion in direct-payment subsidies they're planning for farmers . . .''

We can do a lot better than this. I want to associate myself with the comments of Mr. KIND from Wisconsin. Taxpayers expect more.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time it's my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), a ranking member on the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. HAYES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this farm bill and especially to thank Chairman PETERSON and Ranking Member GOODLATTE and really especially the incredible members of the House Republican and Democrat staff for their tremendous work on this very difficult legislation.

However, I must oppose a provision that should not be in this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation needs an agriculture policy for the 21st century. Anyone who is paying attention to their grocery bill lately can see that things are changing around the world and in this country. It's showing up in the price of food. If you're keeping up with the news, the changes we are seeing in higher prices are being played out as full-blown food shortages in other parts of the world. Sound agriculture policy is not just about our economy; it's a key component in our national security.

Mr. Speaker, we need this legislation, and I support the passage of the agriculture provisions. But there is a provision that was added late in the process that has nothing to do with agriculture, nothing to do with farmers or our food supply. It's a provision that will liberalize our current trade practices with Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the impact of this Haiti provision will be. Two of the leading textile groups say the impact will be minimal while the positive benefits of the farm bill will be

much greater. While I would reject this policy change under any procedure, this Haiti provision was added without hearings, without any debate. Mr. Speaker, out of principle I don't think this is the time or the place to add this trade provision with Haiti. And, therefore, to make that point, I am going to cast a ''no'' vote on the farm bill conference report today.

Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear. My vote today is to protest this Haiti provision, but my goal is to ensure passage of the farm bill. I know there's a veto threat from the White House. If the President decides to follow through, I will be there voting to override him because we need this update for our Nation's policy.

Mr. Speaker, after a very lengthy conference process, I am pleased to report significant victories in the ag portion of this bill. As the Ranking Member of Livestock, Dairy and Poultry, I worked with my colleagues to eliminate or water down many of the Livestock Competition issues that were included in the Senate passed Farm bill. Most importantly, we were able to defeat the inclusion of the ban on packer ownership. This ban would have been detrimental to North Carolina and the livestock industry across the nation.

The economic adjustment assistance program for textile mills is another significant provision included in this bill. This important provision will provide critical assistance to textile manufactures for the modernization of equipment and operations. This is a priority for our leading domestic textile organizations including the National Council of Textile Organizations, the Cotton Council and the American Manufacturing and Trade Action Coalition.

The White House or anyone else watching, should not read my ''no'' vote today as opposition to passage of the agriculture provisions in the Farm Bill. Our Nation needs updated agriculture policy. As a member of the Agriculture Committee and conferee to this bill, I had a hand in shaping these changes. We ultimately need to get this done, and I will be there to make sure it does.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to recognize the distinguished chairman of the Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry Subcommittee, who is responsible for having the first-ever livestock title in the farm bill, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) for 1 minute.

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

Mr. BOSWELL. Thank you, Mr. PETERSON, for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. And I would just say to my friend Mr. KIND, we all want the whole loaf of bread but sometimes we take a few slices, and you have to know that lots of reform has taken place.

As chairman of the Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry Subcommittee, working with my ranking member over here, Mr. HAYES, we have got the first-ever livestock title. It offers producers much-needed protections and ensures fairness and transparency within the marketplace.

I'm proud of this bipartisan bill. It also has a strong title for the dairy industry. Together we were able to bring producers and processors together on issues that have divided the industry for years. We were able to bring together the National Milk Producers Association and the International Dairy Food Association, with their excellent leadership, to avoid a very controversial issue in the dairy forward pricing program. Also, in the dairy title we ensure our dairy producers have an adequate safety net and our dairy industry continues to thrive.

The farm bill will provide a safety net for farmers and increase conservation efforts so that we can protect the land for future generations.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 10 seconds.

Mr. BOSWELL. Everybody, every man, woman, and child, has a vested interest in the farm bill. We have access to the most plentiful, safest, least expensive food in the world. Mr. RANGEL gets it. Mr. ACKERMAN gets it. We should all get it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, Indiana is agriculture, but Hoosiers on and off the farm also believe in fiscal discipline and reform. And it's for these reasons that I regretfully express my opposition to this farm bill, the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008.

During my years of service on the House Agriculture Committee, I have sought to be a voice for Indiana family farmers and an advocate for reform. I have worked to advocate changes in this legislation. And I want to express my profound appreciation to Chairman PETERSON and to Ranking Member GOODLATTE for including provisions in this farm bill that will save Indiana jobs and create new opportunities for farmers across the Midwest. While I differ ultimately in the support for the final product, I respect deeply these two men and am grateful for their work on behalf of these issues.

I'm opposing the farm bill because I believe it's fiscally irresponsible and does not contain the kind of reforms in American agriculture that these times demand. This bill fails to reduce government subsidies to farmers, fails to encourage market-based reforms to the Nation's agricultural policy, and fails to promote international trade. It also fails to meet our Nation's farm policy needs within our own budget guidelines.

The farm bill being considered today will actually increase the size and scope of government and will cost taxpayers more than $650 billion over the next 10 years. In comparison with the previous farm bill, this bill will cost $65 billion a year as opposed to the $45 billion before. It is in effect a 44 percent increase in spending.

And let me say I support family farming and I loathe the demagoguery of many who criticize farm subsidy programs, ignoring completely the real world input costs that American farmers face. But this bill still goes too far, in my judgment. It will continue to allow married couples with household incomes up to $2.5 million to receive subsidies. Subsidy payments oftentimes, under this legislation and previous bills, are concentrated in the hands of a few with the top 10 percent of recipients receiving nearly two-thirds of all farm payments.

There are other problems with this bill as well. It will allow farmers to lock in price support payments at the lowest possible market price and sell their crops at the highest price. And the bill also ignores the plight of consumers facing skyrocketing food prices by making a bad sugar program worse.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor with a sense of melancholy about this, having been on the Agriculture Committee during development of the last farm bill and coming from the great State of Indiana. It has always been my ambition to support Indiana farmers, to support them with Federal policy that enables farmers to sustain the American cutting edge in global agriculture. But I have always sought to do that in a way that protects our Federal budget and protects the American taxpayer at large.

It's for those reasons that I am opposing this farm bill legislation and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I will yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. HULSHOF. I thank the tag team here for allowing me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report, and I commend my friend for his patience and his persistence in bringing to this body this consensus product.

I realize that fewer and fewer Americans have a direct connection to the land. One reason is because it's becoming quite tough to make a living in production agriculture. And certainly that disconnect to rural America is evident here on the floor of the House. Dwight Eisenhower once said, ''Farming looks mighty easy when your plow is a pencil and you're a thousand miles away from the cornfield.''

Or to put it another way, Mr. Chairman, I quote from the saying on the plaque in your office that says, ''If farming were easy, Congressmen would do it.''

Well, I am a farmer. I'm the son of a farmer. I'm the grandson of a farmer.

Agriculture runs in cycles, and sometimes those cycles are pretty volatile. In September of 2005 during our corn harvest after Hurricane Katrina, the price of corn at a river terminal in Southeast Missouri was $1.40, and I don't recall anybody other than yours truly coming to the floor to extol that fact.

□ 1445

Yesterday, that same bushel of corn would have brought $5.97 at least on the Chicago Board of Trade, and even that isn't a windfall. And because we know that it is 47 percent more this year to plant one acre of corn in Missouri than it was last year, fertilizer is up 112 percent. Grain contracts and loans are getting harder to come by. Debt has increased by 30 percent in the last 5 years. We know farming looks a lot today like it did before the crash of the 1980s.

And we also know with all respect to those who talk about profligate spending, that about three-quarters of the farm bill dollar in this bill will not go to farmers but to the equally noble goal of ensuring that Americans have enough to eat. And quite frankly I expect that most of the farm payments to production agriculture in this bill will never have to be paid because the market price is going to be above the trigger level.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the farm bill. In doing so, I thank my good friend Chairman PETERSON for bringing a bill we can all support to the floor. I must say that without his leadership, we would have never reached this point.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the last farm bill I will vote on as a Member of this great House. And as I do so, I think of my dad, the founder of my family's farm. He built our farm using not Government handouts but hard work, business savvy and penny-pinching.

By creating this successful small business he was able to save just enough to plant the next year's crop and send his only son to college. Many who oppose this bill would probably point to my dad as one of those rich farmers who doesn't need a safety net. In response, I quote Dwight Eisenhower, "farming looks mighty easy when your plow is a pencil and you're a thousand miles from the corn field."

Those of us who actually farm, know farming isn't easy. We know that it now costs $534, or 47 percent more than last year, to plant 1 acre of corn in Missouri and we know fertilizer is up 112 percent from last year. We know that farming looks a lot like it did in the 1970s.

For those who don't remember, during the 1970s we had conditions much like today; healthy world demand took prices to all-time highs. Many farmers cashed in their land's equity and bought new land to chase these high prices. Then Government policies changed, including the grain embargo to the Soviet Union after their invasion of Afghanistan, and the market crashed.

I remember that policy well; it was the first time I realized that factors beyond our farm gate could determine the fate of our farm. I later learned that it nearly cost us our farm.

Ultimately, the crash of the 1980s caused thousands of farms to go under and when they did they took with them 300 agricultural banks, countless business that depended on farmers, and even some entire rural communities.

The similarities to today are striking. Today farm debt sets a new record every year, increasing 30 percent, or $52.8 billion, in the last 5 years. The price of land has once again risen to 1970s-esque highs, climbing 67 percent since 2003.

Now I am not saying that we can expect a crash, I don't know what the market will do over the next few years—no one does. What I am saying is that now is not the time to support irresponsible cuts to the safety net.

Now I know, the opponents of the farm bill will say they don't support irresponsible cuts, they only want "reform." There is reform in this bill, there is a lower income cap, there are reforms to the loan programs and the bill does away with the three-entity rule.

I know, the reformers will counter by saying these reforms don't go far enough. But if their reform plan—the Kind-Flake Amendment—would have passed and prices would have declined during the life of the farm bill, then "most of the farms and ranches would not be able to survive the erosion in farm income," according to the independent Agriculture and Food Policy Center at Texas A&M University.

The bottom line is that Chairman PETERSON has engineered an excellent compromise. It provides $209 billion for food stamps and school lunches. The bill also provides $25 billion for conservation programs, including enough funding to enroll nearly 13 million acres, or an area the size of West Virginia, into the Conservation Security Program. And the bill provides $35 billion to help farmers stay afloat.

The good news is if prices stay at their current level, most of those authorized dollars will never have to be paid. The safety net in the 2002 Farm Bill cost $20 billion less than what it was projected to cost, because commodity prices stayed high.

This bill is not a windfall; it is a basic safety net for our farmers. This safety net costs each taxpayer 6 cents a day. In return, farmers provide the safest, most abundant food supply at the lowest cost—just 11 percent of our income goes toward food, the lowest total in the world.

So I ask all of my colleagues to support this compromise. I am sure every Member can find things to oppose in this bill, there are certainly parts I oppose and I know there are even parts of the bill that Chairman PETERSON opposes. But at the end of the day, we cannot allow the perfect to be the enemy of the farmer. Support the farm bill.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to recognize the chairman of the General Farm Commodities and Risk Management subcommittee, the outstanding chairman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) for 1 minute.

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, let me commend the chairman and ranking member for their hard work. And I stand in support of this conference report.

This truly is a bipartisan piece of legislation that the House Agriculture Committee has produced and one that affects every citizen in this country.

Agriculture is the number one industry in my home State of North Carolina. It is responsible for $66 billion in income and employs almost one-fifth of the State's workforce.

Mr. Speaker, it is critical that we have a stable farm policy in this country, not just for North Carolina, but for every child that participates in the nutrition program, for every food bank and for every school lunch program.

The bill increases the funding for the Nation's nutrition programs by over $10 billion, provides over $1.1 billion for renewable energy, and increases funding for conservation efforts by $6.6 billion.

And for new and growing sectors of agriculture like organic foods, we have included, for the first time, mandatory funding for specialty crop research and marketing.

And we are able to do all this while ensuring that the safety net for our farmers remains intact, ensuring that no matter what, our citizens will always have a stable food supply.

Mr. FLAKE. I yield 1 minute to the minority leader, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I have been around the House Agriculture Committee for nearly 18 years. The chairman and I came together. We are good friends, and so is the ranking Republican, Mr. GOODLATTE. And I know they have worked hard to produce this bill.

But clearly, most Americans think that Washington is broken. And this farm bill frankly is another example of that. I know there is some reform in this bill. But when you begin to step back and look at the bill, we didn't get anywhere near the reform that I think most Americans would expect.

At a time when we have got the highest commodity prices that we have seen in a generation, you would think that we would take a slightly different approach to the farm bill. But unfortunately, because of the process, because of the negotiations, it didn't happen. I just want to point out what I would describe as the most egregious part of this.

I, or one of my designees, will have a motion to recommit this conference report. And it is no secret that politicians have traditionally used and abused the farm bill for their own pet projects. There are three pet projects in this bill that I am going to single out in my motion to recommit.

One, it would strip out the "Trail to Nowhere," a land swap that was airdropped into the bill by the senior Senator from Vermont. The language would require the U.S. Forest Service to sell portions of the Green Mountain National Forest exclusively to Vermont's Bromley Ski Resort. And believe it or not, to accommodate this obscure demand, portions of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail may

have to be moved. They are actually going to move the Appalachian Scenic Trail, possibly have to move it, because we are going to sell this land to a ski resort. I don't think the taxpayers ought to have to bankroll this boondoggle.

Secondly, our motion will strip out a $170 million earmark for the salmon industry that was airdropped into this bill in secret. The provision was never considered in the House. It was never considered in the Senate. One hundred seventy million dollars to bail out salmon fisheries. Now you should also note that after Hurricane Katrina, when the entire gulf coast fishing industry was annihilated, they actually only got $126 million from the Federal Government to fix their fisheries. I don't think taxpayers ought to be required to put up the money for an airdropped earmark that was brought into this bill never having been considered in either body.

Finally, our proposal would strip out a $250 million earmark secured by the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the gentleman from Montana. This earmark, incredibly enough, is targeted for forests to house fish. Yes. We are going to target a forest that houses fish, incredibly, what we would call ''forest fish.'' Only one forest in the country happens to have fish in it. And it just happens to be based in Montana, located in Montana where the Senator is from. I don't think the taxpayers ought to have to pay $250 million to take care of forest fish.

Listen, the American people are struggling with the high cost of living, whether it is the cost of gasoline, the cost of food, trying to make sure that they have got health care, concerned about whether they have a job tomorrow or will be able to afford their home mortgage. And here we are moving a farm bill that has earmarks in it that just don't pass the straight-face test.

And so I would ask my colleagues, if you think that this is a wise use of taxpayer funds, you can go ahead and vote against this motion to recommit. But I would invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, if you think that taxpayer funds could be spent more wisely, vote for the motion to recommit, and let's make this bill a better bill. We can do better.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to a strong advocate of reform and for a strong conservation title in this farm bill, my good friend from Oregon, EARL BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy as I appreciate his leadership.

I heard my friend from Missouri talk about the lack of connection to rural America. And I think that is, in fact, the case. And we are missing an opportunity with this farm bill to try to strengthen it because this farm bill continues to shortchange most farmers. It will fail to fund the majority of the environmental programs that go lacking. And most farmers will continue to get nothing, nothing from this bill. The richest 10 percent will get two-thirds to three-quarters of the total direct farm payments.

There are a number of things in this bill that I like, that I have been working for since the last farm bill to help provide some support for people who grow food, not just the five big commodities. I am glad that there is an increase in nutrition. But the reason the President should, and I think will, veto this bill has nothing to do with the good stuff. It is time to reform the farm bill, to reduce to $200,000 limit on AGI to qualify for subsidy. That is what the President is arguing for. That is the right thing to do. It is something that we ought to be able to have a bipartisan majority to support.

It will save the taxpayers money. It will enable us to fully fund the environmental programs that are so critical, particularly for small and medium-sized farmers and ranchers. We don't have to shortchange nutrition. The nutrition provisions ought to be strengthened with money we save from unneeded payments to the rich.

We have lots of money that is flowing to the richest farmers in America who don't need it. That's wrong. In fact, they have assumed that this bill is so egregious, I invite any of my colleagues to look at section 1619. The authors of the bill carve out an exemption to the Freedom of Information Act so that the recent Circuit Court ruling that would open this up to a spotlight is off limits.

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

Mr. KIND. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We should not drop a veil of secrecy over this bill. We should open it up. Let the American public know what is in it. If for no other reason, the notion that we are going to play a game of ''hide-the-marble'' with them, and not be honest about the true cost and the true benefits is another illustration of what is wrong with this bill, why the President should veto it, and why each and every Member should sustain that veto.

We can do a lot better for less money to help more farmers and ranchers. And I urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to recognize the distinguished chairman of the Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry Subcommittee, one of our outstanding chairmen, Mr. BACA of California.

Mr. BACA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for yielding. I want to thank our chairman, COLLIN PETERSON, for his leadership. I want to thank the minority ranking member, Mr. GOODLATTE, in supporting this historic farm bill which I strongly support. As Chair of the Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry Subcommittee, I am strongly supportive of this bill that increases nutrition by $10.364 billion.

Right now, there are 38 million Americans who do not have enough food to eat. This farm bill helps these people. It fights hunger in America by making an historic investment in nutrition programs that will help 13 million American families. This will help an additional 10 million Americans, including 320,000 working poor families, 380,000 elderly and disabled, plus our veterans. This will help put food on the table for many individuals that don't have food.

This farm bill also ensures that low-income elementary school children will have access to fresh fruits and vegetables in schools by expanding the USDA snack program to all 50 States leaving no child behind who is left hungry.

I ask you to support this farm bill. It is an important farm bill. I urge everyone to vote for it.

Mr. FLAKE. I yield myself 1 minute.

We have mentioned the generous subsidies that still flow to multimillionaire farmers. Let me just put that in perspective in this legislation. With this legislation, a farm couple earning $2.5 million in combined on-farm and off-farm income is still eligible for hundreds of thousands of dollars in farm payments. Yet an urban couple earning a little more than $17,800 or owning more than one vehicle can become ineligible for food stamp benefits.

Now I am not making an argument that we should raise the threshold for food stamp benefits. But look at the difference here. How in the world can you justify having a farm couple with on-farm and off-farm income of $2.5 million still eligible for hundreds of thousands of dollars in subsidies? It is simply indefensible.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 6¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona has 15 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say to my friend from Arizona that if you know of the farm couple where each person has $500,000 in off-farm income and each has $750,000 in farm income, the two limits we have imposed, down from $2.5 million to $500,000 for nonfarm income and never before limited to $750,000, I would like to meet that couple, and then we will fix that problem.

I yield to the gentleman from New York 1 minute.

(Mr. KUHL of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in congratulating Chairman PETERSON and Ranking Minority Member GOODLATTE in bringing this bill to the floor in very difficult times. I rise in support of the farm bill conference agreement.

Agriculture is one of the most important industries in New York State, believe it or not. In the 29th District alone, there are over 6,000 farms covering more than 1.2 million acres and employing thousands of workers. Annually, the farm economy generates over $360 million in my district alone.

During the writing of the farm bill, I hoped to address some of the most pressing issues facing New York farmers without destroying important provisions for other States, districts or industries.

□ 1500

The committee held a field hearing in my district, where we heard about issues such as extending the MILC program, increasing funding for specialty crops such as apples and grapes, enhancing conservation programs such as FRPP and EQIP, augmenting nutrition and food assistance policy, and utilizing our crops to assist in developing a strong renewable energy portfolio.

This bill makes historic investments in priorities to strengthen the fruit and the vegetable industry and expands a variety of things like the snack program. I hope my colleagues will support it.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to recognize one of the members of the conference committee, a valuable member of our committee, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, for 1 minute.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, let me just say, is this a perfect bill? No, but is it a good bill, yes. It's a good bill for the people of America in response precisely to their needs now.

The American people are concerned about high food prices, this brings it down. They are concerned about high gas prices, this bill brings it down. One of the most pressing areas that this bill does good on, it corrects a major injustice to African American farmers by passing a bill which includes $100 million to set up a fund so that these black farmers can have their day in court, something they fought for for years.

It also has money in here to set up research grants for predominantly African American land-grant colleges of 1890, Florida A&M University, agriculture, mechanical; Arkansas A&M University, agriculture, mechanical; North Carolina A&T, agriculture and technical. These schools were grounded in agriculture. But, yet, because of past discrimination, the black farmers and black colleges have been denied.

This good bill corrects that. We must pass this bill and make sure that this bill passes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) who is a subcommittee ranking member on the Agriculture Committee.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008.

There have been a lot of figures and a lot of terms thrown around in this room today about payment limits and adjusted gross income, but let's really talk about what this bill is about, and what this bill is about is feeding and clothing the American people, to making sure that they continue to have access to the safest, highest quality products in the world. By the way, they are also the most affordable.

Now, one of the things that some people talk about is all of these rich farmers. Now, I will tell you it's very interesting. If it is as lucrative as everyone says, why is the number of farmers in America dropping? Go to a Farm Bureau meeting some evening in west Texas and see how many young farmers are dying to get into the farming business, or even have the capacity to get into the farming business.

I think it's also interesting, when we look at this bill, that about 70 percent of this bill has to do with providing an opportunity for those people that need a little extra helping hand to make sure that they do have a quality meal during the day, and that is in some of our food stamp and nutrition programs. Yet only 12 percent of this bill has anything to do with growing something.

Now, let me tell you that if you are going to feed and clothe people, I want everybody to know that those things just don't show up at the department store and the grocery store. Somebody actually has to produce it. We have hardworking farm families all over America that are fulfilling that commitment.

Let me tell you, it's difficult, the prices that some people have been talking about, well, the prices of these commodities are up. Yes, they are up, but let me tell you, look back 2 or 3 years ago when a lot of people wouldn't plant certain commodities because they couldn't make any money doing it.

The other question about this bill is, yes, it's about making sure Americans have quality agricultural products, but it's also about who is going to provide it.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. We have to make a decision today. In this energy situation this country is in, we are relying on other people to provide energy for America. Are we going to let American agriculture die so we have to let other countries feed and clothe America? I don't think the American people want that.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a member of the committee.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his hard work and the chairman for his hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I will hit a quick list in my 1 minute. This bill cuts direct payments. We should not do that. That's green box, and that helps us stay in compliance with WTO.

It cuts a blenders' credit on ethanol. We should not do that, because that slows capital investment into ethanol production from corn.

It requires Davis-Bacon wage scales, which will reduce the numbers of ethanol plants we can build from five with the same money down to four. It imposes union scale in the countryside. We should not do that.

It has in it Pigford farms, which the gentleman spoke to, that's ripe with fraud. I will prove that over the months as it unfolds.

The other side of this coin is—you have to ask and answer this question—how does this bill get better if it fails here on the floor of this Congress? What comes out of the House and the Senate in a better configuration? Does it get better or does it get worse?

If you can paint a scenario by which it gets better, then you vote ''no.'' If you paint a scenario by which it gets worse, you vote ''yes.''

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN), a valuable member of our committee.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. I want to congratulate the chairman and the ranking member of the full committee for this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the important reforms and preserving the safety net and the commodity title as well as important increases in the nutrition and conservation titles, I worked with the chairman of the full committee during the House version of the markup to place an emphasis on beginning farmers and ranchers. This conference report includes a number of important provisions, including reauthorizing tax-exempt bonds to provide low-interest loans to beginning farmers and ranchers, increasing the loan limit for them from $250,000 to $450,000 and indexing that limit amount for inflation. There are also important provisions in the credit and research titles of this conference report for beginning farmers and ranchers.

The energy title is another area that as Mr. HOLDEN, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, Energy and Research, pointed out, the loan guarantees for advance biofuel production plants, reauthorizing the Rural Energy for America Program which provides the loans, loan guarantees and grants for producers to purchase and install on-the-farm renewable energy systems, establishing a forest bioenergy program; and, of course, championed by the chairman of the full committee, the biomass crop assistance program.

I encourage all of my colleagues for these reasons, as pointed out by many other colleagues, to support the conference report.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), another outstanding member of our committee, for 1 minute.

Mr. COSTA. I, too, want to congratulate the chairman and the ranking member for an effort that has extended now over 2½ years.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the measure before us, the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, reflects a bipartisan compromise and consensus not easily gained.

I represent three of the country's most productive agricultural counties in the Nation. In my district alone, farmers grow over 300 various crops, which oftentimes are referred to as specialty crops, fruits, vegetables all sorts of diversified good food in America.

For the first time the important segment of American agriculture is being recognized, not in the form of subsidies, but in support of research, competitiveness programs, focusing on pest and disease prevention efforts. Not only does this help our growers, but it helps our consumers to ensure availability of safe, healthy fruits and vegetables for our citizens, a diet that's based upon good science.

Our farmers are working hard to implement better environmental stewardship programs, but they face continued challenges as it relates to air quality concerns and water shortages. This makes improvements in those areas as well.

Is this bill perfect? Certainly not, but it represents a hard-fought compromise.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

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

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about whether or not there is reform in the legislation.

Let me point out that there is very substantial reform. We have caps on adjusted gross income limits on farmers and on nonfarmers. We require direct attribution of benefits. We reform the dairy and sugar support programs. We create revenue-based countercyclical programs. We address the beneficial interest problem. We reform the crop insurance program, and we eliminate the three-entity rule.

Those of you who are not in agriculture may wonder what some of those things are. They are all significant reforms resulting in this. For those who say we are not making cuts in the commodity programs, this orange bar represents payment for commodity programs under the last 3 years of the so-called Freedom to Farm Act, which some have touted as being more reform oriented in agriculture, $24.7 billion a year.

During the last farm bill, the 2002 to 2007 farm bill, it averages $12.1 billion per year. The projected average cost for the current farm bill that we are debating right now, $7.6 billion a year, less than one-third of what was spent per year under the Freedom to Farm program. This is real reform, these are real cuts in the commodity title for America's farmers and ranchers.

This gives you an illustration of what we are talking about, what we are debating about. This thing that looks like a pin, this little tiny slice of overall total Federal spending, is what goes to commodity programs, one-quarter of 1 percent of the Federal budget, down from three-fourths of 1 percent during the first year of the 2002 farm bill.

You might say we are dancing on the head of a pin when we have this much debate about reform for one-fourth of 1 percent of the farm programs.

I urge my colleagues to support this reform legislation.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, in my very short time remaining, let me simply say that we have a huge problem with entitlements in this country, one of which is the entitlement, direct payment system for farmers. This is not serious reform, when you are still paying farmers that make up to $2.5 million in subsidies from the taxpayer.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman from Virginia, he really is an expert on these programs, but he knows as well as anyone the reason commodity spending is down is because commodity prices are up.

Two of the three subsidy programs are based on the amount farmers are getting in the marketplace. But that can all return in a heartbeat, and he knows it.

The fact is that you need a few Members of Congress here today to stand up and say the emperor has no clothes. As I said from the beginning, where's the beef, where's the real reform?

When you still allow taxpayer subsidies going to a farm couple with an adjusted gross of $2.5 million, that's not reform. When you lift the income limits under the LDP and the countercyclical program, that's not reform. When you increased the loan rate and the target price, it's not reform.

You have marginal reform with the crop insurance. Instead of having a farm bill today that has reasonable reform for taxpayers throughout the country, and has the great conservation title for the 21st century, or the healthy food bill of the 21st century, it's more status quo. It's more wait for 5 years, we will do it then.

Well, those 5 years never come. The time has never been better today, and the President is right. We should not be spending taxpayer subsidies for wealthy individuals at a time of record prices in the marketplace. When people are facing increased food and fuel costs, let us not do this to the American taxpayer and use their money needlessly.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no.'' We can do better. I know we can do better in producing a bill that provides a safety net for family farmers but is also responsible to the American taxpayer.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time it's my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I certainly thank the gentleman for yielding and certainly appreciate his work and the chairman's very, very diligent work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of the 2007 farm bill. This bipartisan legislation will ensure a secure food supply and the continuance of a strong agricultural sector. A very important part of that agricultural sector in my district, actually, is the production of sugar beets, which is helped greatly by this bill.

□ 1515

The increase in sugar loan rates, the first since 1985, is widely supported by Michigan farmers.

Also including sugar producers in the development of alternative energies I think is very important and can help to make them an integral part of developing energy resources that will only help consumers and reduce our dependence on foreign sources of energy.

While the sugar program faces some criticism, which we have all heard on the floor today, I think it is important that Members be reminded that this program comes at little or no cost to the taxpayers.

As well, our specialty crop farmers will also be protected in this bill while ensuring that the wealthiest farmers are not receiving government subsidies.

I don't believe anyone understands more about how to strengthen our agricultural sector than farmers themselves, so I certainly listened, as I am sure all Members did, to our local farmers while this bill was being negotiated and I sought their input and their counsel, and I am glad that much of what they stated was needed was included in this legislation and they strongly support this final product.

I believe this bill is a great example of bipartisan compromise, and I also believe it is good for the future of American agriculture and thereby our entire Nation. I would urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to recognize for 1 minute the distinguished Speaker of the House without whose support and backing we wouldn't be here today. From the start when she came to Farm Fest a couple years ago until now, she has become an agriculture expert. We appreciate her involvement.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want

to congratulate the distinguished chairman of our Agriculture Committee for his important work in bringing this legislation to the floor today. I also want to commend Mr. GOODLATTE for his leadership as well, so we can come to the floor with bipartisan legislation that will help lower food prices, invest in energy independence, support conservation, and recognize the importance of specialty crops.

I want to commend Mr. KIND also for his leadership. It is very important for us to reform the farm subsidy programs in our country. I think where we have a disagreement is I think this bill is a good first step in that direction. I don't think we will ever see another bill that will look this way. And when we come to the place where our situation is addressed again in a bipartisan way on the next farm bill, I think your work will be repaid. But I hope, Mr. KIND, that you take some satisfaction in the fact that from your leadership and advocacy, this farm bill is moving in the right direction. I too am not satisfied that it does enough in terms of farm subsidies, but I want to talk about what it does do.

And what it does do is much better because of the leadership of Mr. GOODLATTE, our distinguished chairman Mr. PETERSON, the work of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee who just did a phenomenal job. Chairman RANGEL did a phenomenal job on his aspect of the bill. And Mr. POMEROY, who serves on both the Ways and Means Committee and the Agriculture Committee, was a wonderful bridge in terms of these initiatives. I also commend Congresswoman HERSETH SANDLIN for her leadership, and all of our colleagues who are here today, including Mr. HOLDEN who is number two on the Ag Committee. All across America, we are proud of the work that has been done.

In California, we are proud of the work of Dennis Cardoza, a member of the Ag Committee, representing some new ideas about fresh fruits and vegetables and how they should be part of this initiative. We on the coast, to my colleague Mr. SCOTT, we wanted to see some initiatives about fresh fruits and vegetables and specialty crops, and they are contained in here. And I commend Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO for her incredible work on the nutrition piece of this.

As part of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. BACA was a leader in terms of the nutrition piece, and Congresswoman DELAURO as Chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture was an important voice and strong leader and advocate for increasing the nutrition initiatives in this legislation. If there was one reason for Members to vote for this bill, it would be to support the nutrition piece of it, but there are other reasons as well.

I talked about how it could lower grocery prices. Time magazine recently had this on its Web site, four ways the farm bill could lower grocery bills. First with the disaster relief, a $3.8 billion program for farmers hit by drought and flooding could speed up compensation, allowing them to bring crops to market faster.

Cuts in ethanol subsidies. Demand for corn-based ethanol has increased corn prices. This bill cuts the producers' tax credit and creates a subsidy for more efficient cellulosic ethanol made from stalks, grass, and wood rather than from corn.

Food stamps. Payments to those on assistance will be more responsive to inflation. The minimum monthly benefit will increase from $10, where it has been since 1977, and may I say, probably since they put this out.

The final bill has strong support for the food pantries, food banks throughout America. Now if you go to a food bank, you will see a sign that says you can only come one time a month to pick up food because the shelves are bare in those food pantries. This bill will go a long way to filling those shelves. So for emergency food assistance, this program would supply food banks and pantries and could add up to $100 million more in funding per year as more Americans affected by the sluggish economy visit its distribution centers.

Some people in our country are concerned as our economy is in a downturn, they are concerned about losing their jobs. Many people are concerned about losing their homes; but almost everyone is concerned about losing his or her living standard. The purchasing power of middle-income families has been reduced while costs have gone up for necessities like gasoline and groceries and health care and education. The issue of gasoline and groceries are addressed somewhat, one more than the other, in this legislation.

In terms of energy, high energy costs are a contributing factor to our high food prices, which is why the Food and Energy Security Act, which this is, will help reduce gas prices and ensure that America's family farmers fuel America's energy independence. Think of this. We are talking about energy independence, and with this legislation we take a step for America's farmers to fuel America's energy independence, following up on the work we did last year in the energy bill.

It makes a $1 billion investment in energy independence. In addition to that, it takes a critical step in transitioning from biofuels, from corn as I mentioned, and creates a new tax credit that will provide a $400 million investment in cellulosic biofuels. These efforts will ensure that we send our energy dollars to the Midwest instead of to the Middle East.

In terms of conservation, the bill recognizes that those who work the land, America's farmers and ranchers, are great stewards of the land. The farm bill improves access to and funding for initiatives that take environmentally sensitive lands out of production. It encourages environmentally friendly practices on working lands, and it invests $5.4 billion to preserve farm and ranchland, improve our air quality, our water quality, and enhance soil conservation and wildlife habitats on working lands.

Others have mentioned the issue of specialty crops. For the first time, the farm bill makes an historic investment in specialty crops, especially important to my State of California, and as I have said, those of us living on the coast as well as in the rest of America. It provides $1.3 billion in mandatory spending. This investment was made possible by the leadership of Congressman DENNIS CARDOZA of California who has worked to ensure that the producers who account for more than half of all crop value in the United States are now represented in our farm policy. Producers who provide one-half of all crop value in the United States are now represented in our farm bill.

Specifically this bill invested $365 million in specialty crop block grants, $230 million to create a new dedicated research program for specialty crops, $377 million to create a new initiative for early detection prevention and eradication of emerging pest and disease. I know that Mr. THOMPSON of California has a special interest in this aspect of the legislation.

The bill takes a critical step toward reforming farm programs, not enough I agree, Mr. KIND, by eliminating payments to the ultra-rich and closing loopholes that for decades have allowed some to evade farm-payment limits. This is the most significant reform in farm policy in more than 30 years. This Food and Energy Security Act will ensure that future farm bills will never again look like this.

Thanks to the efforts of Chairman PETERSON and many others who have made this historic investment in energy independence and nutrition assistance, this bill's effects will also be felt far from farm country. As George Washington our first President whom we visit every day when we come to the Chamber said, ''I know of no pursuit in which more real and important services can be rendered to any country than by improving its agriculture.'' Well, we were an agrarian society then, but there is still a great deal of truth in that statement today.

With this legislation we will help families facing high food prices; fuel our Nation's energy needs with American-made, renewable energy; and be better stewards of the land and protect our environment. In addition to all of that, we will have fresh snacks, fresh fruit and vegetable snacks for our children in the schools.

I urge my colleagues to support this new direction in American farm policy. I urge an ''aye'' vote. Again, I salute Mr. PETERSON and Mr. GOODLATTE for their leadership. It is wonderful for us to have this bipartisanship on the floor today.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to give one of my minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Speaker just mentioned the bipartisanship in this legislation, and that is very true. But this legislation is not bipartisan because many Republicans will be supporting a Democratic bill, this legislation is bipartisan because it was crafted by both Republicans and Democrats throughout the conference process, and this legislation is very, very different than the legislation that passed the House last summer which I voted against primarily because there were tax increases to pay for the legislation. There are no more tax increases paying for this legislation. In fact, this legislation is paid for by a means that is acceptable to both sides and acceptable to the administration.

But there are more reforms in this legislation that Republicans prevailed upon our Democratic colleagues on in the conference. The effort to prohibit States, most particularly the State of Indiana, from being able to seek outside help to reform their flawed food stamp program was removed from this bill, and so now not just Indiana but all 50 States will be able to continue to use appropriate means to modernize their food stamp programs.

Davis-Bacon provisions in the Northern Border Economic Development Commission, the Southeast Crescent, and the Southwest Border Regional Commissions, those Davis-Bacon provisions have been removed from this legislation.

An effort to undermine the Welfare Reform Act of 1996 by providing increased food stamp benefits to adults, able-bodied adults without dependents was removed from this legislation.

And anticompetition livestock provisions, which were very troubling to many Members on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle as well, were removed.

So while there are certainly advocates for each of those provisions in this bill, this bill is bipartisan because we worked together to give on both sides to make sure that we came up with a good farm bill that could command strong bipartisan support.

□ 1530

This bill promotes energy independence by expanding investment in cellulosic biofuels and helping move away from corn-based ethanol. It cuts the ethanol subsidy by 12 percent. It's fiscally responsible because it contains no tax increases and is PAYGO compliant. It boosts conservation programs benefiting our environment. It aids food banks and nutrition in our schools in its nutrition programs. It preserves the farm safety net and assures that we continue to have the safest, most affordable, most abundant food supply in the world. This is real reform. This is a real farm bill for the 21st century.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

I want to thank, again, the chairman of the committee, the chairmen of the subcommittees, the ranking members on my side of the aisle, but most importantly, the staff on both the majority and the minority side who worked many, many, many weekends over the last 2½ years, but particularly in the last few months, to craft this legislation, to address all of the concerns that were raised, to go down blind alleys, find that something didn't work, come back up, find a different way to make it work, and to reach this point today, the staff has helped make that possible.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to echo Mr. GOODLATTE's comments. I have a list of all of the staff members, majority and minority, that I would like entered into the RECORD to honor their work. You think we've been through a process here. It's nothing compared to what the staff has done, and so they deserve our thanks. And they're going to, hopefully, get a little bit of rest now once we get this over with.

To follow on Mr. GOODLATTE's comments, there's a lot of reform in this bill that I would call real reform, as opposed to ginned-up reform that's been done by different folks. We have made huge changes in the conservation programs that are going to make those programs work a lot better in the future, work for more different parts of the country.

We have a new revenue-based countercyclical program that we're going to try out on an optional basis for the next 5 years that may be the new future direction of the farm bill, depending on how it works out. So we've got a lot of reforms in this bill that never get talked about because all anybody wants to focus on is AGI.

Well, I don't have any problem putting an AGI limit on nonfarmers, because, frankly, I don't think they should be in farming in the first place. We've got enough capital in agriculture. We don't need folks from outside of agriculture coming in and being involved. That's my personal opinion.

But, you know, we've got a $500,000 limit. We'd have gone lower, but that's as far as we could get.

We put a limit on farmers, on farm income for the first time, in spite of the fact that this is the only part of business people in this country that are getting benefits from the Federal Government that are requiring an AGI, that I know of. I don't know why farmers get singled out and nobody else does, why we don't have an AGI on oil companies and whoever else is getting benefits from the Federal Government. That continues to mystify me.

But I just have to clarify, you know, people keep manipulating these statistics. We've fixed some of that in this bill as well, which I would call reform. But as to what Mr. GOODLATTE said earlier, we have a $500,000 hard cap on nonfarm income. So I suppose that if you earn $500,000 as a doctor or something, your wife earned $500,000 as a doctor, and then you had a farm and you earned $750,000 as a farmer, and your wife had a real farm and earned $750,000 you could get to $2.5 million. But I think you need to understand that, in order for you to qualify for that, you're going to have a real genuine farm, and it has to be your income, certified by a CPA or a lawyer, and if it's not, if they do it wrong they're going to go to jail and you are, too.

So I think the likelihood of anybody getting to this $2.5 million limit is almost nonexistent. That is a bogus argument that's being put out there, being ginned up by people that want to keep this fight going on.

So if you want to put a $200,000 cap on everybody that gets money from the Federal Government on AGI, then we'll be right there with you. But I don't think that's going to happen.

Just like we tried to put AGI limits on conservation. We had a revolt. Some of these conservation groups that have been pushing these payment limits, as soon as we said we're going to have the same limit on them as farmers, we had a revolt.

This is a good bill. It's got a lot of reform. I thank everybody. We'll appreciate a good vote to get this over with.

Majority Staff: Andy Baker, Christy Birdsong, Wynn Bott, Aleta Botts, Claiborn Crain, Jack Danielson, Nona Darrell, Adam Durand, Nathan Fretz, Alejandra Gonzalez-Arias, Chandler Goule, Tony Jackson, Craig Jagger, Tyler Jameson, Keith Jones, Martha Josephson, John Konya, Scott Kuschmider, Rob Larew, Merrick Munday, Clark Ogilvie, John Riley, Sharon Rusnak, Lisa Shelton, Anne Simmons, April Slayton, Cherie Slayton, Debbie Smith, Kristin Sosanie, and Jamie Weyer.

Minority Staff: Patricia Barr, Brent Blevins, Bryan Dierlam, Mike Dunlap, John Goldberg, Alise Kowalski, Kevin Kramp, Scott Martin, Josh Maxwell, Pam Miller, Rita Neznek, Bill O'Conner, Pelham Straughn, and Pete Thomson.

Fellow/Intern: Rob McAfee, Rachel Huhn, Randi Hughes, Jennifer Spraberry, Olivia Vickers, Melinda Cep, and J.D. Hale.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2419, the 2008 Farm Bill Conference Report. This bill provides a breakthrough for the Chesapeake Bay by providing an unprecedented level of funding to aid in the cleanup of this national treasure. H.R. 2419 provides, for the first time, a bay specific program to ensure that farmers in the watershed will get their fair share of conservation funding. The Conference Report provides $188 million,

over 5 years, in bay-specific conservation funding. Moreover, the bill includes a baseline of funding in the amount of $438 million over 10 years. This will enable the program to be extended at the expiration of this 5-year bill. Additionally, the Chesapeake Bay Foundation estimates that farmers in the bay watershed will be eligible for an additional $252 million in national program funding in working land programs in addition to conservation set-aside programs. This funding will be over and above the annual conservation funding in the last year of the previous farm bill that provided $80 million to the Bay watershed.

I want to thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, COLLIN PETERSON, and the chairman of the Conservation Subcommittee, TIM HOLDEN, for the programs and funding that they have provided to assist farmers in controlling sediment and nutrient runoff into the Chesapeake Bay. Moreover, the program would not have been possible without the support of the many Members of Congress on the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Taskforce. In addition, the work of the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, in providing technical assistance and grass roots support, was essential to the success of the establishment of this program. The Chesapeake Bay Commission also provided assistance in the crafting of an initial legislation, CHESSEA, that helped galvanize the support of Members who are committed to restoring the health of the Bay.

The Chesapeake Bay is the largest estuary in the U.S. Its watershed includes 66,000 farms with an estimated 8.5 million acres of land. The watershed contains 150 tributary streams and rivers. The watershed spans 6 States and the District of Columbia. Almost half of the nitrogen and phosphorus pollutant load in the bay is caused by agricultural runoff—from fertilizer and animal waste.

In 1987 there was the first attempt to clean up the bay with an agreement between the States and the Federal Government. The goal was to clean up the bay by 2000. When the deadline passed, a more detailed agreement was developed and the leaders of Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia, and the EPA pledged to fix the bay's water, its oyster population, its beds of underwater grass, and other environmental indicators by 2010—which will require the reduction of 110 million pounds of pollution.

Every environmental assessment indicates that the 2010 deadline will not be met and that the environmental condition of the bay is continuing to deteriorate. A recent report by the Chesapeake Bay Program's Health and Restoration Assessment found that most of the bay's waters are degraded, the bay's critical habitats, like grasses, are at risk and that many of the bay's blue crabs, striped bass and oyster populations are below historic levels. This bill provides the much needed resources to restore the Chesapeake Bay to its original vitality.

NATIONAL CONSERVATION

In addition to the conservation funding for the bay, this bill boosts conservation programs by $7.9 billion, to nationally reduce soil erosion, enhance water supplies, improve water and air quality, increase wildlife habitat and reduce damage caused by floods and other natural disasters. Moreover, fruit and vegetable producers will have their own place in the farm bill for the first time and will benefit from more than $1.3 billion for new programs that support research, pest management, and trade promotion to help the industry.

NUTRITION

Nearly three-fourths of the farm bill before us today, an additional $10.4 billion in new spending, goes to nutrition programs that help 38 million American families afford healthy food. These critical food stamp provisions will help about 11 million people by 2012. Households with children receive 77 percent of food stamp benefits. Moreover, during this time of fiscal austerity for many families in our Nation, this bill provides much-needed support to emergency feeding organizations, such as food banks, food pantries, and soup kitchens, by increasing funding for TEFAP by $1.25 billion—with $50 million for immediate shortages at food pantries. The farm bill also will assist schools in providing healthy snacks to students, with $1 billion for free fresh fruits and vegetables. Finally, it provides international nutrition assistance by providing $60 million, in addition to the existing Food for Peace international aid program, to purchase emergency food aid overseas and provides an additional $84 million for the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program for infant, child, and school nutrition programs in underdeveloped countries.

RENEWABLE FUELS

The farm bill we are considering today will assist Congress in promoting the development of biofuels from noncorn sources. The Renewable Fuels Standard that was part of the 2007 Energy law requires that two-thirds of our fuel needs be met by nonfood feedstocks for biofuels, such as switchgrass and woodchips. The farm bill takes another critical step in transitioning biofuels beyond corn—by reducing the current tax credit for corn-based ethanol by 6 cents per gallon and creating a new tax credit to promote the production of cellulosic biofuels. Moreover, the farm bill invests $1 billion in renewable energy, focusing on new technologies and new sources, including $320 million in loan guarantees for biorefineries that produce advanced biofuels and a new program to encourage the production of new biomass for cellulosic ethanol and other energy production, helping producers learn how to harvest, store, and transport biomass to bioenergy facilities.

CRITICAL REFORMS

The Conferees have made many reforms to commodity subsidies in this bill. Commodity programs account for less than 13 percent of the farm bill. This bill will reduce the cap for nonfarm income by 80 percent, to $500,000, and puts in place the first-ever cap for farm income at $750,000 for fixed direct payments. The bill reduces direct farm payments by $300 million; the Administration proposed increasing these fixed payments by $5.5 billion, even though they are paid out regardless of farm prices. The bill also closes a loophole (the three-entity rule) that for decades has permitted the collection of double the farm payment limits by collecting cash on more than one business. Moreover, it includes tax reforms to limit the use of farming losses to reduce their taxes on nonfarm income.

I applaud the Conferees for these reforms. Unfortunately, these measures do not go far enough. I would have preferred the elimination of subsidies to wealthy agri-business interests in their entirety. We need to continue to work to reduce the reliance of our farm program on commodity supports that often benefit the farmers who need support the least.

CONCLUSION

However, the Commodity Title is included in a comprehensive bill that contains many good programs, including: the Chesapeake Bay conservation provision, as well as significant funding for farm conservation across the Nation. Moreover, the robust nutrition program that aids the disadvantaged here and abroad, coupled with the recognition of specialty crops and the inclusion of the proper incentives to increase the production and refinement of renewable fuel from nonfood sources are extraordinary advancements that are worthy of support. I believe that, on balance, this bill provides many worthwhile benefits which prompt me to cast my vote in support of this Conference Agreement.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, the nutrition title in the Conference Report for the 2008 Farm Bill is a monumental achievement for the millions of Americans who struggle to put enough healthy, nutritious food on the table. I know it's not always easy to make ends meet and to put food on the table each day. I've walked in those shoes, and I've sat at that table. But with this bill we start to fulfill our responsibility to our neighbors. We have improved and strengthened food stamps and other important nutrition programs for our children and seniors. I want to take a few minutes to expand upon some of the accomplishments that are in this nutrition title.

First off, we have updated the name of the program. The new name will be SNAP: The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. We needed a new name because there are no places left in this country where food stamps actually are ''stamps.'' Instead, like with other modern transactions, people swipe their cards at the store to access their benefits. This has been a huge success for reducing fraud and stigma in the program. We hope and expect that the new name and new image for the program will help us to continue to chip away at the stigma that keeps some proud people, especially senior citizens, from signing up for help in paying for their groceries and puts them at risk of hunger.

The name reflects the fact that the program provides a ''supplement'' to help people afford an adequate diet when their own resources are not quite enough. We also say ''nutrition,'' instead of ''food,'' because the program is about more than just food. It has got a vibrant nutrition education component to help our low-income population learn about healthy diets and make the choices that will improve their health status over their lifetimes. So I'm very proud of this new name for food stamps: an established program that is one of the best Government programs we've got. Let me be clear, however, that in changing the name and eliminating food stamp coupons we did not intend to make any other policy changes to the program.

I think the biggest single accomplishment in the nutrition title is to end the decades of erosion in the value of food stamp benefits. We're all aware of the rising gas and food prices of recent months and the bite they've taken out of the pocketbooks of most Americans. But for many low-income Americans the squeeze has been getting tighter for decades, as the value of their food stamps has been able to purchase less and less food with each passing year. Food stamp benefits average only $1

per person per day. It's not easy to purchase a healthy, nutritious diet on such a limited amount.

So in this bill we have addressed this problem. We made critical improvements, and, for the first time in the program's history, we have ensured that, in every aspect, the food stamp program keeps its purchasing power over time. We raise the standard deduction from $134 to $144 and index it for inflation. That is an important accomplishment. It helps about 10 million people afford more food—families, seniors, people with disabilities—all types of low-income food stamp recipients are helped by this change. We raise the minimum benefit, and index it for inflation. We uncap the dependent care deduction so that families can deduct the full cost of the child care they so desperately depend on to hold down their jobs. And we index the asset limits. We don't know what the future will hold. Hopefully, the high inflation of the past months will shortly subside as the country gets back on track. But we now can rest assured, as never before, that if there is substantial inflation our low-income families and senior citizens won't lose out on food.

For me what this bill really is about is people. It's about our senior citizens who have worked hard their whole lives and deserve better than to face the fear of hunger in their last years. It's about children, who come home from school and look to their parents to put a nutritious meal on the table.

One of the groups that will be most helped are our Nation's senior citizens. We were able to increase the minimum benefit, which goes predominantly to senior citizens, from $10 to about $14 a month. This is the first increase in almost 30 years in the minimum benefit. I would have liked to have increased it even more, but this change will help make it worthwhile for some of our seniors who qualify for a low benefit to participate in the program. We did this by setting the minimum benefit at 8 percent of the thrifty food plan for a single person. Because USDA adjusts the thrifty food plan every year for increases in food prices, so too will the minimum benefit now adjust. In addition, because of higher food prices in some places, like Alaska, Hawaii, and some of the territories, seniors in these places will now also see a modestly higher minimum benefit. For example in some parts of Alaska, the minimum benefit will be as high as $25 per month.

In this bill we've also excluded retirement accounts from assets and indexed the asset limits to inflation. These changes will help seniors and working families to save for the future. It makes no sense to require people who fall on hard times to virtually liquidate all of the savings they've managed to put away in order to get help paying for groceries for themselves and their families. Our seniors, especially, may have no ability to replace these savings, and as a result, no cushion to deal with unexpected expenses. And a working family who is forced to spend down savings now will be that much closer to poverty in their older years. So this is an important change for the long-term ability of low-income individuals to move toward financial independence and for our senior citizens to be able to retain an ability to support themselves in their retirement.

But I also want to reaffirm that we did not take away, as President Bush proposed, the State option in the food stamp program to design a more appropriate asset test at the State level. In my home State of California the legislature and Governor have been working together to design an ''expanded categorical eligibility'' program that will revise the asset limit for many food stamp recipients and make it easier for them to save for the future. I hope that other States consider this option, and I urge USDA to work with other States to promote this important policy.

In another major improvement for senior citizens, we have expanded to seniors a State option from the 2002 farm bill that dramatically reduces paperwork requirements. This policy is known as ''simplified reporting'' and it will allow seniors to participate without filing paperwork for 12-month periods, unless they have a major increase in their income that makes them ineligible for food stamps. I urge USDA to make this option as simple and streamlined for seniors and States as possible, and to find ways to insulate food stamp benefits from interactions with other programs that low-income seniors participate in, particularly Medicaid.

Finally, we have heard reports that despite the overwhelming success of the electronic benefits, some seniors can find the technology confusing. For those at the minimum benefit who receive maybe only $10 to $20 a month, we've heard concerns that if they don't use their benefits fast enough those benefits can be taken away—or moved ''offline''—sometimes in as short a period as 3 months, with the senior citizen not understanding why this has occurred. I don't think this is a very common problem, but it is understandable that a senior citizen might want to store up small benefits to use at one shopping trip every few months, rather than have to keep track of the card every month. This bill allows States to move benefits off-line after 6 months of inactivity, but requires them to notify the household and restore the benefits within 48 hours upon request. This benefit reinstatement should be a simple process, and States should aim to help seniors navigate it, so we don't have our seniors being bounced around an EBT call center trying to figure out what happened to their food stamp benefits.

For children and families, the biggest change we make is the increase and indexing of the standard deduction which will significantly boost the ability of low-wage workers to afford food for their families, especially over time. More than $5 billion of the nutrition title's 10-year investment go to this change, which primarily benefits families with children.

We also lift the limit on the dependent care deduction. This change will help about 100,000 families who pay out-of-pocket child care costs above $175 per child per month, or $200 for infants, by recognizing that money that is needed to pay for child care so that a parent can work is not available to purchase food. On average, families who are helped will receive an additional $40 a month, or $500 a year, according to the Congressional Budget Office. The dependent care cap has not been raised since the early 1990s, despite the increases in the costs of safe, reliable child care. Families incur all types of costs in order to secure child care for their children, and USDA should continue to allow all of these expenses to count toward the deduction—such as transportation costs to and from day care and the cost of informal care. Finally, as States roll this out to the 100,000 families currently on the program, it is important that they make it easy for eligible families to claim the new deduction. Families shouldn't have to make extra trips to the food stamp office or be at risk of losing benefits if they fail to claim a new higher deduction. A household should never have its benefits cut or reduced because of a failure to document child care expenses, but should be given a full opportunity to receive the higher deduction if they have expenses above the current capped amounts.

We hear all the time that despite the importance and success of the food stamp program, for most families the benefits run out before the end of the month. That is why it is so important that we provide more than $1.2 billion in this farm bill for additional food purchases for emergency food organizations, like church food pantries and soup kitchens, to feed our families and seniors. We provide $50 million in additional funds this year to help meet food banks' needs in light of rising food costs. And, we increase the basic Emergency Food Assistance Program annual funding level to $250 million. That amount will be adjusted for inflation in future years to ensure that this program does not lose any of its food purchasing power.

Another important provision for our children is a provision that ensures that children who receive food stamps can automatically, or ''directly'' be certified as eligible for free meals. The eligibility rules for the two programs overlap: Virtually every child who receives food stamps is eligible for free meals. So making that connection in an automated way can save the family from falling through the cracks or from having to file duplicative paperwork. Unfortunately, too many States and schools don't currently make the connection adequately. So this bill requires USDA to report to Congress annually on each State's progress in directly certifying food stamp recipients for free school meals, and asks for USDA to report on best practices among the various States and school districts. This is a provision that is about good Government—there is no reason the Government can't make these connections, instead of requiring school administrators and families to be responsible for duplicative paperwork.

In addition to my role as Agriculture's Subcommittee Chair on Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry, I also have the great pleasure to assess this bill from the perspective of my role as the chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. More than 5 million Latinos, or more than 10 percent of the Latino population, receive food stamps each month. Food stamps constitute 25 percent of total monthly income for a typical Latino family that participates in the Food Stamp Program. All of the changes that I have just described will benefit low-income Latinos who rely upon this program.

I must take one moment to express my deep personal disappointment that we were not able to restore food stamp benefits to all legal immigrants who are currently ineligible for the program. Keeping food assistance from hard-working immigrants with whom we live side by side is simply wrong and I will not stop fighting until we fully repeal the benefit cuts to legal immigrants enacted in 1996.

In spite of this major setback, we have achieved a number of important improvements for the Latino community. First, USDA will conduct a study on the possibility of bringing

the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico back into the national Food Stamp Program. Since 1982 Puerto Rico has received a fixed block grant amount for food assistance, rather than be a part of the U.S. program like the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. This block grant does not take into account changes in economic or demographic conditions, such as unemployment or the number of people who are in need of food assistance.

The poverty rate in Puerto Rico, 45 percent, is more than three times the national poverty rate. However, because of the block grant, Puerto Rico cannot afford to provide benefits to all households poor enough to qualify for benefits using Food Stamp Program standards. Instead, they have been forced to impose rigid eligibility criteria. For example, a family of four with net income above about $600 a month, or 34 percent of the Federal poverty level, cannot get any food assistance in Puerto Rico. The same family living in California, or any other State on the mainland, could have almost three times as much income and still be eligible for food assistance. An elderly person living alone faces an income limit of $192 per month—just 23 percent of the poverty level.

Clearly, some of our most vulnerable American citizens are at risk of being denied food assistance they greatly need. It seems just plain wrong to knowingly leave some Americans with insufficient food. With this study we hope to get a better understanding of what the local conditions are in Puerto Rico, in terms of food costs, poverty and other programmatic factors so that we can figure out how to address the issue in the next farm bill, or earlier if possible.

Another important achievement of the bill is to ensure that both Federal statute and regulations have the full force of law, ensuring that clients who do not receive adequate service under these rules and standards may bring suit. Recently, a district court in Ohio dismissed a case brought against the State to enforce the Department's regulations for serving people whose primary language is not English. I can't speak to whether the case had any merit, but my colleagues and I were surprised and disturbed to learn about the court's dismissal. We felt that it was critical to clarify in this bill that it has always been Congress's intent that the program's regulations should be fully enforceable and fully complied with to the same extent as the statute. The farm bill, therefore, clarifies that the Department's rules on serving non- and limited-English speaking people have the force of law and create rights for households.

Beyond the issue of bilingual access rules, this legislation makes clear that the Department's civil rights regulations are among those which have the full force of law and which households have the right to enforce. Discrimination is not acceptable in any form or at any point in the food stamp certification process. Households should not be assisted, or not assisted, approved or denied for any reason other than an individual assessment of their need for help or their eligibility by the state. I am pleased to be playing a role in making clear that the Committee and the Congress wish the program to be administered in compliance with the Food Stamp Act and its regulations.

I'd like to also talk about a somewhat related matter that we did not manage to agree to include in this farm bill, much to my disappointment. I worked hard to include in the House bill, and shepherd through the conference negotiations, a provision that would have strengthened the longstanding policy in the food stamp program that certification and eligibility decisions should be done by State employees, rather than private companies. We would have added to the traditional restrictions around merit systems and provided specific exceptions for certain activities, such as outreach. In recent years the Bush Administration has let two States, Texas and Indiana, experiment with using private companies to collect and review food stamp applications and conduct the sensitive eligibility interview. In my view, these projects are not consistent with current law or good sense. These experiments have been disastrous to the States' treasuries but, more importantly, to the vulnerable families and senior citizens who rely on food stamps and found their applications delayed or improperly denied. Some people even had their private, personal information shared inappropriately. The activities involved in determining eligibility—and ineligibility—for food stamps should be public functions and should not be governed by profit motive or a company's responsibility to its shareholders.

While the House voted to include this provision in the Conference agreement, the Senate did not because of opposition from the other party and a veto threat from President Bush, I regret this outcome and I am determined to not drop this issue until we have restored the proper balance to food stamp administration.

But I urge my colleagues to not forget, that separate from this "privatization" issue, in recent years States have been experimenting with a wide variety of changes to food stamp policies and practices that incorporate new technologies and modern business practices. For example, some States are using technology to create new pathways to apply for and retain benefits such as food stamps, health insurance, and child care, including online applications, online program redetermination or recertification, phone interviews, and call centers where changes in circumstances can be reported.

On the one hand, creating ways for families to participate in these programs without having to travel to a human service office can expand access and save time and money for States and families alike. In fact, in this bill we've created a new option for States to accept food stamp applications over the telephone. No doubt technology offers numerous opportunities for improved customer service and simpler application and retention processes.

On the other hand, if these processes are not well-designed, evaluated, and implemented, then families can face new access barriers. Moreover, some States are exploring these options at the same time that they are reducing human service staffing and closing local welfare offices. These steps can create new access barriers for certain groups of families and need to be carefully monitored. And I am concerned because neither States nor USDA appear to be asking the important questions about what has been the effect of these technological changes on access for food stamp households, particularly vulnerable populations like seniors, people with physical or mental disabilities, or people who do not speak English proficiently. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) last year published a report that found that USDA has not sufficiently monitored the States' "modernization" efforts in terms of their effects on program access, payment accuracy, or administrative costs.

So in this bill we have included several provisions to require that States that are eager to pursue modernized systems are pausing to ask the necessary questions about how to ensure that the new systems are designed in such a way that they are effective tools for connecting eligible families to benefits. In this bill we require USDA to establish standards for when States are making major changes in program operations and to monitor the effects on households, especially the types of households I just mentioned. I urge USDA to do this in a way that yields useful information so that States can refine and improve their systems to make them as accessible as possible to all clients.

Another provision requires States to adequately pilot test new computer systems before they go full-scale. This responds to situations where States have implemented new computer systems without adequate testing. This occurred even though some at USDA knew that there were weaknesses in the system and that serious benefit delays and errors were likely to occur. We also included a provision the Administration suggested to require States, instead of households, to repay any overissuances that occur because of one of these preventable major systems failures.

Finally, in light of all of the modernization changes and the potential access to sensitive information that new players may have, we strengthened the Act's privacy protections to ensure that anyone receiving confidential information for appropriate program purposes cannot then share that information with a third party. In addition to our fears that too many people may have access to private food stamp information as a result of new technology, we were also concerned that clients have not been able to access their private records. We heard about clients in Texas who had their benefits cut off, or who never were able to obtain benefits, and could not get access to their case records in order to pursue claims against the State. That is unacceptable. We also clarified that despite all of the changes in how States are storing and maintaining client records, clients can access these records in litigation. These changes are not in conflict because confidential records would continue to be unavailable to the general public and others not having a legitimate reason relating to program administration.

Another concern I have is about two new provisions that would disqualify certain people from food stamps for misusing their benefits. One relates to situations where a recipient of food stamps intentionally uses food stamp benefits to buy a product, like water, that is in a disposable container that can be redeemed for cash, then discards the product and redeems the container in order to obtain the cash deposit. The other new disqualification addresses individuals who intentionally purchase food with food stamp benefits in order to resell the food for a cash profit. I agree that both of these practices are contrary to the purposes of the food stamp program in assisting people in obtaining an adequate diet and it's appropriate to address them in this bill. However, I caution USDA to implement them in a way that ensures that only those who intended

to defraud the system in these manners be disqualified. I do not want to see innocent people—who may simply have bought groceries for a neighbor or relative be caught up as somehow engaging in fraud under this provision.

My concerns here are not completely without precedent. In this bill we are revisiting and clarifying a different disqualification rule that was enacted in 1996, and that has, in fact, ensnared innocent people and denied food stamp benefits in inappropriate ways. The intent of the law was to aid law enforcement and prevent criminals who are fleeing to avoid prosecution from receiving food stamps. Unfortunately, in practice, the provision has disqualified innocent people who had their identities stolen, or who have outstanding warrants for minor infractions that are many years old and where the police have no interest in apprehending and prosecuting the case.

So in this bill we direct USDA to clarify that people should only be subject to disqualification if they are actively fleeing law enforcement authorities who are, in fact, interested in bringing them to justice.

In addition to the very important changes we have made to the food stamp program and new funding for food banks through TEFAP, the bill would expand and improve the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act. This program has been receiving $9 million a year in mandatory funds and operates in 14 States. (Three Indian tribes also operate the program.)

Under the conference agreement, mandatory funding would increase to $40 million for the 2008–2009 school year and continue to grow. By 2012, the program would be funded at nearly eight times its current size: $150 million each year, with annual adjustments for inflation in years after that.

In addition to providing increased funding, the conference agreement takes important steps to target program funds to elementary schools with a significant share of low-income children. Our goal is to provide free fresh fruits and vegetables to all elementary schools in the country where more than half of the children are eligible for free or reduced price school meals. This program should expose a whole new generation of children to a healthy way of eating.

To sum up, I am extremely proud of the work that our Committee and our Congress have undertaken in the nutrition title of the farm bill. With these changes, we are building a healthier better fed population. As a result, we are taking a few important steps towards a stronger future for our children and our communities.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2419, the Food and Energy Security Act of 2007. This bipartisan piece of legislation will better reflect our values, strengthening American agriculture to meet the 21st century needs of the United States and the world with a safe, stable food supply.

I want to commend the work of the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, COLIN PETERSON, as well as the Senate chairman, Mr. HARKIN. Both men diligently worked to reconcile the differences in both the House and Senate versions of the bill. All of that hard work has paid off. This bill will ease the strain of rising food prices for millions of families, take a first step on much-needed reforms to farm payments, and make a substantial commitment to land conservation and to the fruit and vegetable industry.

Mr. Speaker, while these are important and positive provisions of this bill, I am particularly pleased with the nutrition titles of the bill. An additional $10.4 billion in new spending will be allocated for nutrition programs that help 38 million American families afford healthy food. In addition, there are many updates in the food stamp programs that reflect the current state of our economy. These critical food stamp provisions will help about 11 million people by 2012.

In particular, the reforms found in this bill benefit those individuals who need help. The bill helps these individuals adequately cover food expenses and sustains participants in the Food Stamp Program for the entire month. It also increases the minimum benefit for food stamp recipients, which is especially important for our senior citizens in need. I am also particularly proud that the 2008 Farm Bill extends the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, CSFP, of which my grandmother, the late Representative Julia Carson, was a champion. It is important to help the many low-income elderly individuals in need of additional assistance who are reluctant to apply for food stamps.

The legislation also goes far in addressing the health and nutrition needs of our children by increasing funding by $1.02 billion for the USDA Snack Program. Aiding schools in providing healthy snacks to students during after-school activities and expanding the program to all 50 States is something that Congress must do.

Mr. Speaker, I am also in support of the final bill because of its provisions addressing ethanol. It goes without saying that ethanol is helping to reduce fuel prices at the pump. The prices are almost 15 percent lower from where they might be if biofuel producers were not increasing output. The farm bill also invests $1 billion in renewable energy focusing on new technologies and new sources, including $320 million in loan guarantees for biorefineries that produce advanced biofuels and a new program to encourage the production of biomass for cellulosic ethanol and other energy production, helping producers learn how to harvest, store, and transport biomass to bioenergy facilities.

I am also highly supportive of the bill's increased funding for the Emergency Food Assistance Program, TEFAP, by $1.26 billion. I believe in providing commodities and other resources to States to help stock food banks. It is important that Congress continue to provide much-needed support to emergency feeding organizations, such as food banks, food pantries, and soup kitchens by increasing this funding for TEFAP.

Mr. Speaker, from increasing conservation programs by $7.9 billion, to containing provisions that help us meet global food shortages, this is a good bill. The bill is fully paid for and prevents further increases to the national debt. It expands food security programs, protects our vital natural resources, promotes healthier foods and local food networks, and reforms commodity and biofuel programs to reflect the priorities of the Nation.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the farm bill conference report. I would like to commend conference committee members for tackling the tough issues, offsetting costs, and producing a conference report that I can support.

To be sure, this is not a perfect bill. Yet, in my estimation, no amount of negotiation could produce a conference report that all would agree is perfect. Rather, what has emerged is a farm bill that is good for my home State of Colorado and good for the country.

For starters, this bill will provide millions of American families with access to healthy food. Nearly three-quarters of the bill's cost will support nutrition programs, including food stamps and emergency food assistance programs, as well as an initiative to provide fresh fruit and vegetables as healthy snack alternatives for a generation of schoolchildren currently battling an epidemic obesity problem.

This farm bill will help Colorado continue to lead in the development of homegrown energy programs that we need to help free us from our national addiction to oil and protect our environment. It increases investments in renewable energy technologies, while reducing the burdensome tax credit for corn-based ethanol and creating a new tax credit for the production of more efficient cellulosic biofuels.

Rural America can plant their fields with confidence, thanks to the farm bill's new disaster relief program, and this provision of the bill also might significantly lower future grocery bills by speeding up compensation for farmers subject to natural disaster and allowing them to bring crops to market faster.

In addition, American consumers will have added confidence knowing that this farm bill mandates critical food labeling for our meat supply, including country of origin, and improves oversight of USDA's enforcement of rules governing meat packers and stockyards.

Along with promoting safe food and renewable energy production, this legislation increases spending for conservation programs by nearly $8 billion. These programs will help protect agricultural lands from urban sprawl; enhance and protect our natural resources; encourage public access to private land; and protect sensitive wetlands and grasslands, areas that are especially vulnerable in Colorado's eastern plains.

Of particular interest to Colorado is that the farm bill includes provisions similar to those in a bill—H.R. 1182—I introduced dealing with the tax treatment of exchanges of mutual ditch stock. Mutual ditch companies are unique to Colorado and are organized for the mutual benefit of shared water rights rather than for profit. This provision allows for tax-free exchanges of shares of these mutual ditch companies.

Another measure included in the farm bill, which I supported during consideration in the House Natural Resources Committee, will protect domestic timber producers by stopping the flow of illegally logged foreign timber imported into the United States.

This bill will also help bolster America's international standing by helping to meet global food shortage demands. America is already the world's largest provider of food aid, but recent riots in developing nations around the world have shown that we must increase our efforts. This legislation will provide additional funding to purchase emergency food aid overseas, and reauthorizes the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program for infant, child and school nutrition programs in underdeveloped countries.

As I said before, this bill is not perfect. I applaud the conference committee for trimming subsidies for already wealthy farmers, but I would prefer tighter reform of these programs, especially at a time when consumers must sacrifice to afford increasing food costs. And any legislation of this size and scope—especially when it is developed as a compromise between the two Chambers—is likely to include provisions that might not deserve to pass on their own.

Taken in whole, however, the farm bill conference report successfully addresses the most important food and agricultural issues facing the Nation today, and fully pays for all new spending initiatives. I agree with the editorial board of the Denver Post, which wrote, ''this latest version of the Farm Bill is good for the entire country,'' and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MCHUGH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report to H.R. 2419, the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008. At this time, I would like to recognize the hard work of the Gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. PETERSON, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE, and the other conferees that culminated in the conference report before the House today. I also would like to take a moment to mention several items of interest to my constituents in northern and central New York.

Very simply, I could not overstate the importance of dairy farming to the economy of New York's 23rd Congressional District, which I represent. In fact, its importance is readily apparent when one considers that the 2002 Census of Agriculture reported there were 1,989 dairy farms with 188,305 milk cows in the 11 counties that comprise the district. Accordingly, I am pleased that the conference report extends and expands the Milk Income Loss Contract, MILC, Program, continues the Dairy Price Support and Dairy Indemnity Programs, and reauthorizes the Dairy Export Incentive Program.

The conference report also includes a provision to create a Northern Border Regional Commission, which I have been working on a bipartisan basis with the gentleman from Maine, Mr. MICHAUD, and others to enact because it will help further economic development. There is no question this assistance is needed, particularly when one considers that in 2000, seven of the 11 counties I have the privilege of representing had poverty rates in excess of the national rate of 12.4 percent and three—Franklin, Oswego and St. Lawrence counties—had poverty rates in excess of 14 percent. Similarly, from 2004 to 2006, eight of my constituent counties had unemployment rates in excess of the national average.

I was also pleased that the conference report will provide $466 million for the Specialty Crop Block Grant Program, $10 million annually for efforts to address colony collapse disorder in honey bees, grants and guaranteed loans for broadband development, tax incentives for agricultural businesses to enhance chemical security, and at least $1.19 billion for the Emergency Food Assistance Program. Finally, the conference report increases the amount available for direct loans to farmers and authorizes $120 million to fund pending rural infrastructure programs of importance to my constituents such as the Water and Waste Disposal Grants and the Rural Water and Wastewater Circuit Rider Programs.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I commend my good friend and colleague from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, for his leadership in bringing the Conference Report on H.R. 2419, the ''Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008,'' to the House. His outstanding work and dedication over the past year and a half have culminated in this important legislation, which includes critical authorizations for farm programs and addresses vital nutrition, conservation, and economic development needs across the Nation.

This Conference Report makes great strides in the fight against hunger by providing an additional $10.4 billion for nutrition programs, which help 35 million low-income families. For the first time in 30 years, the legislation increases the minimum benefit under the Food Stamp Program, which keeps 26 million of our Nation's poorest individuals from going hungry, and indexes the benefit amount to inflation. The Conference Report also provides an additional $1.3 billion for the Emergency Food Assistance Program to provide food banks, soup kitchens, and other emergency feeding sites with much needed resources. The Conference Report also includes $50 million for 2008, which is available immediately to address food shortages at a number of food banks.

The Conference Report also contains a number of provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, particularly economic and infrastructure development, which I strongly support. The House-Senate agreement voted on today represents a major step forward in delivering critical economic and infrastructure development assistance to the most chronically poor and economically distressed regions of the country. The Conference Report reauthorizes two existing regional economic development commissions and establishes three new regional economic development commissions in economically distressed areas of the Nation.

Section 6026 of the Conference Report reauthorizes the Northern Great Plains Regional Authority through fiscal year 2012 and provides $30 million per year to fully establish this Commission and fulfill the mission Congress intended when it was first authorized in FY 2002. The counties eligible for assistance under the Northern Great Plains Regional Authority, including those in my district, will greatly benefit from the grant funds and planning provisions included in the Conference Report. Section 6025 reauthorizes the Delta Regional Authority, DRA, through FY 2012 at current funding levels of $30 million per year, and includes 12 additional Louisiana parishes and Mississippi counties in the DRA.

The Conference Report also authorizes three new commissions—the Northern Border Regional Commission, the Southeast Crescent Regional Commission, and the Southwest Border Regional Commission—through FY 2012, at an authorization level of $30 million per year for each Commission. I commend Congressman HODES, Congressman MICHAUD, Congresswoman SHEA-PORTER, and other Members representing the Northeast region of the United States for their strong support of regional economic development and for their persistence in bringing this important issue to the attention of Conferees on the farm bill.

These three Commissions are established under a unified administration and management structure as developed in the Regional Economic and Infrastructure Development Act of 2007 (H.R. 3246). We moved this bill expeditiously through the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to the House floor, where, on October 4, 2007, it passed by a strong vote of 264–154. These administrative and management procedures are modeled after the highly successful Appalachian Regional Commission, provide for a consistent method for distributing economic development funds, and ensure a comprehensive regional approach to address problems of systemic poverty in the Nation's most severely distressed areas.

The Conference Report on H.R. 2419 also makes a number of important improvements to conservation programs, including increasing investment in conservation programs that take environmentally sensitive land out of farming and encourage environmentally friendly practices on working farmland. Water conservation provisions under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the final legislation include the creation of a new Chesapeake Bay Watershed Program, which provides a commitment of resources from the Department of Agriculture to restore, improve, and protect water quality throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed; and reauthorization of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act through 2012.

I am also pleased that the Conference Report includes a provision which I strongly support to assist small logging companies who are facing bankruptcy because they are not able to pay off their contracts on National Forest System land. The language contained in Section 8401 gives the Chief of the Forest Service the right to cancel or redetermine a qualified timber contract, and will help a number of small businesses who are suffering, particularly in light of the current housing downturn.

I am proud to lend my support to this important effort and commend Chairman PETERSON for his commitment and determination in getting this legislation to the President's desk.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support the Food and Energy Security Act of 2007 and I congratulate the Committee on providing a bill that includes needed and critical reforms that improve access to food and nutrition, provide more equitable access to research funding and renew America's commitment to conservation.

This bill correctly focuses on the people who need the most help. In fact, nearly three-quarters of the bill will be directed to nutrition programs that will assist 38 million American families afford healthy food. It updates that Food Stamp program and increases funding for food banks, food pantries and soup kitchens.

I am particularly encouraged that the bill increases agricultural research funding for Historically Black Colleges. This is important because minority institutions are usually left out when it comes to Federal research funding. As an example, I point to a Government Accountability Office study conducted in 2003 which indicated that 1890 Land Grant institutions received less than 2 percent of the competitive funding available from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This bill represents a step in the right direction.

The bill also provides for mandatory funding of the 2501 Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Outreach Program. This should

help to slow the troubling trend of significant land loss by African American and other socially disadvantaged producers.

Additionally, the bill significantly boosts spending for conservation programs to reduce soil erosion, enhance water supplies, improve water and air quality, increase wildlife habitat and reduce damage caused by floods and other natural disasters.

Of particular interest to my home State of North Carolina, fruit and vegetable producers will have their own place in the Farm Bill for the first time. The bill includes more than $1.3 billion to support research, pest management, trade promotion and nutrition for the industry.

Also of interest to North Carolina, this bill takes another important step in moving biofuels beyond focusing on corn. It reduces the current tax credit for corn-based ethanol by 6 cents per gallon and creates a new tax credit to promote the production of cellulosic biofuels.

While the Farm Bill may not be perfect, the good far outweighs any shortcomings.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2419, the Farm, Nutrition, and Bioenergy Act of 2007, better known as the Farm Bill. This measure, which reauthorizes federal agriculture and nutrition programs for five years, reflects Rhode Island's priorities: protecting our farmers and surrounding environment and caring for the most vulnerable members of our society.

There has been much discussion about reforming the Farm Bill, particularly with regard to how payments are structured to producers of certain commodities like cotton, rice and sugar. H.R. 2419 begins this process by lowering the annual adjusted gross income of farmers eligible for subsidies from $2.5 million to $750,000 and also excludes farmers making more than $500,000 from non-farm income. This structure will prevent millionaires from receiving farm subsidy benefits, and will also make payments transparent. While I believe we should go further with reform, I look forward to building on this restructuring in future legislation.

This legislation increases funding by nearly $8 billion for the conservation title, which includes programs important to Rhode Island, such as the Environmental Quality Incentive Program, the Farm and Ranchland Protection Program, and the Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program. I am also pleased that H.R. 2419 includes funding for specialty crops, which will benefit our fruit, vegetable and nursery crop farmers. These farmers, who make up a large percentage of Rhode Island's farming landscape, will now receive equal assistance and access to conservation programs.

H.R. 2419 includes over $10 billion in increased funding for the nutrition title, which includes food stamps and other programs aimed to combat hunger and improve nutrition for children, the elderly and low-income Americans. Unfortunately, these members of our society face a stigma when they realize they must turn to the government for assistance, and this Farm Bill works to end that by renaming the Food Stamp Program as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and replacing food stamp coupons with Electronic Benefit Transfer cards. This bill also reauthorizes programs such as the Community Food Projects program, which awards grants to nonprofit groups that establish community food projects targeted to low-income individuals, and the Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program, which provides vouchers for low-income seniors to purchase fruits and vegetables at farmers' markets.

This measure also increases funding for school nutrition programs, including the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program, which will help purchase fruits, vegetables and nuts, and create more avenues for produce to flow from local farmers to schools. This is especially important in Rhode Island, where state lawmakers and local organizations have already taken the initiative in improving the eating habits of our students. In 2007, 26 of 38 RI school districts participated in the Farm to School Program, where produce is purchased from local farms. This Farm Bill will help those school districts continue in a healthy direction.

H.R. 2419 also helps northeast dairy farmers, including those in Rhode Island, by extending the Milk Income Loss Contract Program, which compensates dairy producers when domestic milk prices fall below a certain level. Further, this measure encourages the expansion of renewable energy research and production, contains a new section for horticulture and organic agriculture, and includes funding to make sure our food supply is safe and stable.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a perfect bill; however, this Farm Bill helps farmers meet growing environmental challenges, gives consumers more healthy food choices, and promotes critical renewable energy development. It was also imperative that the Farm Bill take into consideration the country's current economic state. This bill will help stock food banks across our country by increasing funding to the Emergency Food Assistance Program by $1.26 billion. I look forward to passing this measure into law.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to a Farm Bill Conference Report (H.R. 2419) that will continue our wasteful agricultural policy for another five years. It is a rare day indeed that I agree with President Bush, but he is absolutely right to have issued a veto threat of this bill.

With farm income and food prices at or near record highs, now is the perfect time for reform. Unfortunately, this conference report, while masquerading as a reform package, simply tinkers around the edges of our bloated agri-business subsidies. Our current "farm policy" is little more than corporate welfare, with benefits flowing to large corporate operations at the expense of small farmers, both here and abroad, who actually need help. Under current policy the top 10 percent of recipients received 75 percent of all subsidies, while 67 percent of farms receive nothing. This is not good for rural communities, small farms, or taxpayers.

At best, this conference report represents "half a loaf," as the group Bread for the World has said. The conferees got the nutrition title right and I commend them for it. There are important changes to the eligibility rules for the food stamps program as well as a raise in the minimum benefit. These changes, along with increases in funding for emergency food aid will have a real impact on the millions of families who are struggling to put food on their tables. If all this bill contained were the nutrition title, I would proudly support it. For all the conference accomplished on nutrition, they failed in greater measure on reforming farm subsidies.

Proponents of the conference report argue that it represents "reform." They can't be serious. Under this so-called reform, farmers filing jointly could have an adjusted gross income, AGI, of $2.5 million, or $1 million if their only source of income is farm-related and they could still receive subsidies. This amounts to cutting off only 0.3 percent of farmers from the dole. The report does nothing to means test countercyclical payments. Furthermore, the report creates an entirely new $4 billion permanent disaster program that is not only wasteful and redundant, but will also encourage pushing marginal and environmentally sensitive land into production. This is not reform.

Real reform would mean eliminating all subsidizes for corn-based ethanol, which have driven up food costs around the world. Real reform would mean ending direct payments except for farmers who actually need assistance. By passing this bill, Congress is missing a golden opportunity to enact real reform. We should not wait another five years to make our farm policy equitable and responsible. By rejecting the conference report we can begin the important work of enacting a fair Farm Bill. I urge all of my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report on H.R. 2419, the Food and Energy Security Act of 2007.

With the U.S. economy faltering and food prices rising, this conference agreement takes critical steps to reduce hunger, ensure that healthy foods are included in federal nutrition programs, and meet the nutritional needs of many low-income Americans.

To help low-income families hit especially hard by high food prices, this legislation invests more than $7.8 billion in the food stamp program, now renamed the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

This commitment will slow the erosion of food stamp benefits caused by increasing food prices, provide food assistance to recipients without requiring them to spend down their education savings accounts and retirement plan assets, and increase food assistance to households with high child care expenses.

The bill also invests $1.25 billion in commodity purchases for food banks, which will strengthen emergency food assistance programs' efforts to serve needy families.

Our nation is facing a growing child obesity epidemic—an issue that demands strong efforts to improve the quality and nutritional value of foods offered through school meal programs.

H.R. 2419 includes important provisions that will expand children's access to healthy foods during the school day, and that will help inform our efforts to reauthorize the nation's child nutrition programs next year.

I am also pleased that this report increases the volume of fresh fruits and vegetables available through federally-supported domestic nutrition programs, and, as part of that, invests more than one billion dollars in expanding the fruit and vegetable snack program.

Thanks to this significant investment, the snack program, targeted primarily to low- income children and to schools that disproportionately serve low-income families, will now provide thousands of students in every state with greater access to healthy foods.

This bill also supports local food systems and farm-to-school programs by encouraging child nutrition programs to use a geographic

preference when purchasing foods—allowing schools and other programs to select more nutritious agricultural products such as fresh fruits and vegetables, dairy products, eggs and meat.

In addition, it will require the U.S. Department of Agriculture to conduct a national survey of the foods purchased by the school lunch programs.

Science and research overwhelmingly tell us that providing our children with healthy, nutritious foods from the earliest years on is one of the best things we can do to help our children succeed.

I am very pleased that all of the child nutrition provisions throughout this bill retain a focus on providing healthier foods and nutritional benefits as supported by scientific research.

When we last reauthorized the child nutrition programs in 2004, we required children in low-income households receiving food stamps to be automatically enrolled for free meals at school through a process known as ''direct certification.''

This simplification reduces work for school administrators, eliminates a duplicative application process for low-income families, and improves the accuracy of the school meal enrollment process.

We had hoped that school districts, states, and the USDA would do everything in their power to make sure that every eligible low-income child would benefit from this simplification. Unfortunately, the evidence to date indicates that the implementation of this provision has been inconsistent.

The USDA must act more aggressively to help states and school districts reach all children who could benefit from this coordination of efforts. This bill will ensure that we get information from USDA that will allow us to monitor this progress and promote best practices through their new annual reports on direct certification.

While this conference report contains many positive accomplishments, I am disappointed that it does not include a proposal from the House-passed bill that would ensure that public employees conduct eligibility determinations for food stamp benefits.

Without this proposal, the food stamp determination process will now be open to for-profit companies, many of which may be more focused on boosting efficiency and revenue than serving the best interests of vulnerable Americans.

The House provision would have re-established longstanding and productive public-private partnerships that help ensure that the right balance of private contractors and public employees are included in this process. It is frustrating that this was excluded from what is otherwise a very strong conference report.

By making the right investments to strengthen the quality of foods provided to our Nation's children, this bill is a down payment on a healthier future for this country.

I would especially like to thank Chairman PETERSON, Congressman GOODLATTE, and Senators HARKIN and CHAMBLISS for their hard work on this conference agreement.

The House Education and Labor Committee is committed to building on this effort to improve child nutrition in this country, and to ensure that the National School Lunch Program, the School Breakfast program, and the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants and children (WIC) are available to all eligible children and families.

I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman PETERSON for working tirelessly over the past year and a half to craft this farm bill—legislation that may not be perfect, but which takes our Nation in a new direction in agriculture policy.

This farm bill makes important reforms in the commodity title, while continuing to provide a safety net for our small- and mid-sized farmers—farmers like those I represent in southern Maryland.

The bill tightens payment limits, eliminates loopholes that have been exploited to get around those limits, and makes payments transparent by requiring direct attribution to a single individual.

I am proud that this bill takes important steps to ensure that our children and those in need will have the resources they need to live healthy lives.

Its nutrition title includes more than $10 billion to better stock food banks and pantries, provide healthy snacks to schoolchildren, and reform the food stamp program by tying it to inflation.

It is important to note that this bill also makes record investments in conservation, renewable energy, and rural development, which will enable our producers to better protect our environment and bolster economic development in our rural communities.

I am particularly pleased that this legislation includes $438 million in direct assistance over the next 10 years to help our farmers in their ongoing efforts to be good stewards of the Chesapeake Bay.

While we have been able to make some strides in our efforts to restore this magnificent estuary, it is clear that there is much work to be done.

Recently, the University of Maryland Center for Environment Science issued a report card which rated the bay's health a C-minus.

Ironically, this slight improvement over the previous year was largely due to drought conditions that limited nutrient and sediment runoff into the bay.

The funds included in this farm bill will help farmers throughout the watershed control erosion and reduce sediment and nutrient levels. Their efforts will help enhance, restore, and conserve this ecologically significant habitat.

The legislation also directs the Secretary of Agriculture to give special consideration to producers in specific, targeted river watersheds, including those of the Potomac and the Patuxent.

Our concerted effort to restore these significant tributaries will go a long way to bolstering the health of the great body of water into which they all empty—the Chesapeake Bay.

Finally, I want to express my support for the Enhanced Use Lease Authority Pilot Program. This program seeks to create a national model at the National Agricultural Library and our Nation's flagship agricultural research facility—the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center. This program will enable them to partner onsite with public and private facilities to enhance the mission of USDA–ARS and address much needed facilities upgrades in a timely and efficient fashion.

Again, I want to congratulate Chairman PETERSON on this bill—a farm bill that will be noted for putting America's agricultural policy on the right track and laying the foundation for more far reaching reforms in the future.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of rural Missouri, let me take this opportunity to share my support for the 2008 farm bill.

I commend Chairman PETERSON and Ranking Member GOODLATTE for producing a balanced and bipartisan bill that would bring a level of stability to commodity markets and ensure farmers throughout the United States can make long-term business decisions.

Important to farm families in the Show-Me State, the 2008 farm bill would extend the farm program safety net for producers while also reforming eligibility requirements and strengthening payment limitations for those who receive farm program payments. While I cannot overemphasize the importance of having a safety net in place to help farmers recoup some expenses associated with agricultural production and to ensure they are not put out of business if markets collapse, I am pleased that reforms were made to address some concerns of the administration and other farm program critics.

In addition to ensuring a strong safety net, the farm bill would make historic commitments to food security and nutrition, expand conservation, promote rural development, streamline agricultural research, and invest in renewable energy.

The farm bill would make essential commitments to the health of the American people and would help families in need by boosting nutrition funding by over $10 billion. In Missouri and elsewhere, food pantries are short of food and low-income Americans are having a difficult time affording groceries. The legislation would allocate resources to food banks, modernize the food stamp program, expand farmers' markets, extend food programs for low-income senior citizens and pregnant women, promote student health, and fight obesity.

The farm bill would expand popular conservation programs designed to preserve farmland, improve water quality, and enhance soil conservation, air quality, and wildlife habitat. In Missouri, the Conservation Reserve Program, the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, and the Wetlands Reserve Program, among others, have allowed farmers to more easily address conservation problems and comply with expensive, but important, environmental regulations.

By expanding USDA rural development loans and grants, the farm bill would foster critical investments in small town America. The measure would improve rural Internet broadband access, expand first responder and emergency medical services in rural areas, and authorize grants for weather radio transmitters to alert rural citizens about coming storms. It would also provide grants for drinking water and wastewater improvements, foster rural small business development, and provide for greater value-added loans and grants for small farmers.

With respect to research and development, the farm bill would create a National Institute of Food and Agriculture within the U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA, to maximize coordination throughout USDA's research

agencies. The bill would also create the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative to stimulate business development and access to capital in rural America and create the Energy Research Program to improve research on the production and sustainability of biofuels, like ethanol and biodiesel. Additionally, the bill would address concerns raised by livestock producers and others regarding the high cost of corn by slightly reducing the corn ethanol producers' tax credit and creating a subsidy to accelerate commercialization of advanced biofuels, like cellulosic ethanol.

Also important to Missourians, the farm bill would continue price supports for dairy farmers and increase funding for fruit and vegetable producers. It also contains the first-ever Livestock Title, which would increase market access for small, state-inspected meat processing plants, better protect producers who have contracts with livestock firms, and better enforce the Packers and Stockyards Act. Additionally, the legislation would require that all meat sold to American consumers have a country-of-origin label. But, importantly, this labeling agreement represents a compromise that would simplify record keeping and other requirements associated with the law.

The farm bill would also prohibit the closure or relocation of county Farm Service Agency offices for 2 years, would encourage additional funding directed to Historically Black Colleges, like Lincoln University in Jefferson City, and would establish an Office of Homeland Security within USDA to better protect our Nation from terrorist attacks aimed at America's agricultural sector.

The people of Missouri and Americans from all walks of life do well by the 2008 farm bill. I am pleased to lend my support to it and hope it will pass the House with broad, bipartisan support. I further hope that the President of the United States will reconsider his threat to veto the farm bill, which would be a disservice to rural Americans and to low-income citizens of our Nation who would benefit from the bill's commitment to food security.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the nutrition title of the pending conference report. It includes many urgently needed improvements to our food assistance programs for low-income people.

As a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I am particularly pleased to see this title includes language to correct a couple of problems that have arisen relating to the enforceability of the act and to ensure that no further problems exist.

The Food Stamp Act has long been recognized as fully enforceable on behalf of active and prospective participants. This history of enforceability is comparable to that of securities regulations, which the courts have long accepted. When, many years ago, a panel of the Fifth Circuit found no private right of action under the Food Stamp Act in a case brought by a pro se plaintiff, several other circuits, and ultimately the Fifth Circuit en banc, rejected that conclusion. Had they not done so, I have no doubt we would have intervened.

Recently, a couple of Federal courts cast doubt on this long-held principle, one by finding the Department's regulations on bilingual service unenforceable and another by forcing plaintiffs to meet the high standards for supervisory liability when suing a State to enforce the act and regulations against local agencies. I am pleased that this legislation overrules both of those decisions.

More broadly, the legislation recognizes that lawsuits by individual households or classes of household to enforce their rights under the act and regulations are an important part of the program. There now should be no doubt, if there ever was any, that all provisions of the act and regulations that help individuals get food assistance, or that protect them from burdens in their pursuit of food aid, are intended to create enforceable rights, with corrective injunctions or back benefits, the latter subject to the limitations in the act, as appropriate.

The act does not require States or the Department only to exercise reasonable efforts or to substantially comply with its requirements and those in the regulations: it gives each individual a right to be treated as the act and rules provide. The act and regulations have an unmistakable focus on the benefited class of participants and prospective participants, they are written in mandatory, not precatory terms, and they are concerned with the treatment of individuals as much as they are with aggregate or system-wide performance.

I cannot imagine how Congress could be any clearer in this regard. I anticipate that we will have no further confusion concerning the enforceability of the act and regulations.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, because I believe that this legislation represents a missed opportunity to modernize the regulation of our Nation's futures and securities markets, I am unable to sign this conference report.

Section 13106 of the conference report directs the members of the President's Working Group on Financial Markets, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC, and the Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, CFTC, to work to ensure that by September 30, 2009, the SEC and CFTC take action under their existing authorities to permit risk-based portfolio margining for security options and security futures products. Depending on when this bill is approved and signed into law, the agencies would have roughly 16 months to achieve this directive. Because the SEC and CFTC have a fundamental disagreement over how to proceed, there is no guarantee that a legislative directive to reconcile their differences will yield a breakthrough in what has become a longstanding turf battle between the two agencies over this issue.

Chairman FRANK, Mr. KANJORSKI and I proffered a solution to this regulatory impasse during conference that would create a clear pathway the agencies must follow in order to realize a state-of-the-art portfolio-based margining system for customers of broker-dealers. Our targeted amendment to the Securities Investor Protection Act, SIPA, would extend Securities Investor Protection Corporation, SIPC, insurance to futures positions held in a portfolio margining account under an SEC-approved program, thereby significantly advancing the goal of risk-based portfolio margining.

Our amendment is consistent with recent recommendations by the Treasury Department in its Blueprint for a Modernized Financial Regulatory Structure, which found that "the realities of the current marketplace have significantly diminished the original reason for the regulatory bifurcation between the futures and securities markets." As Treasury has recognized, there are many policy issues—portfolio margining included—where a lack of action has placed U.S. markets at a competitive disadvantage to other markets that do not draw the same artificial distinctions between securities and futures products.

Portfolio margining recognizes the risk-reducing effects of offsetting or hedged positions in calculating customer margin. Thus, a portfolio margin system should align a customer's total margin requirement, the amount of money they have to put up in order to fund their investment positions, with the actual risk the customer is taking.

Today, the portfolio margin rules already allow futures positions on broad-based securities indexes such as the S&P 500 to be used to hedge offsetting securities positions such as options and exchange traded funds on the same index. There is uncertainty about how these existing portfolio margin rules fit within the regime that protects investors in the event of the liquidation of their broker-dealer. SIPA governs such liquidations, which specifically excludes futures from the definition of a "security." Single stock securities futures are not excluded as they are both futures and securities.

Consequently, if a broker-dealer carrying portfolio margin accounts failed, its customers' net equity claims would not include the value of futures positions in a portfolio margin account. This could result in situations where gains in the futures positions are not allowed to offset losses in the securities positions, thereby reducing the protection the customer would be entitled to under SIPA. It also would create severe operational challenges as the customers' futures positions would need to be unwound separately from the offsetting securities positions.

Some have argued that the Financial Services Committee's approach to solving this problem would somehow prejudice the so-called "one-pot/two-pot" debate over whether futures should be allowed to be kept in a securities account. It does not. Allowing futures into a securities account would still require action by the CFTC. Our language would simply provide uniform investor protection in the event of a liquidation of a broker-dealer with portfolio margin accounts for whatever assets are in the securities account.

I am disappointed that the CFTC and the Agriculture Committee rejected the Financial Services Committee's proposal, the adoption of which would enhance the competitiveness of the U.S. markets and streamline financial services regulation. While I will not be able to sign a conference report that does not incorporate our language, I will continue to work with Mr. KANJORSKI and other members of the Financial Services Committee to eliminate inefficiencies and redundancies in our current financial regulatory regime that place U.S. firms at a competitive disadvantage internationally.

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and congratulate him on successfully bringing this conference report to the floor after many months of hard work and committed effort. I also thank him for his prior support for inclusion of a muck soils conservation program to address serious challenges being faced by the farmers in my district and throughout the country. Although such language was included in the version of this bill passed by the House, it was unfortunately not able to survive the conference negotiations.

Currently available conservation programs have shown that they do not specifically address the needs of farmers who produce crops

on muck soil. The existing Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, CREP, seeks to prevent erosion and protect water quality through a voluntary retirement program. In areas like the Hudson Valley, this has created unintended consequences including the full retirement of productive soil and inflationary pressures on rental rates.

The program included in section 2303 of the House version of the bill, which would have sought to meet conservation goals with practices that would also keep these lands active and address local rent pressures, will not become law as part of this bill, but the needs it was meant to address remain. Similarly, efforts to make changes in future CREP contracts at the administrative level will not address the rent inflation that has been created in places like Orange County, NY, by contracts that are in place today and will have standing for several years.

The issues of unintended land retirement and rent inflation are ongoing challenges for farmers in my district, who as farmers in the Northeast, growers of specialty crops, and producers of muck land crops have been thrice underserved by previous farm bills.

The chairman has been extraordinarily understanding and supportive of efforts to address these challenges. Again, I thank him for his efforts and ask if he would be willing to continue our work on this issue and to work with USDA on solutions that will meet the conservation goals of farmers on muck soils and address the unintended economic consequences of existing programs.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2419, a $289 billion bill which will subsidize wealthy farmers and agribusiness, increase welfare benefits, violate pay-go rules, and will not dent our current energy needs, all paid for by the American taxpayer.

Folks, this country is facing an impending entitlement crisis. In the next few years millions of baby boomers will begin to retire and begin collecting Social Security and Medicare benefits. However, the Congressional Budget Office projects that Social Security will begin to pay out more in benefits than it takes in payroll taxes by 2020, and Medicare spending, that is already 13 percent of our Nations budget, will double over the next 10 years. Yet, this Democrat lead Congress sees fit to grant farm subsidies to farmers who are making up to $2.5 million in income per year.

As crop prices soar, American farm incomes are achieving record highs. Since enactment of the last farm bill in 2002, key crop prices have grown as much as 281 percent, and total farm income has more than doubled. More and more farmers are now multimillionaires. With $20 billion in increased spending, this bill irresponsibly wastes taxpayer dollars by subsidizing an industry whose profits are soaring. The evidence is clear; the Department of Agriculture estimates that the 2007 farm income was $87.5 billion, which totals a 48 percent increase from the previous year's level of $59 billion.

The search for alternative energy sources is vital to our country's national and economic security. However, this farm bill will extend tax and tariff subsidies for ethanol, while keeping in place the Federal ethanol mandate. This has directly resulted in the price of a bushel of corn in this country to triple and has failed to ease our energy crisis. The ethanol mandate to produce alternative energy has pushed up the prices not only of corn, but also of crops such as soybeans that have been abandoned by many farmers during this current corn-planting bonanza. Despite these steep price increases, large subsidies for these crops will continue under this wasteful bill and rising food costs will continue to be thrown upon our citizens.

I support our country's farmers and agree that a Federal farm program should be in place to alleviate farming poverty. However, with crop prices rising to record-breaking levels, and farm incomes doubling over the past 7 years, I cannot support a bill that seeks to subsidize multimillionaire farmers on the backs of tax paying Americans.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, section 12017 of H.R. 2419, the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, amends the Federal Crop Insurance Act. Among other things, the changes provide that, during periodic renegotiations with USDA's Federal Crop Insurance Corporation regarding the standard reinsurance agreement for the FCIC's crop insurance program, approved insurance companies may consult with each other, and collectively with the FCIC.

As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I would like to provide a bit of background, and to sound a cautionary note.

For a number of years, insurance companies participating in providing reinsurance to the FCIC—that is, providing back-up insurance to the insurance being provided by the FCIC—did indeed consult with each other, and collectively with the FCIC. This occurred most recently in the 1997 renegotiation. In fact, the insurers apparently used a common agent to negotiate the terms of the agreement on their behalf.

I understand that that experience may have led USDA's Risk Management Administration, which runs the FCIC, to begin reconsidering whether joint discussions were a good idea from a competitive standpoint, in achieving the best result with the taxpayers' dollars that the FCIC was spending in the reinsurance marketplace. In any event, the RMA evidently discussed the matter at some length with the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, and came away with the clear conviction that joint negotiations are anticompetitive—as experience under the antitrust laws confirms time and time again.

As a result of its new understanding, the RMA restricted the kinds of collaborative consultations it would permit during the 2004 renegotiation.

Some may believe that the RMA either went further than it needed to in 2004, or that it may go further in future renegotiations, prohibiting consultation even on aspects of the renegotiation that not only are not competitively sensitive, but where the antitrust laws recognize that cost-saving efficiencies can be gained without harm to competition. To the extent that that has been a concern, the new language being added to the Federal Crop Insurance Act may help clear the way for that kind of competitively benign consultation.

I wish to emphasize, however, that the new language does not create an antitrust exemption, or alter the antitrust laws in any way. The Supreme Court has aptly referred to the antitrust laws as the Magna Carta of our free enterprise system, and has said repeatedly that exceptions to those laws are not to be lightly inferred. Therefore, any insurer wishing to engage in consultations pursuant to this new authorization should be careful to do so in compliance with the antitrust laws.

Some observers have raised the question whether some of the conduct that could be at issue here might be covered under the McCarran-Ferguson Act's antitrust exemption for the business of insurance, to the extent that such business is regulated by State law. It is far from clear, however, that reinsurance being provided to the USDA's FCIC for its federally administered crop insurance program is in fact regulated by State law. And even if it were, the McCarran-Ferguson Act does not apply to the antitrust prohibitions against boycott, which can all-too-easily be implicated when competing firms start coordinating their negotiation-related activities and strategies. These are serious violations of the law, and those who would seek to avoid the pitfalls here would be well advised to seek appropriate antitrust guidance.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored legislation to allow farmers who grow fruit and vegetables for processing to opt out of farm programs on an acre for acre basis without limitation. That legislation would reduce farm program costs and improve the environment by allowing more extensive crop rotations. I am very pleased that the conference report takes a step toward that proposal by establishing a pilot project to allocate 75,000 acres of new authority for production of fruit and vegetables for processing in specified Midwestern states. USDA has broad discretion in administration of this pilot project to meet the objectives of the pilot project. The conference report does not specify a procedure for allocation of the pilot project acreage or other administrative matters, such as reallocation of unused acreage allocations among States. However, USDA is clearly required to establish rules to assure that this additional fruit and vegetable production authority will not be abused. Only fruit and vegetables under contract for processing are to be produced under this authority. USDA is to assure that all of the crop produced is delivered to a processor and that the quantity of crop delivered under the original contract, the contract in existence upon Farm Service Agency certification, does not exceed the quantity that is produced on the contracted acreage. Further, the effects of the pilot project and FAV restrictions on the specialty crop industry, both fresh and processed, are to be evaluated. These restrictions are intended to ensure protection of the objectives of the pilot project, not to compel food waste or excessive regulatory burden. Further, the conference report includes an important statement of policy indicating that in the next recalculation of base acreage, fruit and vegetable production will not cause a reduction in farmer's base acreage. While this is a timid step in reducing restrictions on production of fruits and vegetables, I commend this step in the right direction.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2419, the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008.

Mr. Speaker I must state from the beginning—I have never been a strong supporter of the previous farm bills that we have considered.

I and many of my constituents have long believed that the Federal Government wastes far too much taxpayer money on subsidizing farmers and farm programs.

While it is true that many small scale farmers should be protected during cyclical downturns, far too much Federal funding is spent subsidizing large scale agribusiness and wealthy farmers who don't need our support.

That being said, I appreciate the efforts of the committee to address some of the unnecessary spending in this bill. However I had hoped they would have gone further to reform farm bill programs.

The reason I am able to support the conference report is because it does include a very robust nutrition title that provides $10.361 billion in funding which will support 38 million families to purchase healthy foods.

Among the key nutrition items included in the bill:

The food stamp program is modernized to help an additional 11 million people by 2012.

The Emergency Food Assistance program is expanded and indexed for inflation to help support food banks, soup kitchens and homeless shelters.

The bill also provides $1 billion to help schools provide free fruits and vegetables to schoolchildren.

These and other improvements to nutrition programs in the farm bill will provide much needed funding to groups like the Alameda County Community Food Bank and the Berkeley Food and Housing Project in my district.

The conference report is also supported by a number of organizations, including the California Association of Food Banks, California Food Policy Advocates, California School Employees Association, National Council of Jewish Women, Congressional Hunger Center, AARP, ACORN, Families USA, National Association of Social Workers, National Association of Counties, and the Center for Law and Social Policy.

Mr. Speaker, despite my concerns about continuing unnecessary subsidies, I believe the robust nutrition title in the conference report deserves our support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1189, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CANTOR

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. CANTOR. I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cantor moves to recommit the conference report to accompany the bill H.R. 2419, to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes, to the committee on conference of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to strike (1) section 8303, relating to the sale and exchange of National Forest System land, Vermont, (2) section 12034, relating to fisheries disaster assistance, and (3) section 15316, relating to qualified forestry conservation bonds.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I think Congress should act to reform the earmark process.

That's why I have introduced H.R. 595, the Stimulating Leadership in Limiting Expenditures (or 'SLICE') Act, which would provide the president with a constitutionally-sound version of a line-item veto that could be used to force Congress to vote separately on any specific spending earmark.

That's why I am a cosponsor of legislation (H. Res. 727) to put a moratorium on considering any bill with any congressional earmarks until a bipartisan panel has been set up and made recommendations for that reform.

And that's why I am also cosponsoring the Earmark Transparency and Accountability Act (H.R. 631) which would require any earmark, to be effective, to be included in a bill's text—not just in a committee report—so it would be subject to amendment.

But I cannot support this motion to recommit.

If we were considering this legislation for the first time, it might make sense to consider sending it back to the Agriculture Committee for revisions.

But we first considered this bill a year ago. Since then, the Senate has also acted and the differences between their version and the one we passed last year have been resolved by a committee of conferees appointed for that sole purpose.

That purpose was fulfilled when the conferees filed their report, and at that point the conference committee ceased to exist.

So, this motion would not really send the conference report back for more work—it would send it into oblivion.

And while I know the conference report has flaws, I think they are not so great as to require us to in effect tear it up completely.

So I urge rejection of this motion.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the conference report, and motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 1133.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 193, nays 230, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 314]

YEAS—193

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

NAYS—230

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
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 (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Bono Mack
Cramer
Crenshaw
Gerlach
Lewis (KY)
Mack
Myrick
Pickering
Rush
Schmidt
Weller

□ 1601

Messrs. PALLONE, HOYER, BERRY, FARR, FOSTER, HODES and LARSON of Connecticut changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. WELDON of Florida, BACHUS, MORAN of Virginia, BURGESS and TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 318, noes 106, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 315]

AYES—318

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gallegly
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
Kingston
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (OH)
Wittman (VA)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—106

Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boehner
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capuano
Castle
Chabot
Cooper
Culberson
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Goode
Granger
Harman
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Hobson
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lungren, Daniel E.
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCrery
McDermott
McHenry
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Nunes
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Reichert
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Saxton
Scalise
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Stark
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Wamp
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Bono Mack
Cramer
Crenshaw
Gerlach
Lewis (KY)
Mack
Myrick
Rush
Schmidt
Weller

□ 1607

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2419.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL SHOOTOUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the event conducted by the bipartisan Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, last year the Democrats won the Congressional Shootout, the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus trophy, between sporting clays, trap and skeet, and the Democrats thought that there was a realignment occurring in Congress, in America. They thought they were on a good run for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to say this year that the Republicans reclaimed the trophy and won the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus Shootout this year. The realignment was very short-lived.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, I would like to, on behalf of my co-chairman Mr. KIND from Wisconsin; the vice chairmen, Mr. PEARCE from New Mexico and Mr. BOREN from Oklahoma, I would like to give particular note to the people who really shot straight yesterday.

Top gun: Congressman HAYES only dropped a few clays all day.

Top Republican: Congressman JOHN KLINE, Minnesota.

Top Democrat: Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON.

Top Sporting Clays: Congressman MIKE ROSS.

Top Trap: Congressman DON YOUNG.

And Top Skeet: MIKE THOMPSON.

All together, a good bipartisan effort, but more to the point, the Republicans reclaimed the trophy and reversed the realignment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING WINONA STATE UNIVERSITY ON WINNING THE 2008 DIVISION II MEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1133, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1133, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 316]

YEAS—413

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
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
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Andrews
Bachmann
Bono Mack
Carnahan
Cramer
Crenshaw
DeGette
Ellison
Feeney
Gerlach
Gordon
Lewis (KY)
Mack
Myrick
Rush
Schmidt
Smith (NJ)
Walden (OR)
Weller
Wu

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1618

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF FARM PROGRAMS

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6051) to amend Public Law 110–196 to provide for a temporary extension of programs authorized by the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 beyond May 16, 2008, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEINER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6051

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

SECTION 1. ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS AND SUSPENSION OF PERMANENT PRICE SUPPORT AUTHORITIES.

Effective May 16, 2008, section 1 of Public Law 110–196 (122 Stat. 653) (as amended by Public Law 110–200 (122 Stat. 695), Public Law 110–205 (122 Stat. 713), and Public Law 110–208 (122 Stat. 720)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''May 16, 2008'' and inserting ''the earlier of May 23, 2008, or the date of the enactment of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ''May 16, 2008'' and inserting ''the earlier of May 23, 2008, or the date of the enactment of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008''.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2008.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Under Clause 2(g) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Ms. Deborah M. Spriggs, Deputy Clerk and Mr. Robert F. Reeves, Deputy Clerk, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which they would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 110th Congress or until modified by me.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

PROVIDING FOR ADOPTION OF S. CON. RES. 70, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1190 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1190

Resolved, That the House hereby (1) takes from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 and 2010 through 2013, (2) adopts an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of House Concurrent Resolution 312, as adopted by the House, (3) adopts such Senate concurrent resolution, as amended; (4) insists on its amendment; and (5) requests a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 Washington, my very, very good friend, Mr. HASTINGS. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 1190 provides for the adoption of the Senate budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 70, with an amendment consisting of the House-passed budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 312. It also provides that the House request a conference with the Senate.

This rule simply allows the House to move quickly and efficiently to a conference on the budget resolution. Let me be clear, the minority still has the right to offer a motion to instruct conferees, and they still have the ability to defeat this rule, denying the opportunity to begin a conference on the budget resolution.

It's a simple and straightforward rule that allows the House to do what the American people sent us here to do, legislate. The American people don't want the partisan infighting that is being perpetrated by the minority in this Chamber. Time after time the American people have spoken, and their voices are being heard loud and clear. They want action, not disruption. They want us to do our job. And this rule will allow us to do just that.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my very, very, very good friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this rule is redundant and totally unnecessary. The House doesn't need to pass this rule to go to conference with the Senate. Democrats already have all the power they need to go to conference on the budget. The Budget Committee chairman already has the ability to make a motion to go to conference, and a rule that this House passed 2 months ago also provides that authority. We have already done this with the rule, H. Res. 1036, which my very, very, very good friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, managed only a couple of months ago. There is no reason for the House to be considering this rule, except perhaps one, Mr. Speaker, and that's so that the Democrat majority can deny Republicans their rights as the minority party.

Democrats are going to get their way at the end of the day; majorities always do that. But in putting this rule on the floor, Democrats are saying that they needn't even bother with respecting minority rights. This rule exists solely as an abuse of power.

Mr. Speaker, when Democrats won control of the Congress in 2006, they promised the American people that they would run the most open and honest House in history. They would seek to work in a bipartisan manner. Instead of keeping that promise, the Democrat majority has stooped to depths and gone to extremes that no previous majority in the House has ever dared. When it comes time to shutting down debate, silencing ideas, restricting minority rights, ignoring rules they themselves wrote, and running the House in a top-down, shut-up, sit-down manner, this Democrat majority has no peer.

The Democrat promise to run the most open, honest House in history has been revealed as a hollow charade. They have passed more closed rules that block all amendments and debate than any House in history. They wrote new rules to prohibit votes from being held open to change the vote's outcome, and then violated that rule time after time. They passed new rules to ensure House and Senate conference committees are more open and public, but instead they turn around and retreat even further behind closed doors. They almost totally abandon even holding conference committees.

Mr. Speaker, why is this rule suddenly on the House floor today? Why the sudden interest of Democrats in the House to go to conference with the Senate on a budget? The House passed their version of the budget on March 13. The Senate passed their version on March 14. Today is May 14. Why didn't we go to conference 2 months ago? Never mind, of course, that the law sets April 15 as the deadline for Congress to pass a final budget resolution. The facts are that this House could and should have gone to conference 2 months ago. But Democrats have instead hid behind closed doors to negotiate, bargain and cut deals to write a final budget.

By reading media reports, Mr. Speaker, it appears the Democrat majority in the House and Senate have reached a final agreement on the final budget for fiscal year 2009. That agreement will apparently increase spending by billions of dollars and include the largest tax increase in history. So now they apparently are going to go to a phony conference after all the true tax and spend work has been done in secret. Mr. Speaker, they aren't doing this to be more open and honest. They are doing this to force through their plan to massively increase taxes and increase government spending.

Mr. Speaker, the news media also reports that the Democrat majority has abandoned another of their promises it made to the American people when they wrote the new law for the House that is known as PAYGO. This is a rule that was sought by the Blue Dog Democrats. This rule places a blanket requirement that any bill that lowers taxes or increases spending must be correspondingly offset. Under the secret budget agreement, it appears that the Democrat PAYGO rule was jettisoned.

Blue Dog Democrats have given up on their rule and their PAYGO principle. They traded an enforceable House rule for a meaningless promise from a Senator. It's meaningless because everyone knows that this one Senator will in all likelihood be overridden by his Senate colleagues. Mr. Speaker, one can respect my colleagues

on the other side of the aisle for standing on principle, but this is a principle that's being abandoned.

This rule isn't necessary. The Democrats already have all the power they need to go to conference. So the only reason we are here is because the majority is trying to restrict the rights of the minority to be heard and for the Republicans to have a fair opportunity to offer alternative proposals to legislation Americans care about most, taxing and spending.

We are being blocked, shut down, and unfairly restricted in our rights. And as a result, our constituents will potentially be subjected to higher taxes and more government spending. I really don't think Americans want that.

When it comes to Democrat plans for billions of dollars in new government spending, Republicans have the right to protest, to demand votes in the House, to have the voices of Members representing almost half of this country to be heard.

□ 1630

We especially have the right to protest the Democrat majority's writing of a $200 billion appropriations bill that just completely skips over any hearing or markup in the Appropriations Committee. Instead of passing a bill to fund our troops who are fighting to protect America, Democrats are short-circuiting the legislative process, shutting out Republicans and larding the bill up with billions and billions of dollars of unrelated spending.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, upstairs in the Capitol on the third floor, the House Rules Committee is meeting to consider this massive $200 billion supplemental spending bill. The text of this bill was just released an hour before the committee met. It never went before the Appropriations Committee. Republicans have obviously just had minutes to read the bill. This is wrong and is abuse of power by the Democrat majority. The American people deserve to have a more open process on how their tax dollars are spent.

So, Mr. Speaker, I repeat again that this rule is totally unnecessary. Democrats already have the power to go to conference. They're just 2 months late in doing so. The Democrats have broken their promise to the American people to operate the House in an open and honest manner. They are conspiring in secret to write a budget that increases taxes by the largest amount in history and use a vital troop funding bill to try to pass billions and billions of new dollars in unrelated government spending.

So for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID DAVIS).

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I'm glad we're talking about the budget, but I will tell you the budget I want to talk about right now is the budget of the American family and small businesses and the middle class across America.

I was just in Elizabethton, Tennessee, over the weekend back at Whitson's Barber Shop, and I can tell you the issue that is on people's minds right now is not more taxes and more spending; it's the need for a true energy policy in America. An energy policy that actually uses American energy. We need a policy that will stop taxing and spending. We need an energy policy that will break our dependence on foreign oil.

Right now we're buying our energy from people that hate us, hate our freedoms, and, quite frankly, hate our religion. We need to go back to the drawing board and have an energy plan that uses American energy. I'm talking about clean coal technology. I'm talking about drilling off the Outer Continental Shelf. I'm talking about drilling in ANWR. I'm talking about wind technology. I'm talking about building safe nuclear plants. Those are the things that will bring down the cost at the pumps.

We have moms and dads right now that are worried about how they're going to get their children to school in the mornings. They're worried about how they're going to put food on their kitchen table. That's the budget that the American people are concerned about. The American people are looking for solutions. They are not looking for big government, inside the beltway in Washington. The American people are looking for solutions to make sure that we keep government as small as possible, and they're looking to make sure that we pass an energy policy that actually uses American energy. It's time for no more excuses. It's time for us to pass an energy bill that will give some relief to the American family.

It's basic economics. I talk to schools all across my district when I go home, and it's basic economics. You can talk to any high school student. They will understand supply and demand. If you have a lot of a supply and a little bit of demand, the cost will go down; and, conversely, if you have a lot of demand for a limited supply, cost will go up. Right now we have a demand for a lot of energy, a lot of oil. And right now we're dependent on the Middle East, on Venezuela, on Russia, other countries; and we're actually begging the Middle East to increase their energy production. And we have policies here in Washington that won't allow us to use our own American natural resources in energy.

The American people want solutions. They want solutions now. And they don't want it in taxing and spending. It's time for no more excuses. We need an energy plan that uses American energy.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire from my very good friend from Massachusetts if he has any more requests for time on his side.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Thank you for inquiring. I'm it.

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

I would like to ask my good friend from Massachusetts just a very straight-up question, and I will be happy to yield to him.

Why are we addressing and debating this redundant rule today?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Thank you for yielding.

We are debating this rule today to do the people's business, to expedite the process so we can move to a conference on the budget resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, of course, which we already did on H. Res. 1036, which my good friend managed on the floor here just a couple of months ago.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk about an issue that's been talked a great deal about here on the House floor by colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and I certainly hear about it when I go home.

Mr. Speaker, since the Democrats took control of Congress in January of 2007, the cost of gasoline has risen to record-setting prices. In fact, the cost of gasoline has gone up more in 16 months than it had gone up in the prior 6 years. According to a report from just 2 days ago by AAA in my State of Washington, the price for a gallon of gasoline is at a record $3.80. That's 26 cents higher than it was just last month. The average price of a gallon of diesel is $4.53, which is $1.46 higher than a year ago.

Speaker PELOSI made a promise that the Democrats had a ''commonsense plan'' to ''lower the price at the pump.'' But this Congress has done nothing and has only seen fuel prices rise.

Mr. Speaker, I really believe it's time for the House to act. It's time for the House to debate ideas for lowering prices, and it's time for the Democrats to reveal their promised plan.

So by defeating the previous question, this House can finally consider solutions to rising energy costs. When the previous question is defeated, I will move to add a section to the rule, not rewrite the entire rule, just to add a section to the rule, that would allow the House to consider H.R. 5984, the Clean Energy Tax Stimulus Act of 2008, introduced by Representative BARTLETT of Maryland, as well as ''any amendment which the proponent asserts, if enacted, would have the effect of lowering the national average price per gallon of regular unleaded gasoline and diesel fuel by increasing the domestic supply of oil by permitting the extraction of oil in the Outer Continental Shelf.''

Mr. Speaker, the United States is the only developed nation in the world that

forbids safe energy production on its Outer Continental Shelf. This puts our country and economy at a disadvantage to other countries. According to the U.S. Minerals Management Service, America's deep seas on the Outer Continental Shelf contain 420 trillion cubic feet of natural gas and 86 billion barrels of oil. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. The Outer Continental Shelf contains 420 trillion cubic feet of natural gas and 86 billion barrels of oil. That's 86 billion barrels of American oil that sits waiting while we import a little over 4½ billion barrels from foreign countries each year.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we are serious about addressing gas prices and energy costs in America, we need to get serious about accessing our country's energy resources.

Some will declare that it's unsafe to produce energy from reserves beneath the ocean in the Outer Continental Shelf. But other countries do it safely all around the world. As a matter of fact, our country utilizes deep sea production in the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, this technology was severely tested, severely tested, and proven safe when two back-to-back category five storms hit the Gulf of Mexico in 2005. Almost 3,000 offshore platforms were in the direct path of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Some experienced 5 to 6 hours of sustained winds at 170 miles per hour and gusts over 200 miles per hour.

Now, to be sure, production was halted and platform workers were evacuated during these terrible hurricanes; so there was no loss of life.

But, Mr. Speaker, do you know how many of these rigs ruptured? The answer is zero. Zero. Some tops fell off but no platforms ruptured. So I think we must make a distinction between concerns that production can be done safely and scare tactics that oppose efforts to make use of America's resources and reduce imports from foreign nations.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can consider this vitally important issue for America's families; workers; truckers; small businesses; and, for that matter, our entire economy.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate hearing from my very good friend from Washington State explain his rationale on various issues. But let me just say a couple of things.

If we want to have a serious discussion about the cost of energy in this country, let's understand one thing. The Republicans had been in control of this Congress for 12 years and the Republicans have controlled the White House for nearly 8 years. When George Bush went into office on January 22, 2001, the cost of a gallon of gas was $1.47. As of last week, it was $3.61. It's gone up since last week, and part of that is because of the failed, the failed policies of this administration and the Republican Congress.

Yesterday, thanks to the leadership of Speaker PELOSI, we voted on a bill to instruct the President not to continue putting oil in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. And guess what. President Bush said he's going to veto it. He's going to veto a measure that will bring down prices for oil and gas in the short term. That's where their priorities are. Siding with Big Oil against the consumer. So enough is enough.

And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that what we're trying to do here today is expedite consideration of a budget resolution. After nearly 8 years, the Bush legacy is the highest deficits in our Nation's history. That is what he has left our children and our grandchildren, the greatest amount of national debt in our Nation's history. Future generations, our kids and our grandchildren, will be forced to pay the price for this unprecedented rise in debt and the Republicans' fiscally reckless and irresponsible policies.

The budget resolution that Chairman SPRATT, our leader here in the House, has fashioned and the one that he is going to conference with is a budget with a conscience. That's something we had not had when the Republicans were in control of this Congress. It is a budget that doesn't cut Medicare and doesn't cut Medicaid and doesn't cut the Community Development Block Grant program and doesn't cut LIHEAP. It is a budget that understands that average people have suffered under the 12 years that Republicans controlled this Congress and under the 8 years that George Bush has been in office. It is a budget that protects priorities like SCHIP, infrastructure needs, homeland security, innovation, energy, education, health care, veterans, and the environment. It protects middle class tax relief, including the alternative minimum tax, the child tax credit, and the marriage penalties. In short, what the Democrats are trying to do is get a budget passed that charts a new direction for a stronger, safer, more compassionate America, a direction very different from the one that this President and the previous Republican Congress has brought us down.

Let me finally say, Mr. Speaker, this will be the first budget resolution conference report to be considered in an election year since Bill Clinton was in office. So for all the talk about process, the fact of the matter is we have a Congress, a Democratic Congress, that is actually committed to getting things done, including a budget resolution.

□ 1645

And again, when we bring the budget resolution to the floor, it will be the first budget resolution conference report to be considered in an election year since Bill Clinton was in office. And that is something I think we all can be proud of and the American people can be proud of a finished product which will be a budget that will reflect their priorities.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1190 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. That upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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. 5984) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the limited continuation of clean energy production incentives and incentives to improve energy efficiency in order to prevent a downturn in these sectors that would result from a lapse in the tax law. The first reading of the bill shall he dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except any amendment which the proponent asserts, if enacted, would have the effect of lowering the national average price per gallon of regular unleaded gasoline and diesel fuel by increasing the domestic supply of oil by permitting the extraction of oil in the Outer Continental Shelf. Such amendments shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for thirty minutes 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. 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.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 1190; and motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 1173.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 187, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 317]

YEAS—225

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

NAYS—187

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

NOT VOTING—21

Andrews
Bono Mack
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
DeGette
Gerlach
Gohmert
Hinojosa
Lewis (KY)
Mack
Meeks (NY)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Rush
Schmidt
Shuler
Weller
Wilson (NM)
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1711

Messrs. UPTON, CANNON, SMITH of Nebraska, CAZAYOUX, YOUNG of Alaska and SESSIONS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. KIRK, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 317, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 317, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to clarify my vote on Ordering

the Previous Question on the Rule for the Conference Report on S. Con. Res. 70, the Budget Resolution.

I have always strongly supported the current ban and worked to protect Florida's beaches by helping to enact Public Law 109–432. With the energy needs our Nation is facing, other States may decide to explore for more energy sources and I support their right to drill off of their coasts if that is what they choose to do.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 203, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

YEAS—214

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

NAYS—203

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

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews
Bono Mack
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
DeGette
Gerlach
Honda
Lewis (KY)
Mack
Meeks (NY)
Myrick
Pickering
Rush
Schmidt
Wilson (NM)
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1719

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

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1190, Senate Concurrent Resolution 70, as amended, is considered as adopted and the House is considered to have insisted on its amendment and requested a conference with the Senate thereon.

Without objection, House Concurrent Resolution 312 is laid on the table.

There was no objection.

The text of the Senate concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 70

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 and 2010 through 2013.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Social Security.
Sec. 103. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses.
Sec. 104. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Direct Spending and Receipts

Sec. 201. Senate point of order against legislation increasing long-term deficits.
Sec. 202. Point of order—20 percent limit on new direct spending in reconciliation legislation.

Subtitle B—Discretionary Spending

Sec. 211. Discretionary spending limits, program integrity initiatives, and other adjustments.
Sec. 212. Point of order against advance appropriations.
Sec. 213. Senate point of order against provisions of appropriations legislation that constitute changes in mandatory programs with net costs.
Sec. 214. Discretionary administrative expenses of the Postal Service.

Subtitle C—Other Provisions

Sec. 221. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 222. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 223. Debt disclosure requirement.
Sec. 224. Debt disclosures.
Sec. 225. Exercise of rulemaking powers.
Sec. 226. Circuit breaker to protect social security.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 301. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to strengthen and stimulate the American economy and provide economic relief to American families.
Sec. 302. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for improving education.
Sec. 303. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for investments in America's infrastructure.
Sec. 304. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to invest in clean energy, preserve the environment, and provide for certain settlements.

Sec. 305. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for America's veterans and wounded servicemembers and for a post 9/11 GI bill.
Sec. 306. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve America's health.
Sec. 307. Sense of the Senate regarding Medicaid administrative regulations.
Sec. 308. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for judicial pay and judgeships.
Sec. 309. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reforming the alternative minimum tax for individuals.
Sec. 310. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for repealing the 1993 increase in the income tax on social security benefits.
Sec. 311. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve energy efficiency and production.
Sec. 312. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for immigration reform and enforcement.
Sec. 313. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for border security, immigration enforcement, and criminal alien removal programs.
Sec. 314. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for science parks.
Sec. 315. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for 3-year extension of pilot program for national and state background checks on direct patient access employees of long-term care facilities or providers.
Sec. 316. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for studying the effect of cooperation with local law enforcement.
Sec. 317. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to terminate deductions from mineral revenue payments to States.
Sec. 318. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the establishment of State Internet sites for the disclosure of information relating to payments made under the State Medicaid program.
Sec. 319. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for traumatic brain injury.
Sec. 320. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve animal health and disease program.
Sec. 321. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for implementation of Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program for members of the National Guard and Reserve.
Sec. 322. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reimbursing States for the costs of housing undocumented criminal aliens.
Sec. 323. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for acceleration of phased-in eligibility for concurrent receipt of benefits.
Sec. 324. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for increased use of recovery audits.
Sec. 325. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for food safety.
Sec. 326. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for demonstration project regarding Medicaid coverage of low-income HIV-infected individuals.
Sec. 327. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reducing income threshold for refundable child tax credit to $10,000 with no inflation adjustment.
Sec. 328. Sense of the Senate regarding the diversion of funds set aside for USPTO.
Sec. 329. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for education reform.
Sec. 330. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for processing naturalization applications.
Sec. 331. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for access to quality and affordable health insurance.
Sec. 332. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for a 9/11 health program.
Sec. 333. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to ban medicare advantage and prescription drug plan sales and marketing abuses.
Sec. 334. Sense of the Senate regarding extending the ''Moving to Work Agreement'' between the Philadelphia Housing Authority and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development under the same terms and conditions for a period of one year.
Sec. 335. Sense of the Senate regarding a balanced budget amendment to the constitution of the United States.
Sec. 336. Sense of the Senate regarding the need for comprehensive legislation to legalize the importation of prescription drugs from highly industrialized countries with safe pharmaceutical infrastructures.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $1,871,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,012,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,198,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,404,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,488,673,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,613,013,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: –$7,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: –$85,001,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $15,395,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: –$23,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: –$164,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: –$141,727,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,579,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,533,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,555,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,687,858,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,731,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,860,070,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,476,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,575,733,417,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,616,367,415,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,709,059,134,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,722,339,034,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,852,077,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $604,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $563,610,417,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $418,108,415,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $304,908,134,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $233,666,034,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $239,064,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $9,618,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $10,278,552,417,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $10,805,195,832,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $11,215,113,966,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $11,580,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $11,934,375,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $5,418,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $5,803,409,417,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $6,032,754,832,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $6,129,282,966,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $6,141,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $6,153,706,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $666,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $695,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $733,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $772,468,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $809,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $845,044,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $463,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $493,607,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $520,158,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $540,487,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $566,249,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $595,544,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $5,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $5,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,476,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $5,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $5,788,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $5,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $6,147,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,115,000,000.

SEC. 103. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $275,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $284,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $293,000,000.

SEC. 104. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2008 through 2013 for each major functional category are:
(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $693,273,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $604,289,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $612,502,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $645,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $550,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $607,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $557,026,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $577,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $565,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $561,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $576,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,503,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $38,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,771,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $38,609,416,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,449,416,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $35,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $36,322,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $37,024,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,243,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $27,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,456,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $30,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $30,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,490,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $30,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $31,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $31,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,635,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $3,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $7,026,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $6,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $6,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $6,895,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $6,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,159,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $32,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $39,835,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,309,500,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $34,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,217,875,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,394,875,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $36,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,756,875,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $22,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,495,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $21,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,501,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,665,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,307,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,513,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $11,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $9,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $11,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $7,713,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $8,028,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $492,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $8,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $195,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $87,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,370,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $75,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $78,075,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $78,913,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $79,763,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $80,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,534,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $15,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,486,700,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $15,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,115,400,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $15,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,240,900,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $15,746,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,186,800,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $15,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,872,800,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $91,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $94,679,670,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,253,020,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $103,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,615,482,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $106,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,806,534,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $108,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,904,034,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $101,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,626,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $286,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $287,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $313,109,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $310,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $324,863,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $325,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $345,558,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $344,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $368,273,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $367,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $393,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $391,805,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $390,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $390,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $420,389,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $420,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $445,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $445,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $494,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $494,305,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $491,399,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $491,163,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $551,039,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $551,161,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $393,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,613,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $414,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $419,023,200,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $416,322,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $418,871,200,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $425,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,242,100,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $411,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $411,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $426,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,611,400,000.
(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $30,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $33,162,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,162,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $86,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $93,319,584,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,397,584,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $95,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $100,959,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $97,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $103,241,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $102,521,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $46,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $49,432,330,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,896,297,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $48,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,714,333,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $48,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,113,500,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $49,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $50,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,706,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $56,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $24,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $19,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $20,395,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $20,796,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,107,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,991,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $349,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $349,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $335,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $335,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $372,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $372,253,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $409,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $409,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $435,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $435,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $451,980,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $451,980,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $9,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$14,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,099,300,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$8,179,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$10,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$8,466,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$9,360,775,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$8,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$9,295,675,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$9,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$10,206,075,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$86,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$86,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$67,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$67,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$70,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$70,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$73,364,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$73,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$76,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$76,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$79,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$79,691,000,000.

TITLE II—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Direct Spending and Receipts

SEC. 201. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION INCREASING LONG-TERM DEFICITS.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare for each bill and joint resolution reported from committee (except measures within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations), and amendments thereto and conference reports thereon, an estimate of whether the measure would cause, relative to current law, a net increase in deficits in excess of $0 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-year periods beginning with the first fiscal year that is 10 years after the budget year provided for in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would cause a net increase in deficits in excess of $0 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-year periods described in subsection (a).

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) DETERMINATIONS OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of net deficit increases shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Senate Committee on the Budget.

(e) SUNSET.—This section shall expire on September 30, 2017.

(f) REPEAL.—In the Senate, subsections (a) through (d) and subsection (f) of section 203 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) shall no longer apply.

SEC. 202. POINT OF ORDER—20 PERCENT LIMIT ON NEW DIRECT SPENDING IN RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION.

(a)(1) In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider any reconciliation bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or any conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a reconciliation bill pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, that produces an increase in outlays, if—

(2) the effect of all the provisions in the jurisdiction of any committee is to create gross new direct spending that exceeds 20 percent of the total savings instruction to the committee; or

(3) the effect of the adoption of an amendment would result in gross new direct spending that exceeds 20 percent of the total savings instruction to the committee.

(b) A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(1) Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under paragraph (1).

(2) If a point of order is sustained under paragraph (1) against a conference report in the Senate, the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Subtitle B—Discretionary Spending

SEC. 211. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS, PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) SENATE POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on that bill or joint resolution) that would cause the discretionary spending limits in this section to be exceeded.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—This subsection may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(b) SENATE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—In the Senate and as used in this section, the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—

(1) for fiscal year 2008, $1,055,478,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,093,343,000,000 in outlays; and

(2) for fiscal year 2009, $1,008,482,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,108,449,000,000 in outlays;

as adjusted in conformance with the adjustment procedures in subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution relating to any matter described in paragraph (2), or the offering

of an amendment thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon—

(A) the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may adjust the discretionary spending limits, budgetary aggregates, and allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, by the amount of new budget authority in that measure for that purpose and the outlays flowing therefrom; and

(B) following any adjustment under subparagraph (A), the Senate Committee on Appropriations may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(2) MATTERS DESCRIBED.—Matters referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND SSI REDETERMINATIONS.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates $264,000,000 for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, and provides an additional appropriation of up to $240,000,000 for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and aggregates may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed $240,000,000 in budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom for fiscal year 2009.

(B) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX ENFORCEMENT.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates $6,997,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced tax enforcement to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid) and provides an additional appropriation of up to $490,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced tax enforcement to address the Federal tax gap, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and aggregates may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed $490,000,000 in budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom for fiscal year 2009.

(C) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates up to $198,000,000 to the Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control program at the Department of Health and Human Services, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and aggregates may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed $198,000,000 in budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom for fiscal year 2009.

(D) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IMPROPER PAYMENT REVIEWS.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates $10,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews, and provides an additional appropriation of up to $40,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and aggregates may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed $40,000,000 in budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom for fiscal year 2009.

(E) COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH AT THE AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates $30,000,000 for comparative effectiveness research as authorized under section 1013 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement and Modernization Act of 2003, and provides an additional appropriation of up to $70,000,000 for that purpose, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and aggregates may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed $70,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2009 and the outlays flowing therefrom.

(F) REDUCING WASTE IN DEFENSE CONTRACTING.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates up to $100,000,000 to the Department of Defense for additional activities to reduce waste, fraud, abuse, and overpayments in defense contracting; achieve the legal requirement to submit auditable financial statements; or reduce waste by improving accounting for and ordering of spare parts; subject contracts performed outside the United States to the same ethics, control, and reporting requirements as those performed domestically, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and aggregates may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed $100,000,000 in budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom for fiscal year 2009.

(3) ADJUSTMENTS FOR COSTS OF THE WARS IN IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may adjust the discretionary spending limits, allocations to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and aggregates for one or more—

(A) bills reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations or passed by the House of Representatives;

(B) joint resolutions or amendments reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations;

(C) amendments between the Houses received from the House of Representatives or Senate amendments offered by the authority of the Senate Committee on Appropriations; or

(D) conference reports;

making appropriations for fiscal year 2008 or 2009 for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes (and so designated pursuant to this paragraph), up to $108,056,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2008 and the new outlays flowing therefrom, and up to $70,000,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2009 and the new outlays flowing therefrom.

(d) OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.—In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs within their jurisdictions to root out waste, fraud, and abuse in program spending, giving particular scrutiny to issues raised by Government Accountability Office reports. Based on these oversight efforts and committee performance reviews of programs within their jurisdictions, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committees on the Budget.

(e) SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008.—If legislation making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2008 is enacted, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate adjustments in allocations, aggregates, discretionary spending limits, and other levels of new budget authority and outlays to reflect the difference between such measure and the corresponding levels assumed in this resolution.

(f) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, subsections (a), (b), (c), (e), and (f) of section 207 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) shall no longer apply.

SEC. 212. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2009, or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2010, that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2010.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $29,352,000,000 in new budget authority in each year; and

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(d) FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 206(a) of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) shall no longer apply.

SEC. 213. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS WITH NET COSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider any appropriations

legislation, including any amendment thereto, motion in relation thereto, or conference report thereon, that includes any provision which constitutes a change in a mandatory program producing net costs, as defined in subsection (b), that would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) were they included in legislation other than appropriations legislation. A point of order pursuant to this section shall be raised against such provision or provisions as described in subsections (e) and (f).

(b) CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS PRODUCING NET COSTS.—A provision or provisions shall be subject to a point of order pursuant to this section if—

(1) the provision would increase budget authority in at least 1 of the 9 fiscal years that follow the budget year and over the period of the total of the budget year and the 9 fiscal years following the budget year;

(2) the provision would increase net outlays over the period of the total of the 9 fiscal years following the budget year; and

(3) the sum total of all changes in mandatory programs in the legislation would increase net outlays as measured over the period of the total of the 9 fiscal years following the budget year.

(c) DETERMINATION.—The determination of whether a provision is subject to a point of order pursuant to this section shall be made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(d) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) GENERAL POINT OF ORDER.—It shall be in order for a Senator to raise a single point of order that several provisions of a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report violate this section. The Presiding Officer may sustain the point of order as to some or all of the provisions against which the Senator raised the point of order. If the Presiding Officer so sustains the point of order as to some of the provisions (including provisions of an amendment, motion, or conference report) against which the Senator raised the point of order, then only those provisions (including provision of an amendment, motion, or conference report) against which the Presiding Officer sustains the point of order shall be deemed stricken pursuant to this section. Before the Presiding Officer rules on such a point of order, any Senator may move to waive such a point of order as it applies to some or all of the provisions against which the point of order was raised. Such a motion to waive is amendable in accordance with rules and precedents of the Senate. After the Presiding Officer rules on such a point of order, any Senator may appeal the ruling of the Presiding Officer on such a point of order as it applies to some or all of the provisions on which the Presiding Officer ruled.

(f) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or amendment shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(g) EFFECTIVENESS.—This section shall not apply to any provision constituting a change in a mandatory program in appropriations legislation if such provision has been enacted in each of the 3 fiscal years prior to the budget year.

SEC. 214. DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF THE POSTAL SERVICE.

In the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Postal Service.

Subtitle C—Other Provisions

SEC. 221. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Senate Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 222. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002).

SEC. 223. DEBT DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order to consider a budget resolution in the Senate unless it contains a debt disclosure section including all, and only, the following disclosures regarding debt:

"SEC. ____. DEBT DISCLOSURES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The levels assumed in this budget resolution allow the gross Federal debt of the nation to rise/fall by $_____ from the current year, fiscal year 20____, to the fifth year of the budget window, fiscal year 20____.

''(b) PER PERSON.—The levels assumed in this budget resolution allow the gross Federal debt of the nation to rise/fall by $_____ on every United States citizen from the current year, fiscal year 20____ to the fifth year of the budget window, fiscal year 20____.

''(c) SOCIAL SECURITY.—The levels assumed in this budget resolution project that $_____ of the Social Security surplus will be spent over the 5-year budget window, fiscal years 20____–20____, on things other than Social Security which represents ____ percent of the projected Social Security surplus over this period.''.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY.—If any portion of the Social Security surplus is projected to be spent and/or the gross Federal debt in the fifth year of the budget window is greater than the debt projected in the current year, as described in the debt disclosure section described in subsection (a) of this section, the report, print, or statement of managers accompanying the budget resolution shall contain a section that—

(1) details the circumstances making it in the national interest to allow Federal debt to increase rather than taking steps to reduce the debt; and

(2) provides a justification for allowing the surpluses in the Social Security Trust Fund to be spent on other functions of Government even as the baby boom generation retires, program costs are projected to rise dramatically, the debt owed to Social Security is about to come due, and the Trust Fund is projected to go insolvent.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—The term ''gross Federal debt'' described above represents nominal increases in gross Federal debt measured at the end of each fiscal year during the period of the budget, not debt as a percentage of gross domestic product, and not levels relative to baseline projections.

SEC. 224. DEBT DISCLOSURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The levels assumed in this budget resolution allow the gross Federal debt of the nation to rise by $2,000,000,000,000 from the current year, fiscal year 2008, to the fifth year of the budget window, fiscal year 2013.

(b) PER PERSON.—The levels assumed in this budget resolution allow the gross Federal debt of the nation to rise by $6,440 on every United States citizen from the current year, fiscal year 2008, to the fifth year of the budget window, fiscal year 2013.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY.—The levels assumed in this budget resolution project $800,000,000,000 of the Social Security surplus will be spent over the 5-year budget window, fiscal years 2009–2013, on things other than Social Security, which represents 70 percent of the projected Social Security surplus over this period.

SEC. 225. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

SEC. 226. CIRCUIT BREAKER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) CIRCUIT BREAKER.—If in any year the Congressional Budget Office, in its report pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 projects an on-budget deficit (excluding Social Security) for the budget year or any subsequent fiscal year covered by those projections, then the concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year shall reduce on-budget deficits relative to the projections of Congressional

Budget Office and put the budget on a path to achieve on-budget balance within 5 years, and shall include such provisions as are necessary to protect Social Security and facilitate deficit reduction, except it shall not contain any reduction in Social Security benefits.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—If in any year the Congressional Budget Office, in its report pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 projects an on-budget deficit for the budget year or any subsequent fiscal year covered by those projections, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year or any conference report thereon that fails to reduce on-budget deficits relative to the projections of Congressional Budget Office and put the budget on a path to achieve on-budget balance within 5 years.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO BUDGET RESOLUTION.—If in any year the Congressional Budget Office, in its report pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 projects an on-budget deficit for the budget year or any subsequent fiscal year covered by those projections, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider an amendment to a concurrent resolution on the budget that would increase on-budget deficits relative to the concurrent resolution on the budget in any fiscal year covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget or cause the budget to fail to achieve on-budget balance within 5 years.

(d) SUSPENSION OF REQUIREMENT DURING WAR OR LOW ECONOMIC GROWTH.—

(1) LOW GROWTH.—If the most recent of the Department of Commerce's advance, preliminary, or final reports of actual real economic growth indicate that the rate of real economic growth (as measured by the real gross domestic product) for each of the most recently reported quarter and the immediately preceding quarter is less than zero percent, this section is suspended.

(2) WAR.—If a declaration of war is in effect, this section is suspended.

(e) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(1) WAIVER.—Subsections (b) and (c) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(f) BUDGET YEAR.—In this section, the term ''budget year'' shall have the same meaning as in section 250(c)(12) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN AND STIMULATE THE AMERICAN ECONOMY AND PROVIDE ECONOMIC RELIEF TO AMERICAN FAMILIES.

(a) TAX RELIEF.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would provide tax relief, including extensions of expiring tax relief, reinstatement of expired tax relief, such as enhanced charitable giving from individual retirement accounts, including life-income gifts, and refundable tax relief and incentivizing utilization of accumulated alternative minimum tax and research and development credits, by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(b) MANUFACTURING.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports, including tax legislation, that would revitalize the United States domestic manufacturing sector by increasing Federal research and development, by expanding the scope and effectiveness of manufacturing programs across the Federal government, by increasing efforts to train and retrain manufacturing workers, by increasing support for development of alternative fuels and leap-ahead automotive and energy technologies, or by establishing tax incentives to encourage the continued production in the United States of advanced technologies and the infrastructure to support such technologies, by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(c) HOUSING.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would provide housing assistance, which may include low income rental assistance, or establish an affordable housing fund financed by the housing government sponsored enterprises or other sources, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(d) FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would provide for flood insurance reform and modernization, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(e) TRADE.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to trade agreements, preferences, sanctions, enforcement, or customs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(f) ECONOMIC RELIEF FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports which—

(1) reauthorizes the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families supplemental grants or makes improvements to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, child welfare programs, or the child support enforcement program;

(2) provides up to $5,000,000,000 for the child care entitlement to States;

(3) provides up to $40,000,000 for the emergency food assistance program established under the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7501 et seq.);

(4) improves the unemployment compensation program; or

(5) reauthorizes the trade adjustment assistance programs;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(g) AMERICA'S FARMS AND ECONOMIC INVESTMENT IN RURAL AMERICA.—

(1) FARM BILL.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide for the reauthorization of the programs of the Food Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 or prior Acts, authorize similar or related programs, provide for revenue changes, or any combination of the preceding purposes, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes up to $15,000,000,000 over the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(2) COUNTY PAYMENTS.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–393), make changes to the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–565), or both, by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 302. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR IMPROVING EDUCATION.

(a) FEDERAL PELL GRANT.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would make higher education more accessible or more affordable, which may include increasing funding for the Federal Pell Grant program or increasing Federal student loan limits, facilitate modernization of school facilities through renovation or construction bonds, reduce the cost of teachers' out-of-pocket expenses for school supplies, or provide tax incentives for highly-qualified teachers to serve in high-needs schools, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018. The legislation may include tax benefits and other revenue provisions.

(b) IMPROVING EDUCATION.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may

revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would improve student achievement during secondary education, including middle school completion, high school graduation and preparing students for higher education and the workforce, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 303. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide for a robust federal investment in America's infrastructure, which may include projects for transit, rail (including high-speed passenger rail), airport, seaport, public housing, energy, water, highway, bridge, or other infrastructure projects, by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 304. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INVEST IN CLEAN ENERGY, PRESERVE THE ENVIRONMENT, AND PROVIDE FOR CERTAIN SETTLEMENTS.

(a) ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would decrease greenhouse gas emissions, reduce our Nation's dependence on imported energy, produce green jobs, or preserve or protect national parks, oceans, or coastal areas, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018. The legislation may include tax legislation such as a proposal to extend for 5 years energy tax incentives like the production tax credit for electricity produced from renewable resources, the biodiesel production tax credit, or the Clean Renewable Energy Bond program, to provide a tax credit for clean burning wood stoves, a tax credit for production of cellulosic ethanol, a tax credit for plug-in hybrid vehicles, or provisions to encourage energy efficient buildings, products, and power plants. Tax legislation under this section may be paid for by adjustments to sections 167(h)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as it relates to integrated oil companies.

(b) SETTLEMENTS.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would fulfill the purposes of the San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement Act or implement a Navajo Nation water rights settlement and other provisions authorized by the Northwestern New Mexico Rural Water Projects Act, by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 305. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS AND WOUNDED SERVICEMEMBERS AND FOR A POST 9/11 GI BILL.

(a) VETERANS AND WOUNDED SERVICEMEMBERS.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports which would—

(1) enhance medical care, disability evaluations, or disability benefits for wounded or disabled military personnel or veterans;

(2) provide for or increase benefits to Filipino veterans of World War II, their survivors and dependents;

(3) allow for the transfer of education benefits from servicemembers to family members or veterans (including the elimination of the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation);

(4) providing for the continuing payment to members of the Armed Forces who are retired or separated from the Armed Forces due to a combat-related injury after September 11, 2001, of bonuses that such members were entitled to before the retirement or separation and would continue to be entitled to such members were not retired or separated; or

(5) enhance programs and activities to increase the availability of health care and other veterans services for veterans living in rural areas;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation does not include increased fees charged to veterans for pharmacy co-payments, annual enrollment, or third-party insurance payment offsets, and further provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(b) POST 9/11 GI BILL.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports which would enhance educational benefits of service members and veterans with service on active duty in the Armed Forces on or after September 11, 2001, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 306. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE AMERICA'S HEALTH.

(a) SCHIP.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides up to $50,000,000,000 in outlays over the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 for reauthorization of SCHIP, if such legislation maintains coverage for those currently enrolled in SCHIP, continues efforts to enroll uninsured children who are already eligible for SCHIP or Medicaid but are not enrolled, or supports States in their efforts to move forward in covering more children or pregnant women, by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes, provided that the outlay adjustment shall not exceed $50,000,000,000 in outlays over the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013, and provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(b) MEDICARE IMPROVEMENTS.—

(1) PHYSICIAN PAYMENTS.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that increases the reimbursement rate for physician services under section 1848(d) of the Social Security Act and that includes financial incentives for physicians to improve the quality and efficiency of items and services furnished to Medicare beneficiaries through the use of consensus-based quality measures, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(2) OTHER IMPROVEMENTS TO MEDICARE.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that makes improvements to the Medicare program, which may include improvements to the prescription drug benefit under Medicare Part D, adjustments to the Medicare Savings Program, and reductions in beneficiary cost-sharing for preventive benefits under Medicare Part B, or measures to encourage physicians to train in primary care residencies and attract more physicians and other health care providers to States that face a shortage of health care providers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes up to $10,000,000,000, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(3) ELECTRONIC PRESCRIBING.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that promote the deployment and use of electronic prescribing technologies through financial incentives, including grants and bonus payments, and potential adjustments in the Medicare reimbursement mechanisms for physicians, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(4) RURAL EQUITY PAYMENT POLICIES.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that—

(A) preserves existing Medicare payment provisions supporting America's rural health care delivery system; and

(B) promotes Medicare payment policies that increase access to quality health care in isolated and underserved rural areas,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(5) MEDICARE LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that makes improvements to the Medicare Savings Program and the Medicare part D low-income subsidy program, which may include the provisions that—

(A) provide for an increase in the asset allowance under the Medicare Part D low-income subsidy program so that individuals with very limited incomes, but modest retirement savings, can obtain the assistance that the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 was intended to deliver with respect to the payment of premiums and cost-sharing under the Medicare part D prescription drug benefit;

(B) provide for an update in the income and asset allowances under the Medicare Savings Program and provide for an annual inflationary adjustment for those allowances; and

(C) improve outreach and enrollment under the Medicare Savings Program and the Medicare part D low-income subsidy program to ensure that low-income senior citizens and other low-income Medicare beneficiaries receive the low-income assistance for which they are eligible in accordance with the improvements provided for in such legislation,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(c) HEALTH CARE QUALITY, EFFECTIVENESS, EFFICIENCY, AND TRANSPARENCY.—

(1) COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that establish a new Federal or public-private initiative for comparative effectiveness research, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(2) IMPROVING THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that—

(A) creates a framework and parameters for the use of Medicare data for the purpose of conducting research, public reporting, and other activities to evaluate health care safety, effectiveness, efficiency, quality, and resource utilization in Federal programs and the private health care system; and

(B) includes provisions to protect beneficiary privacy and to prevent disclosure of proprietary or trade secret information with respect to the transfer and use of such data;

provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal 2008 through 2018.

(3) HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND ADHERENCE TO BEST PRACTICES.—

(A) HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide incentives or other support for adoption of modern information technology, including incentives or other supports for the adoption of electronic prescribing technology, to improve quality and protect privacy in health care, such as activities by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to integrate their electronic health record data, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(B) ADHERENCE TO BEST PRACTICES.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide incentives for Medicare providers or suppliers to comply with, where available and medically appropriate, clinical protocols identified as best practices, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided in the Senate that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(d) FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) REGULATION.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that authorizes the Food and Drug Administration to regulate products and assess user fees on manufacturers and importers of those products to cover the cost of the Food and Drug Administration's regulatory activities, by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(2) DRUG IMPORTATION.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that permits the safe importation of prescription drugs approved by the Food and Drug Administration from a specified list of countries, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(e) MEDICAID.—

(1) RULES OR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that includes provisions regarding the final rule published on May 29, 2007, on pages 29748 through 29836 of volume 72, Federal Register (relating to parts 433, 447, and 457 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations) or any other rule or other administrative action that would affect the Medicaid program or SCHIP in a similar manner, or place restrictions on coverage of or payment for graduate medical education, rehabilitation services, or school-based administration, school-based transportation, or optional case management services under title XIX of the Social Security Act, or includes provisions regarding administrative guidance issued in August 2007 affecting SCHIP or any other administrative action that would affect SCHIP in a similar manner, so long as no provision in such bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report shall be construed as prohibiting the Secretary of Health and Human Services from promulgating or implementing any rule, action, or guidance designed to prevent fraud and protect the integrity of the Medicaid program or SCHIP or reduce inappropriate spending under such programs, by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the total of the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the total of the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(2) TRANSITIONAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions or conference reports that extend the Transitional Medical Assistance program, included in title XIX of the Social Security Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the total of the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the total of the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(f) OTHER IMPROVEMENTS IN HEALTH.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports which—

(1) make health insurance coverage more affordable or available to small businesses and their employees, through pooling arrangements that provide appropriate consumer protections, and through reducing barriers to cafeteria plans;

(2) improve health care, provide quality health insurance for the uninsured and underinsured, and protect individuals with current health coverage;

(3) reauthorize the special diabetes program for Indians and the special diabetes programs for Type 1 diabetes;

(4) improve long-term care, enhance the safety and dignity of patients, encourage appropriate use of institutional and community-based care, promote quality care, or provide for the cost-effective use of public resources; or

(5) provide parity between heath insurance coverage of mental health benefits and benefits for medical and surgical services, including parity in public programs;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(g) PEDIATRIC DENTAL CARE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would provide for improved access to pediatric dental care for children from low-income families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 307. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING MEDICAID ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Medicaid program provides essential health care and long-term care services to approximately 60,000,000 low-income children, pregnant women, parents, individuals with disabilities, and senior citizens. It is a

Federal guarantee that ensures the most vulnerable will have access to needed medical services.

(2) Medicaid provides critical access to long-term care and other services for the elderly and individuals living with disabilities, and is the single largest provider of long-term care services. Medicaid also pays for personal care and other supportive services that are typically not provided by private health insurance or Medicare, but are necessary to enable individuals with spinal cord injuries, developmental disabilities, neurological degenerative diseases, serious and persistent mental illnesses, HIV/AIDS, and other chronic conditions to remain in the community, to work, and to maintain independence.

(3) Medicaid supplements the Medicare program for about 7,500,000 low-income elderly or disabled Medicare beneficiaries, assisting them with their Medicare premiums and co-insurance, wrap-around benefits, and the costs of nursing home care that Medicare does not cover. The Medicaid program spends over $100,000,000,000 on uncovered Medicare services.

(4) Medicaid provides health insurance for more than one-quarter of America's children and is the largest purchaser of maternity care, paying for more than one-third of all the births in the United States each year. Medicaid also provides critical access to care for children with disabilities, covering more than 70 percent of poor children with disabilities.

(5) More than 21,000,000 women depend on Medicaid for their health care. Women comprise the majority of seniors (64 percent) on Medicaid. Half of nonelderly women with permanent mental or physical disabilities have health coverage through Medicaid. Medicaid provides treatment for low-income women diagnosed with breast or cervical cancer in every State.

(6) Medicaid is the Nation's largest source of payment for mental health services, HIV/AIDS care, and care for children with special needs. Much of this care is either not covered by private insurance or limited in scope or duration. Medicaid is also a critical source of funding for health care for children in foster care and for health services in schools.

(7) Medicaid funds help ensure access to care for all Americans. Medicaid is the single largest source of revenue for the Nation's safety net hospitals, health centers, and nursing homes, and is critical to the ability of these providers to adequately serve all Americans.

(8) Medicaid serves a major role in ensuring that the number of Americans without health insurance, approximately 47,000,000 in 2006, is not substantially higher. The system of Federal matching for State Medicaid expenditures ensures that Federal funds will grow as State spending increases in response to unmet needs, enabling Medicaid to help buffer the drop in private coverage during recessions.

(9) The Bush Administration has issued several regulations that shift Medicaid cost burdens onto States and put at risk the continued availability of much-needed services. The regulations relate to Federal payments to public providers, and for graduate medical education, rehabilitation services, school-based administration, school-based transportation, optional case management services.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that administrative regulations should not—

(1) undermine the role the Medicaid program plays as a critical component of the health care system of the United States;

(2) cap Federal Medicaid spending, or otherwise shift Medicaid cost burdens to State or local governments and their taxpayers and health providers, forcing a reduction in access to essential health services for low-income elderly individuals, individuals with disabilities, and children and families; or

(3) undermine the Federal guarantee of health insurance coverage Medicaid provides, which would threaten not only the health care safety net of the United States, but the entire health care system.

SEC. 308. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR JUDICIAL PAY AND JUDGESHIPS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would authorize salary adjustments for justices and judges of the United States or increase the number of Federal judgeships, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 309. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORMING THE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX FOR INDIVIDUALS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would reinstate the pre-1993 rates for the alternative minimum tax for individuals, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 310. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REPEALING THE 1993 INCREASE IN THE INCOME TAX ON SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would repeal the 1993 increase in the income tax on Social Security benefits, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 311. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND PRODUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution by the amounts provided by a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would encourage—

(1) consumers to replace old conventional wood stoves with new clean wood, pellet, or corn stoves certified by the Environmental Protection Agency;

(2) consumers to install smart electricity meters in homes and businesses;

(3) the capture and storage of carbon dioxide emissions from coal projects; and

(4) the development of oil and natural gas resources beneath the outer Continental Shelf in areas not covered by a Presidential or Congressional moratorium.

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY.—Subsection (a) applies only if the legislation described in subsection (a) would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 312. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports, by the amounts provided in such legislation for the purposes described in paragraphs (1) through (7), that—

(1) provide for increased border security, enforcement of immigration laws, greater staffing, and immigration reform measures;

(2) increase criminal and civil penalties against employers who hire undocumented immigrants;

(3) prohibit employers who hire undocumented immigrants from receiving Federal contracts;

(4) provide funding for the enforcement of the employer sanctions described in paragraphs (2) and (3) and other employer sanctions for hiring undocumented immigrants;

(5) deploy an appropriate number of National Guard troops to the southern or northern border of the United States provided that—

(A) the Secretary of Defense certifies that the deployment would not negatively impact the safety of American forces in Iraq and Afghanistan; and

(B) the Governor of the National Guard's home State certifies that the deployment would not have a negative impact on the safety and security of that State;

(6) evaluate the Federal, State, and local prison populations that are noncitizens in order to identify removable criminal aliens; or

(7) implement the exit data portion of the US–VISIT entry and exit data system at airports, seaports, and land ports of entry.

(b) LIMITATION.—The authority under subsection (a) may not be used unless the legislation described in subsection (a) would not increase the deficit over—

(1) the total period comprised of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; or

(2) the total period comprised of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 313. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR BORDER SECURITY, IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT, AND CRIMINAL ALIEN REMOVAL PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of 1 or more committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution by the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the programs described in paragraphs (1) through (6) in 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that funds border security, immigration enforcement, and criminal alien removal programs, including programs that—

(1) expand the zero tolerance prosecution policy for illegal entry (commonly known as ''Operation Streamline'') to all 20 border sectors;

(2) complete the 700 miles of pedestrian fencing required under section 102(b)(1) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1103 note);

(3) deploy up to 6,000 National Guard members to the southern border of the United States;

(4) evaluate the 27 percent of the Federal, State, and local prison populations who are noncitizens in order to identify removable criminal aliens;

(5) train and reimburse State and local law enforcement officers under Memorandums of Understanding entered into under section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)); or

(6) implement the exit data portion of the US–VISIT entry and exit data system at airports, seaports, and land ports of entry.

(b) LIMITATION.—The authority under subsection (a) may not be used unless the appropriations in the legislation described in subsection (a) would not increase the deficit over—

(1) the 6-year period comprised of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; or

(2) the 11-year period comprised of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 314. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SCIENCE PARKS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would provide grants and loan guarantees for the development and construction of science parks to promote the clustering of innovation through high technology activities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 315. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR 3-YEAR EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAM FOR NATIONAL AND STATE BACKGROUND CHECKS ON DIRECT PATIENT ACCESS EMPLOYEES OF LONG-TERM CARE FACILITIES OR PROVIDERS.

If the Senate Committee on Finance reports a bill or joint resolution or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is submitted thereon, that provides for a 3-year extension of the pilot program for national and State background checks on direct patient access employees of long-term care facilities or providers under section 307 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 1395aa note) and removes the limit on the number of participating States under such pilot program, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes up to $160,000,000, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 316. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR STUDYING THE EFFECT OF COOPERATION WITH LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports, by the amounts provided in such legislation for the purposes described in this subsection, that would require an assessment of the impact of local ordinances that prohibit cooperation with the Department of Homeland Security, with respect to—

(1) the effectiveness of law enforcement, success rates of criminal prosecutions, reporting of criminal activity by immigrant victims of crime, and level of public safety;

(2) changes in the number of reported incidents or complaints of racial profiling; or

(3) wrongful detention of United States Citizens and Lawful Permanent Residents.

(b) LIMITATION.—The authority under subsection (a) may not be used unless the legislation described in subsection (a) would not increase the deficit over—

(1) the total period comprised of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; or

(2) the total period comprised of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 317. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO TERMINATE DEDUCTIONS FROM MINERAL REVENUE PAYMENTS TO STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution by the amounts provided by a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would terminate the authority to deduct certain amounts from mineral revenues payable to States under the second undesignated paragraph of the matter under the heading ''ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS'' under the heading ''MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE'' of title I of the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–161; 121 Stat. 2109).

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY.—Subsection (a) applies only if the legislation described in subsection (a) would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 318. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF STATE INTERNET SITES FOR THE DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION RELATING TO PAYMENTS MADE UNDER THE STATE MEDICAID PROGRAM.

If the Senate Committee on Finance reports a bill or joint resolution or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is submitted thereon, that provides for States to disclose, through a publicly accessible Internet site, each hospital, nursing facility, outpatient surgery center, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental diseases, or other institutional provider that receives payment under the State Medicaid program, the total amount paid to each such provider each fiscal year, the number of patients treated by each such provider, and the amount of dollars paid per patient to each such provider, and provided that the Committee is within its allocation as provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in the allocations and aggregates to reflect such legislation if any such measure would not increase the deficit over either the total of the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the total of the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 319. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide at least $9,000,000 for fiscal year 2009 to funds traumatic brain injury programs under sections 393A, 393B, 1252, and 1253 of the Public Health Service Act, if such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 320. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE ANIMAL HEALTH AND DISEASE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution by the amounts provided by a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would ensure that the animal health and disease program established under section 1433 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3195) is fully funded.

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY.—Subsection (a) applies only if the legislation described in subsection (a) would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 321. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM FOR MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would provide for the implementation of the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program for members of the National Guard and Reserve under section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013.

SEC. 322. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REIMBURSING STATES FOR THE COSTS OF HOUSING UNDOCUMENTED CRIMINAL ALIENS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would reimburse States and units of local government for costs incurred to house undocumented criminal aliens, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 323. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ACCELERATION OF PHASED-IN ELIGIBILITY FOR CONCURRENT RECEIPT OF BENEFITS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides for changing the date by which eligibility of members of the Armed Forces for concurrent receipt of retired pay and veterans' disability compensation under section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, is fully phased in from December 31, 2013, to September 30, 2008, by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 324. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INCREASED USE OF RECOVERY AUDITS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieves savings by requiring that agencies increase their use of recovery audits authorized under subchapter VI of chapter 35 of title 31, United States Code, (commonly referred to as the Erroneous Payments Recovery Act of 2001) and uses such savings to reduce the deficit, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 325. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FOOD SAFETY.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would expand the level of Food and Drug Administration and Department of Agriculture food safety inspection services, develop risk-based approaches to the inspection of domestic and imported food products, provide for infrastructure and information technology systems to enhance the safety of the food supply, expand scientific capacity and training programs, invest in improved surveillance and testing technologies, provide for foodborne illness awareness and education programs, and enhance the Food and Drug Administration's recall authority, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 326. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DEMONSTRATION PROJECT REGARDING MEDICAID COVERAGE OF LOW-INCOME HIV-INFECTED INDIVIDUALS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions or conference reports that provide for a demonstration project under which a State may apply under section 1115 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315) to provide medical assistance under a State Medicaid program to HIV-infected individuals who are not eligible for medical assistance under such program under section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(A)(i)), by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the total of the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the total of the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 327. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REDUCING INCOME THRESHOLD FOR REFUNDABLE CHILD TAX CREDIT TO $10,000 WITH NO INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution by the amounts provided by a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would reduce the income threshold for the refundable child tax credit under section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to $10,000 for taxable years 2009 and 2010 with no inflation adjustment, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 328. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE DIVERSION OF FUNDS SET ASIDE FOR USPTO.

It is the sense of the Senate that none of the funds recommended by this resolution, or appropriated or otherwise made available under any other Act, to the United States Patent and Trademark Office shall be diverted, redirected, transferred, or used for any other purpose than for which such funds were intended.

SEC. 329. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EDUCATION REFORM.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that promote flexibility in existing Federal education programs, restore State and local authority in education, ensure that public schools are held accountable for results to parents and the public, and prevent discrimination against homeschoolers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 330. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PROCESSING NATURALIZATION APPLICATIONS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would provide for the adjudication of name check and security clearances by October 1, 2008 by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for individuals who have submitted or submit applications for naturalization before March 1, 2008 or provide for the adjudication of applications, including the interviewing and swearing-in of applicants, by October 1, 2008 by the Department of Homeland Security/U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services for individuals who apply or have applied for naturalization before March 1, 2008, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 331. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ACCESS TO QUALITY AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH INSURANCE.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that—

(1) promotes choice and competition to drive down costs and improve access to health care for all Americans without increasing taxes;

(2) strengthens health care quality by promoting wellness and empowering consumers with accurate and comprehensive information on quality and cost;

(3) protects Americans' economic security from catastrophic events by expanding insurance options and improving health insurance portability; and

(4) promotes the advanced research and development of new treatments and cures to enhance health care quality;

if such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR A 9/11 HEALTH PROGRAM.

If the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions reports out legislation to establish a program, including medical monitoring and treatment, addressing the adverse health impacts linked to the September 11, 2001 attacks, and if the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions makes a finding that previously spent World Trade Center Health Program funds were used to provide screening, monitoring and treatment services, and directly related program support, the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, if such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 333. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO BAN MEDICARE ADVANTAGE AND PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN SALES AND MARKETING ABUSES.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would limit inappropriate or abusive marketing tactics by private insurers and their agents offering Medicare Advantage or Medicare prescription drug plans by enacting any or all of the recommendations agreed to by leaders of the health insurance industry on March 3, 2008, including prohibitions on cold calling and telephone solicitations for in-home sales appointments with Medicare beneficiaries, free meals and inducements at sales events, cross-selling of non-health products, and up-selling of Medicare insurance products without prior consent of beneficiaries, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 334. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING EXTENDING THE "MOVING TO WORK AGREEMENT" BETWEEN THE PHILADELPHIA HOUSING AUTHORITY AND THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE SAME TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR A PERIOD OF ONE YEAR.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The current ''Moving to Work Agreement'' between the Philadelphia Housing Authority and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development is set to expire on March 31, 2008.

(2) The Philadelphia Housing Authority has used this agreement to leverage private and public resources to develop mixed-income communities that address the needs of the very poor while reshaping entire communities, and estimates that it will lose $50,000,000 as a result of the agreement expiring.

(3) The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has refused to grant Philadelphia Housing Authority a 1-year extension of its current agreement under the same terms and conditions.

(4) The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development alleges that Philadelphia Housing Authority is in violation of fair housing requirements.

(5) The Philadelphia Housing Authority denies this assertion and is challenging the matter in Federal District Court.

(6) That there is a suspicion of retaliation with regard to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's refusal to grant a one-year extension of Philadelphia Housing Authorities current agreement under the same terms and conditions.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that it was discovered that two senior level officials at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development had the following email exchange, referring to Philadelphia Housing Authority Executive Director Carl R. Greene—

(1) Then-Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing Orlando J. Cabrera wrote, ''Would you like me to make his life less happy? If so, how?''

(2) Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity Kim Kendrick wrote, ''Take away all of his Federal dollars?''

(3) Then-Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing Orlando J. Cabrera wrote, ''Let me look into that possibility.''

(A) That these emails were the subject of questioning by Senator Casey to U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Secretary Alphonso Jackson at a March 12, 2008 hearing before the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs; and by Senator Specter to Secretary Jackson at a March 13, 2008 hearing before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development and Related Agencies.

(B) That the Philadelphia Housing Authority's allegation of retaliation appears to be substantiated by these newly discovered emails.

(C) That the expiration of the current agreement is imminent and will negatively impact 84,000 low-income residents of Philadelphia.

(4) It is the sense of the Senate that Philadelphia Housing Authority should be granted a one-year extension of its ''Moving to Work Agreement'' with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development under the same terms and conditions as the current agreement.

SEC. 335. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) On January 26, 1996, the House of Representatives passed H.J. Res. 1, the Balanced Budget Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, by the necessary two-thirds majority (300–132);

(2) On June 6, 1996, the Senate fell three votes short of the two-thirds majority vote needed to pass the Balanced Budget Amendment; and

(3) Since the House of Representatives and Senate last voted on the Balanced Budget Amendment, the debt held by the public has grown from $3,700,000,000,000 to more than $5,000,000,000,000.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that a Balanced Budget Amendment to the Constitution of the United States should be voted on at earliest opportunity.

SEC. 336. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NEED FOR COMPREHENSIVE LEGISLATION TO LEGALIZE THE IMPORTATION OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS FROM HIGHLY INDUSTRIALIZED COUNTRIES WITH SAFE PHARMACEUTICAL INFRASTRUCTURES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The United States is the world's largest market for pharmaceuticals, yet consumers still pay the world's highest prices.

(2) In 2000, Congress took action to legalize the importation of prescription drugs from other countries by United States wholesalers and pharmacists, and before such a program can go into effect, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) must certify that the program would have no adverse impact on safety and that it would reduce costs for American consumers.

(3) Since 2000, no Secretary of HHS has made the certification required to permit the implementation of a program for importation of prescription drugs.

(4) In July 2006, the Senate approved by a vote of 68–32 an amendment to the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007, that prohibits Customs and Border Protection from preventing individuals not in the business of importing prescription drugs from carrying them across the border with Canada.

(5) In July 2007, the Senate adopted language similar to the 2007 amendment in the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2008.

(6) In October 2007, the Senate adopted language in the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008, that prohibits anti-reimportation activities within HHS.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the leadership of the Senate should bring to the floor for full debate in 2008 comprehensive legislation that legalizes the importation of prescription drugs from highly industrialized countries with safe pharmaceutical infrastructures and creates a regulatory pathway to ensure that such drugs are safe;

(2) such legislation should be given an up or down vote on the floor of the Senate; and

(3) previous Senate approval of 3 amendments in support of prescription drug importation shows the Senate's strong support for passage of comprehensive importation legislation.

The text of the Senate concurrent resolution, as amended, is as follows:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008 is revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009, including appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 301. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for SCHIP legislation.
Sec. 302. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for veterans and servicemembers.
Sec. 303. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for education benefits for servicemembers, veterans, and their families.
Sec. 304. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for infrastructure investment.
Sec. 305. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for renewable energy and energy efficiency.
Sec. 306. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for middle-income tax relief and economic equity.
Sec. 307. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reform of the alternative minimum tax.
Sec. 308. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for higher education.
Sec. 309. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for affordable housing.
Sec. 310. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for medicare improvements.
Sec. 311. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for health care quality, effectiveness, and efficiency.
Sec. 312. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Medicaid and other programs.
Sec. 313. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for trade adjustment assistance and unemployment insurance modernization.
Sec. 314. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for county payments legislation.
Sec. 315. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for San Joaquin River restoration and Navajo Nation water rights settlements.
Sec. 316. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the National Park Centennial Fund.
Sec. 317. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for child support enforcement.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Program integrity initiatives.
Sec. 402. Oversight of government performance.
Sec. 403. Point of order against advance appropriations.
Sec. 404. Overseas deployments and emergency needs.
Sec. 405. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.
Sec. 406. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 407. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 408. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE V—POLICY

Sec. 501. Policy on middle-income tax relief.
Sec. 502. Policy on defense priorities.

TITLE VI—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

Sec. 601. Sense of the House on the Innovation Agenda and America Competes Act.
Sec. 602. Sense of the House on servicemembers' and veterans' health care and other priorities.
Sec. 603. Sense of the House on homeland security.
Sec. 604. Sense of the House regarding long-term fiscal reform.
Sec. 605. Sense of the House regarding waste, fraud, and abuse.
Sec. 606. Sense of the House regarding extension of the statutory pay-as-you-go rule.
Sec. 607. Sense of the House on long-term budgeting.
Sec. 608. Sense of the House regarding the need to maintain and build upon efforts to fight hunger.
Sec. 609. Sense of the House regarding affordable health coverage.
Sec. 610. Sense of the House regarding pay parity.
Sec. 611. Sense of the House regarding subprime lending and foreclosures.
Sec. 612. Sense of House regarding the importance of child support enforcement.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $1,879,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,027,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,205,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,442,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,669,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,771,740,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be adjusted are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $0.
Fiscal year 2009: −$70,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $23,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $14,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $16,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $17,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,556,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,529,246,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,564,161,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,698,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,740,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,866,862,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,462,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,563,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,622,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,716,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,728,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,857,394,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:
Fiscal year 2008: $583,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $536,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $416,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $274,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $59,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $85,654,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the debt subject to limit are as follows:
Fiscal year 2008: $9,567,484,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $10,199,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $10,724,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $11,103,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $11,295,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $11,495,218,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:
Fiscal year 2008: $5,396,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $5,753,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $5,981,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $6,047,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $5,885,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $5,744,120,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2008 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $590,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $576,173,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $542,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $550,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $557,026,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $565,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $556,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $576,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, 568,829,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $32,648,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $37,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $38,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $39,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $40,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,154,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $40,677,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,346,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $27,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,456,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $29,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $31,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $32,474,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $33,853,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $35,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,477,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $3,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $4,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $4,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $4,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $4,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $4,895,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,020,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $32,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $38,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $33,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $34,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $35,568,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,745,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $36,490,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,299,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $22,456,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $21,719,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,816,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $11,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $9,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,722,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $13,887,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $8,998,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,648,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $79,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $73,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $77,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $78,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,062,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $79,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $80,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,443,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $14,553,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $14,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $15,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $15,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $15,755,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,561,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $90,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $95,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,947,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $102,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $105,612,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,135,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $107,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,397,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $101,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,490,000,000.

(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $285,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $306,795,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $305,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $323,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $324,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $344,749,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $343,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $367,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $366,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $393,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $391,326,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $390,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $390,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $420,191,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $419,974,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $445,225,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $445,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $494,370,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $494,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $491,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $491,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $552,389,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $552,503,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $389,865,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $411,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $417,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $418,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $426,924,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $427,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $412,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $412,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $427,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $427,703,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $30,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $33,162,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,162,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $86,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $93,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $96,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,710,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $101,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,475,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $99,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $105,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,266,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $46,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $48,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $49,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,602,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $50,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $51,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,501,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $52,967,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,542,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $56,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $23,520,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $19,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $20,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,007,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,787,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $349,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $349,296,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $334,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $334,233,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $370,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $406,997,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $406,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $427,954,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $427,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $436,292,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $436,292,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $1,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$53,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$200,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$86,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$86,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$67,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$67,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$70,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$70,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$73,364,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$73,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$76,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$76,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$79,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$79,691,000,000.
(21) Overseas Deployments and Other Activities (970):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $108,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,901,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $70,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,809,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $47,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $18,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $5,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $1,775,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING.—Not later than September 12, 2008, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report a reconciliation bill making changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by $750,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013.

(b) CHANGES IN REVENUE.—Not later than July 15, 2008, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report a reconciliation bill making changes in laws within its jurisdiction that will reduce total revenues by $70,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2009 and will increase total revenues by $70,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2013.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS TO ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—

(1) Upon the reporting to the House of any bill that has complied with reconciliation instructions, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(2) Upon the submission to the House of any conference report recommending a reconciliation bill in which a committee has complied with its reconciliation instructions, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(3) Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be allocations and aggregates established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of such Act.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SCHIP LEGISLATION.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, which contains matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce that expands coverage and improves children's health through the State Childrens Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) under title XXI of the Social Security Act and the program under title XIX of such Act (commonly known as Medicaid) and that increases new budget authority that will result in no more than $50,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 2008 through 2013, and others which contain offsets so designated for the purpose of this section within the jurisdiction of another committee or committees, if the combined changes would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 302. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR VETERANS AND SERVICEMEMBERS.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) enhances medical care for wounded or disabled military personnel or veterans;

(2) maintains affordable health care for military retirees and veterans;

(3) improves disability benefits or evaluations for wounded or disabled military personnel or veterans, including measures to expedite the claims process;

(4) expands eligibility to permit additional disabled military retirees to receive both disability compensation and retired pay;

(5) eliminates the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation; or

(6) provides or increases benefits for Filipino veterans of World War II or their survivors and dependents;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 303. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EDUCATION BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEMBERS, VETERANS, AND THEIR FAMILIES.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that enhances education benefits or assistance for servicemembers (including Active Duty, National Guard, and Reserve), veterans, or their spouses, survivors, or dependents by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 304. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for increased investment in infrastructure projects by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 305. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides tax incentives for or otherwise encourages the production of renewable energy or increased energy efficiency; encourages investment in emerging energy or vehicle technologies or carbon capture and sequestration; provides for reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; or facilitates the training of workers for these industries (''green collar jobs'') by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 306. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MIDDLE-INCOME TAX RELIEF AND ECONOMIC EQUITY.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for tax relief for middle-income families and taxpayers or enhanced economic equity, such as extension of the child tax credit, extension of marriage penalty relief, extension of the 10 percent individual income tax bracket, elimination of estate taxes on all but a minute fraction of estates by reforming and substantially increasing the unified credit, extension of the research and experimentation tax credit, extension of the deduction for small business expensing, extension of the deduction for State and local sales taxes, and a tax credit for school construction bonds, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 307. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORM OF THE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for reform of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by reducing the tax burden of the alternative minimum tax on middle-income families by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 308. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes college more affordable or accessible through reforms to the Higher Education Act of 1965 or other legislation by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 309. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for an affordable housing fund, offset by reforming the regulation of certain government-sponsored enterprises, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 310. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE IMPROVEMENTS.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the Medicare program for beneficiaries and protects access to care, through measures such as increasing the reimbursement rate for physicians while protecting beneficiaries from associated premium increases and making improvements to the prescription drug program under part D, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 311. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH CARE QUALITY, EFFECTIVENESS, AND EFFICIENCY.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) provides incentives or other support for adoption of modern information technology, including electronic prescribing, to improve quality and protect privacy in health care;

(2) establishes a new Federal or public-private initiative for research on the comparative effectiveness of different medical interventions; or

(3) provides parity between health insurance coverage of mental health benefits and benefits for medical and surgical services, including parity in public programs;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 312. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICAID AND OTHER PROGRAMS.

(a) REGULATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that prevents or delays the implementation or administration of regulations or other administrative actions that would affect the Medicaid, SCHIP, or other programs by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(b) TRANSITIONAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE AND QUALIFYING INDIVIDUALS.—In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that extends the transitional medical assistance program or the qualifying individuals program, which are included in title XIX of the Social Security Act, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 313. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE MODERNIZATION.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that reauthorizes the trade adjustment assistance program to better meet the challenges of globalization or modernizes the unemployment insurance system to improve access to needed benefits by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 314. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COUNTY PAYMENTS LEGISLATION.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–393) or makes changes to the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–565) by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 315. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SAN JOAQUIN RIVER RESTORATION AND NAVAJO NATION WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENTS.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that would fulfill the purposes of the San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement Act or implement a Navajo Nation water rights settlement as authorized by the Northwestern New Mexico Rural Water Projects Act by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 316. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE NATIONAL PARK CENTENNIAL FUND.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment,

or conference report that provides for the establishment of the National Parks Centennial Fund by the amounts provided in such measure for that purpose if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018

SEC. 317. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves Federal child support collection efforts or results in more collected child support reaching families by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—

(1) CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME REDETERMINATIONS.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates $264,000,000 for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, and provides an additional appropriation of up to $240,000,000, and the amount is designated for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2009.

(2) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates $6,997,000,000 to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated to improve compliance with the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and provides an additional appropriation of up to $490,000,000, and the amount is designated to improve compliance with the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2009.

(3) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates up to $198,000,000 and the amount is designated to the health care fraud and abuse control program at the Department of Health and Human Services, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2009.

(4) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates $10,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to $40,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2009.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in subsection (a) for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in subsection (a), except that no adjustment shall be made for provisions exempted for the purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 under section 404 of this resolution.

(2) MATTERS TO BE ADJUSTED.—The adjustments referred to in paragraph (1) are to be made to—

(A) the allocations made pursuant to the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(B) the budgetary aggregates as set forth in this resolution.

SEC. 402. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

In the House, all committees are directed to review programs within their jurisdiction to root out waste, fraud, and abuse in program spending, giving particular scrutiny to issues raised by Government Accountability Office reports. Based on these oversight efforts and committee performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 403. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2010 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report to accompany this resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $27,558,000,000 in new budget authority, and for 2011, accounts separately identified under the same heading.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2009.

SEC. 404. OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND EMERGENCY NEEDS.

(a) OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2008 or fiscal year 2009 for overseas deployments and related activities, and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this subsection, then new budget authority and outlays resulting therefrom shall not count for the purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) EMERGENCY NEEDS.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts, and such amounts are designated as necessary to meet emergency needs, then the new budget authority and outlays resulting therefrom shall not count for the purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 405. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

SEC. 406. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—In the House, for purposes of this resolution, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 407. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

In the House, upon the enactment of any bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002).

SEC. 408. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House, and these rules shall supersede other rules of the House only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules of the House; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House.

TITLE V—POLICY

SEC. 501. POLICY ON MIDDLE-INCOME TAX RELIEF.

It is the policy of this resolution to—

(1) minimize fiscal burdens on middle-income families and their children and grandchildren;

(2) provide immediate relief for the tens of millions of middle-income households who would otherwise be subject to the alternative minimum tax (AMT) under current law, in the context of permanent, revenue-neutral AMT reform; and

(3) support extension of middle-income tax relief and enhanced economic equity through policies such as—

(A) extension of the child tax credit;

(B) extension of marriage penalty relief;

(C) extension of the 10 percent individual income tax bracket;

(D) elimination of estate taxes on all but a minute fraction of estates by reforming and substantially increasing the unified tax credit;

(E) extension of the research and experimentation tax credit;

(F) extension of the deduction for State and local sales taxes;

(G) extension of the deduction for small business expensing; and

(H) enactment of a tax credit for school construction bonds.

This resolution assumes that the cost of enacting such policies is offset by reforms within the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that promote a fairer distribution of taxes across families and generations, economic efficiency, higher rates of tax compliance to close the ''tax gap,'' and reduced taxpayer burdens through tax simplification.

SEC. 502. POLICY ON DEFENSE PRIORITIES.

It is the policy of this resolution that—

(1) the Administration's budget requests should comply with section 1008, Public Law 109–364, the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, and the Administration should no longer attempt to fund overseas military operations through emergency supplemental appropriations requests;

(2) the Department of Defense should exclude nonwar requirements from its funding requests for Iraq and Afghanistan;

(3) implementing the recommendation of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (commonly referred to as the 9/11 Commission) to adequately fund cooperative threat reduction and nuclear nonproliferation programs (securing ''loose nukes'') is a high priority and should receive far greater emphasis than the President's budget provides;

(4) readiness of our troops, particularly the National Guard and Reserve, is a high priority, and that greater emphasis needs to be placed on mitigating equipment and training shortfalls;

(5) TRICARE fees for military retirees under the age of 65 should not be increased as the President's budget proposes;

(6) military pay and benefits should be enhanced to improve the quality of life of military personnel;

(7) improving military health care services continues to be a high priority and adequate funding to ensure quality health care for returning combat veterans should be provided;

(8) higher priority defense needs could be addressed by funding missile defense at an adequate but lower level, not providing funding for development of space-based missile defense interceptors, and by restraining excessive cost and schedule growth in defense research, development and procurement programs;

(9) the Department of Defense should reassess current defense plans to ensure that weapons developed to counter cold war-era threats are not redundant and are applicable to 21st century threats;

(10) sufficient resources should be provided for the Department of Defense to do an aggressive job of addressing as many as possible of the 1,260 unimplemented recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) over the last 7 years to improve practices at the Department of Defense, including investigation of the billions of dollars of obligations, disbursements and overcharges for which the Department of Defense cannot account;

(11) savings from the actions recommended in paragraphs (8) and (10) of this section should be used to fund the priorities identified in paragraphs (3) through (7);

(12) the Department of Defense report to Congress on its assessment of cold war weapons and progress on implementing GAO recommendations as outlined in paragraphs (9) and (10) by a time determined by the appropriate authorizing committees; and

(13) the GAO report to the appropriate congressional committees by the end of the 110th Congress regarding the Department of Defense's progress in implementing its audit recommendations.

TITLE VI—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

SEC. 601. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON THE INNOVATION AGENDA AND AMERICA COMPETES ACT.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the House should provide sufficient funding so that our Nation may continue to be the world leader in education, innovation and economic growth;

(2) last year, Congress passed and the President signed the America COMPETES Act, bipartisan legislation designed to ensure that American students, teachers, businesses, and workers are prepared to continue leading the world in innovation, research, and technology well into the future;

(3) this resolution supports the efforts authorized in the America COMPETES Act, providing substantially increased funding above the President's requested level for 2009, and increased amounts after 2009 in Function 250 (General Science, Space and Technology) and Function 270 (Energy);

(4) additional increases for scientific research and education are included in Function 500 (Education, Employment, Training and Social Services), Function 550 (Health), Function 300 (Environment and Natural Resources), and Function 370 (Commerce and Housing Credit), all of which receive more funding than the President's budget provides;

(5) because America's greatest resource for innovation resides within classrooms across the country, the increased funding provided in this resolution will support initiatives within the America COMPETES Act to educate tens of thousands of new scientists, engineers, and mathematicians, and place highly qualified teachers in math and science K–12 classrooms; and

(6) because independent scientific research provides the foundation for innovation and future technologies, this resolution will keep us on the path toward doubling funding for the National Science Foundation, basic research in the physical sciences, and collaborative research partnerships, and toward achieving energy independence through the development of clean and sustainable alternative energy technologies.

SEC. 602. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON SERVICEMEMBERS' AND VETERANS' HEALTH CARE AND OTHER PRIORITIES.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the House supports excellent health care for current and former members of the United States Armed Services—they have served well and honorably and have made significant sacrifices for this Nation;

(2) this resolution provides $48,150,000,000 in discretionary budget authority for 2009 for Function 700 (Veterans Benefits and Services), including veterans' health care, which is $4,888,000,000 more than the 2008 level, $3,602,000,000 more than the Congressional Budget Office's baseline level for 2009, and $3,232,000,000 more than the President's budget for 2009; and also provides more discretionary budget authority than the President's budget in every year after 2009;

(3) this resolution provides funding to continue addressing problems such as those identified at Walter Reed Army Medical Center to improve military and veterans' health care facilities and services;

(4) this resolution assumes the rejection of the health care enrollment fees and pharmaceutical co-payment increases in the President's budget;

(5) this resolution provides additional funding above the President's inadequate budget levels for the Department of Veterans Affairs to research and treat veterans' mental health, posttraumatic stress disorder, and traumatic brain injury; and

(6) this resolution provides additional funding above the President's inadequate budget levels for the Department of Veterans Affairs to improve the speed and accuracy of its processing of disability compensation claims, including funding to hire additional personnel above the President's requested level.

SEC. 603. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) this resolution assumes additional homeland security funding above the President's requested level for 2009 and every subsequent year;

(2) this resolution assumes funding above the President's requested level for 2009, and additional amounts in subsequent years, in the four budget functions—Function 400 (Transportation), Function 450 (Community and Regional Development), Function 550 (Health), and Function 750 (Administration of Justice)—that fund most nondefense homeland security activities; and

(3) the homeland security funding provided in this resolution will help to strengthen the security of our Nation's transportation system, particularly our ports where significant security shortfalls still exist and foreign ports, by expanding efforts to identify and scan all high-risk United States-bound cargo, equip, train and support first responders (including enhancing interoperable communications and emergency management), strengthen border patrol, and increase the preparedness of the public health system.

SEC. 604. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING LONG-TERM FISCAL REFORM.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) both the Government Accountability Office and the Congressional Budget Office have warned that the Federal budget is on an unsustainable path of rising deficits and debt;

(2) using recent trend data and reasonable policy assumptions, CBO has projected that the gap between spending and revenues over the next 75 years will reach 6.9 percent of GDP;

(3) publicly held debt will rise from 36 percent today to 400 percent of GDP by the decade beginning in 2050 under CBO's alternative policy scenario;

(4) the most significant factor affecting the long-term Federal fiscal landscape is the expectation that total public and private health spending will continue to grow faster than the economy;

(5) the House calls upon governmental and nongovernmental experts to develop specific options to reform the health care system and control costs, that further research and analysis on topics including comparative effectiveness, health information technology, preventative care, and provider incentives is needed, and that of critical importance is the development of a consensus on the appropriate methods for estimating the budgetary impact and health outcome effects of these proposals; and

(6) immediate policy action is needed to address the long-term fiscal challenges facing the United States, including the rising costs of entitlements, in a manner that is fiscally responsible, equitable, and lasting, and that also honors commitments made to beneficiaries, and that such action should be bipartisan, bicameral, involve both legislative and executive branch participants, as well as public participation, and be conducted in a manner that ensures full, fair, and timely Congressional consideration.

SEC. 605. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) all committees should examine programs within their jurisdiction to identify wasteful and fraudulent spending;

(2) title IV of this resolution includes cap adjustments to provide appropriations for agencies that control programs that accounted for a significant share of improper payments reported by

Federal agencies: Social Security Administration Continuing Disability Reviews, the Medicare/Medicaid Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Program, and Unemployment Insurance Program Integrity;

(3) title IV also includes a cap adjustment for the Internal Revenue Services for tax compliance efforts to close the $300,000,000,000 tax gap;

(4) the resolution's deficit-neutral reserve funds require authorizing committees to cut lower priority and wasteful spending to accommodate any new high-priority entitlement benefits; and

(5) title IV of the resolution directs all committees to review the performance of programs within their jurisdiction and report recommendations annually to the Committee on the Budget as part of the views and estimates process required by section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act.

SEC. 606. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING EXTENSION OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO RULE.

It is the sense of the House that to reduce the deficit, Congress should extend the PAYGO rules originally enacted in the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

SEC. 607. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON LONG-TERM BUDGETING.

It is the sense of the Congress that the determination of the congressional budget for the United States Government and the President's budget request should include consideration of the Financial Report of the United States Government, especially its information regarding the Governments net operating cost, financial position, and long-term liabilities.

SEC. 608. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE NEED TO MAINTAIN AND BUILD UPON EFFORTS TO FIGHT HUNGER.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) 35.5 million Americans (12.6 million of them children) are food insecure—uncertain of having, or unable to acquire, enough food, and that 11.1 million Americans are hungry because of lack of food;

(2) despite the critical contributions of the Department of Agriculture nutrition programs (particularly the food stamp program), which significantly reduced payment error rates while providing help to partially mitigate the effects of rising poverty and unemployment, significant need remains, even among families that receive food stamps;

(3) nearly 25 million people, including more than nine million children and nearly three million seniors, sought emergency food assistance from food pantries, soup kitchens, shelters, and local charities last year;

(4) legislation that passed the House with bipartisan support was an appropriate first step toward ensuring that nutrition assistance keeps up with inflation and rising food prices; and

(5) Department of Agriculture programs that help us fight hunger should be maintained and that the House should continue to seize opportunities to reach Americans in need and to fight hunger.

SEC. 609. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING AFFORDABLE HEALTH COVERAGE.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) nearly 47 million Americans, including nine million children, lack health insurance;

(2) people without health insurance are more likely to experience problems getting medical care and to be hospitalized for avoidable health problems;

(3) most Americans receive health coverage through their employers, and a major issue facing all employers is the rising cost of health insurance;

(4) small businesses, which have generated most of the new jobs annually over the last decade, have an especially difficult time affording health coverage, because of higher administrative costs and fewer people over whom to spread the risk of catastrophic costs;

(5) because it is especially costly for small businesses to provide health coverage, their employees make up a large proportion of the Nation's uninsured individuals; and

(6) legislation consistent with the pay-as-you-go principle should be adopted that makes health insurance more affordable and accessible, with attention to the special circumstances affecting employees of small businesses, and that lowers costs and improves the quality of health care by encouraging integration of health information technology tools into the practice of medicine, and by promoting improvements in disease management and disease prevention.

SEC. 610. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING PAY PARITY.

It is the sense of the House that rates of compensation for civilian employees of the United States should be adjusted at the same time, and in the same proportion, as are rates of compensation for members of the uniformed services.

SEC. 611. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING SUBPRIME LENDING AND FORECLOSURES.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) over the last six months, the Nation has experienced a significant increase in the number of homeowners facing the risk of foreclosure with estimates of as many as 2.8 million subprime and other distressed borrowers facing the loss of their homes over the next five years;

(2) the rise in foreclosures not only has an immediate, devastating impact on homeowners and their families, but it also has ripple effects—

(A) local communities experiencing high levels of foreclosures experience deterioration as a result of the large number of vacant foreclosed and abandoned homes;

(B) rising foreclosure rates can accelerate drops in home prices, affecting all homeowners; and

(C) home mortgage default and foreclosure rates increase risk for lenders, further restricting the availability of credit, which can in turn slow economic growth; and

(3) the rise in foreclosures is not only a crisis for subprime borrowers, but a larger problem for communities as a whole, and considering the multi-layered effects of increasing foreclosures, the House should consider steps to address this complex problem.

SEC. 612. SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING THE IMPORTANCE OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) additional legislative action is needed to ensure that States have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without financial penalty; and

(2) when 100 percent of child support payments are passed to the child, rather than administrative expenses, program integrity is improved and child support participation increases.

AMERICORPS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1173.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1173.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 344, nays 69, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

YEAS—344

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam

Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—69

Akin
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Boehner
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Carter
Conaway
Culberson
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Hensarling
Herger
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latta
Marchant
McHenry
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Paul
Pearce
Pitts
Poe
Radanovich
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Sali
Sessions
Shadegg
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Walberg
Wamp
Westmoreland
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—20

Andrews
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
DeGette
Doggett
Gerlach
Lewis (KY)
Mack
Meeks (NY)
Myrick
Rush
Schmidt
Stark
Wilson (NM)
Wu
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are less than 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1728

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

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON S. CON. RES. 70, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the concurrent resolution on the budget, S. Con. Res. 70, be instructed to increase negative budget authority and outlays in section 101(19), function 920 (Allowances) of the House amendment, by $2.02 billion over the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) will be recognized for 30 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First off, Mr. Speaker, I would like to celebrate the fact that we are here in this well talking about this motion to go to conference, and I want to compliment our chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT, the gentleman from South Carolina. And I mean this in a very sincere way.

The budget process doesn't work if you don't have a budget, and I want to compliment the gentleman from South Carolina for making it 2 years in a row for actually bringing forward and getting through a budget resolution. It looked like it wasn't going to happen. We won't be supporting it, but the fact that the budget chairman is keeping the budget process intact speaks very good to this institution, good to the process, and I want to compliment the gentleman from South Carolina for doing that.

Now, on to the motion to instruct. Everyone agrees, Mr. Speaker, that we need to reduce our reliance on foreign oil. But frankly, if we really want to move forward with greater energy independence, we should increase our petroleum supply by increasing our domestic production of oil. The motion accomplishes just that.

The Republican motion calls on the conferees to increase the receipt levels in the final budget resolution by expanding leasing in Federal areas in the West, in the Outer Continental Shelf and in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in an environmentally sound manner.

Yesterday, the House voted overwhelmingly to suspend the purchase of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve as a means to increase oil supply and reduce gasoline prices. It's unclear whether this will have any impact on oil prices, much less gas prices.

This motion would accomplish that result. It would, No. 1, increase domestic oil production and put downward pressure on oil prices and gasoline prices; No. 2, it would reduce our reliance on foreign oil; and, No. 3, it would reduce the deficit.

More than a year ago, the Democratic majority pledged to bring gasoline prices down. On January 4, 2007, the day the Democratic majority took control of the House, the price of gas was an average of $2.33 a gallon. Today Americans are paying an average of $3.76 per gallon to put fuel in their cars. Just 2 days ago in Kenosha, Wisconsin it was $3.95. It's $4 in some areas. This is an increase of at least $1.43 a gallon.

Republicans are seeking to tap into America's great natural resources in an environmentally sound and effective way to provide the consumers the relief at the pump that they deserve, while reducing our reliance on foreign oil.

This Republican motion is a step in the right direction to enhance our energy security and put in place a long-term plan to provide relief at the pump. These are the steps we need to take to assist families, communities, small businesses, those that are suffering with soaring prices of oil and gasoline.

With that, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the chairman for yielding.

This is about energy and about the budget, and this is about the Arctic wildlife range in Alaska.

We have voted 12 times on this floor; in fact, I think Mr. SPRATT voted for it, Mr. DINGELL voted for it, or will vote for it, to try to open the last great known elephant in oil fields in the continental United States. If we were to do so today, we would deliver to the American public 1 million barrels of oil for 30 continuing years—a day. Thirty years, 1 million barrels a day. That's the very minor estimate.

But more than that, it would provide, this year, if we were just to lease it, $191 billion in revenue for the budget, $191 billion for the lease and the development of ANWR. And in 3 years I can deliver to the American public 1 million barrels a day or more. That's more than Venezuela. That keeps Venezuela from jacking the prices around.

If we were to do it, my good friends, it would drop the price of oil about $10 a barrel immediately; not because we're delivering it, but it would be the first time this Congress has worked on the supply side, and the speculators would stop speculating if they saw that Congress was serious about developing our national and our Federal lands in fossil fuels. Why we don't do that I cannot understand.

Yes, we do have to change our modes of transportation in a period of time. But there's no way you can bridge the ability of not using fossil fuels in the short-term.

Now, you think about the consumer today in Alaska, and you think about the consumer in the rest of the Nation and what they have to do at $4 a gallon, maybe $5. And I have estimates it may go as far as $10 by the end of the year, and that's going to be on your watch.

We're here talking about the budget. But if we want to solve the budget problems, let's create some dollars. But more than that, let's create less dependency on foreign oil.

How we can sit here as a body and send dollars overseas, and the billions of dollars; to give you some idea, the average tax for every man, woman and child, everybody listening to this station tonight is paying $2,085 per every man, woman and child in tax to the foreign countries, burning their oil. Seventy percent of their oil.

And some people say, well, it's the oil companies. Nonsense. This is about demand globally and supply. We're not the only buyers anymore. America's not the only ones that have automobiles. America's not the only one using fossil fuels. China is burning more barrels of fuel today than we are, and that drives the price up. We're no longer the only buyer, and the seller can ask for the price they're going to get.

The only way you can relieve that is start developing our national, on Federal lands, our oil for the good of the American people. Why we're not doing this, I don't know.

And remember, you heard me before on this, well it's not your fault, it's not our fault, it's this fault, the body of this Congress. We've got to stop pandering for those who say no to developing our fossil fuels. We have to stop pandering for those saying it's going to be a total climate change because it is going to happen in this world. They will be burning oil, and we'll be unable to take and support our people until we develop our fields as we should develop them.

I'm hoping America's listening. I hope America will wake up to the fact. We have the ability to do it here today. We have the ability to solve the budget problem, but we have a better ability to solve the energy problem in America.

I'm asking my fellow colleagues, let's do it. Let's do it today. Let's do it in the future. Let's solve the problems of energy in this Nation.

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

Mr. Speaker, on March 13, we passed the budget resolution. It's a good resolution. It moves the budget to balance by the Year 2012 and, along the way, it accumulates less debt than the Bush budget. It limits spending to a reasonable level.

But I can truthfully say that this bill does more for education, more for the environment, more for energy, more for science and innovation than the President's budget or the Republicans' resolution. And also, critically important, it avoids the deep cuts in Medicare and Medicaid that are provided for, called for in the President's budget. And it protects the middle income tax cuts; provides AMT relief for middle income families for whom it was never intended.

Therefore, we have the outline of a good budget for the coming fiscal year, and we need to pass it, send it to conference, bring the conference report back. We have an excellent chance, I think, of passing the first conference report, back to back, since the year 2000.

What my friends on the other side of the aisle have introduced is, to my way of thinking, a distraction, a red herring. ANWR is never mentioned in our resolution. And to my recollection it was not mentioned in your resolution. So the topic here is wholly out of the scope of the resolution on either side, particularly ours, and wholly outside the jurisdiction of our committee. We don't assume ANWR revenues, we don't preclude ANWR revenues because we don't have the authority to prescribe that.

The most we can provide for in a budget resolution is a certain revenue floor, a certain amount of revenues be collected over the year to be applied against the expenditures that we broadly distribute in something called the 302(a) section of our bill and the 302(b), providing for 302(b) allocations.

So this budget resolution, this resolution to instruct, motion to instruct conferees, goes off on a tack that is totally different from what the resolution's all about, what the committee's jurisdiction is. If you want to debate this, there's another forum for debating it. There's another committee, the Resources Committee.

We don't have the authority to do what you would call upon us to do. We don't take a position for ANWR or against ANWR in the budget resolution because it's not the place for that kind of policy resolution. There are other places here for that to be established.

So we've got a good budget resolution. We do not need this resolution, this motion to instruct conferees, to do anything towards balancing the budget. You've got a very nominal sum of money in here when it comes to a 5-year period of time.

And one question I would leave with you, is you call for an increase in negative budget authority and outlays. If I didn't know what that meant, I wouldn't know what it meant when I first saw it on the printed page here. But I would take it that not only does oil revenues fall under this rubric, but so would forest products, national parks and things of that nature.

So it's not clear exactly what you're calling for here. I can only say it's a distraction. It's a red herring, it's not needed, and it does not really belong in the budget resolution process.

I retain the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 23 minutes. The gentleman from South Carolina has 26½ minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I will yield myself 30 seconds simply to say, using the chairman's argument, then there's no money in this budget for veterans, no money in this budget for science, no money in this budget for education if you use that line of argument. There's only money for discretionary spending in here.

A budget resolution is a series of numbers, and we're saying, let's adjust the numbers to accommodate the policy we're talking about here, drilling for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, the Outer Continental Shelf, the Intermountain West.

At this time I'd like to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Before I speak in favor of the Ryan motion to instruct conferees on the budget, let me give you a post-SPR suspension update. The price of oil went up $1.73 on the mercantile market yesterday after we voted to suspend shipments into the SPR. At some point in time I sure hope it does come down and we'll work together, hopefully, in a bipartisan basis to bring oil and energy prices down. But our symbolic vote yesterday had the opposite effect of what it was intended because prices went up.

Let me speak now in favor of this motion to instruct. I would point all the Members in the body to the quote above the Speaker's rostrum by Daniel Webster. It says, the very first part of that quote, ''Let us develop the resources of our land.'' And this motion to instruct is a direct descendant of that sentiment.

We are not helpless, we are not hopeless in this country in terms of energy. If we will develop the resources of our land, we could, in all probability, within 5, maybe 6, 7 years, double the amount of oil or oil equivalent that we're producing right now in the United States.

We're currently producing somewhere between 6 and 7, maybe a little over 7 million barrels. As Congressman YOUNG has just pointed out, if we were to drill in ANWR, it would start out with a production capacity, in all likelihood, of about 300,000 barrels a day. And in the optimum case, it could be ramped up to about 2 million barrels a day within 5 or 6 years.

We have over a million barrels a day of production off the coast of California. We have 2 trillion barrels of oil equivalent in the shale oil deposits in Wyoming and Colorado.

□ 1745

We haven't even inventoried what is off the coast of the east coast of the United States. We have the Chinese drilling between Cuba and Florida, and yet we're not allowed, because of moratoria, to drill there.

So we're not hopeless. We can also develop our coal resources. Congressman SHIMKUS has a bill on coal-to-liquids that is very helpful, and yet we stand here and refuse to adopt any supply-side policies at all as prices go higher and higher and higher.

If you live in an urban area where you don't depend on an automobile, you may not feel those high prices. But if you live in a suburban or rural area, well, you have to drive to work and drive to shop. If you work for a trucking company, if you work for an airline company and you see the price of diesel and the price of aviation fuel go higher and higher and higher, you feel it. It's not an academic exercise.

This motion to instruct simply says let's have some domestic development of our resources. Let's try to bring those prices down not with just the conservation component, but with the supply component. And with world markets where they are today, production of oil is somewhere around 85 million barrels a day. The consumption of oil is somewhere around 85 million barrels a day. The demand for oil in the United States in the last 2 months in a row has gone down, but the demand for oil in the rest of the world has gone up. And it's gone up more in the rest of the world than it's gone down here in the United States.

But if we were to be producing another 1 million, 2 million, 3 million barrels of oil a day in the United States, that would create a cushion that would take some of the heat out of the market and the price would go down.

I can't imagine any Member of this body that doesn't have a constituency that's concerned about higher food prices, higher energy prices, and higher prices of living.

Let's vote for the motion to instruct and try to get a supply component to our energy policy.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. There is a certain absurdity to this debate that the poor oil companies have had their hands tied. We've had a President from Texas, an oil man; a Vice President from Texas, an oil man; the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee was from Texas; the chairman of the subcommittee on energy was from Texas; the majority leader was from Texas, all over the time that the Republicans controlled the House, the Senate, and the Presidency.

So during that time, by the way, and this is the good news, the Bush administration actually gave to the oil and gas industry 268 million acres of American land to drill on for oil and gas. Said, You just go and drill there. And guess what we got? Last year, ExxonMobil, the other four big companies, they reported $142 billion worth of profits. Pretty good tipping the American people upside down.

How much of it do they put into renewables? How much do they put into the supply side, the new energy sources: wind, solar, all of the new technologies? ExxonMobil: $10 million. They made $42 billion. They put $10 million into renewables. And what else do they say? When we come and say, How about giving back some of those tax breaks so we can give them over to wind and solar, the oil executives said, You can't touch our tax breaks, and by the way, we're also not going to invest in renewables.

Well, there's our future. Our future is saying let's go to the most pristine parts of the country. Let's go drill there. Let's not invest in solar; let's not invest in wind; let's not reinvest. That's the plan.

By the way, the price of oil under the Bush watch has gone from $30 a barrel to $126 a barrel. It's gone from $1.45 a gallon to $3.72 a gallon. And the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, when the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is filled and ready to go so we can deploy it, the President says he doesn't want to use it.

Well, here's the spigot, Mr. President. It's on top of the White House. You just have to turn it, deploy the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the price of a barrel of oil will begin to drop immediately.

This is a phony debate.

Mr. RYAN from Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. SHIMKUS.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. I always love following my friend from Massachusetts.

You know, most countries view their resources as a strategic advantage. But we in this country in the majority view our resources as an environmental hazard. This motion to instruct is critical. If we can get a million barrels out of ANWR at today's prices, do you know how much money goes into the Federal Treasury? $192 billion. Go tell that to your Blue Dogs who are holding up emergency supplemental bills because of PAYGO.

That's just ANWR. Let's talk about the other resources that we have.

Here is the reality. It wasn't President Bush that promised in 2006 that the Democrats have a plan to lower gas prices. That was Speaker PELOSI. In fact, she made the same mistake today. She claimed numerous times that the ag bill would lower prices, gas prices.

Now, I voted for it. I'm an ethanol guy. I'm a cellulosic guy. But if we don't bring more supply into the market, we're not going to lower prices. The demand from China and the demand from India and the demand from Europe just overwhelms us and is overwhelming the market. It was $58 when this majority came into power, $125 today.

I haven't used this for a while, but the Pelosi Premium, $2.33 when you came into the majority, Speaker PELOSI said, We're going to lower gas prices. $3.77 today. Chairman DINGELL is here. He's pulled this bill off the table, but climate change would add 50 cents a gallon. $4.20 is what we would be paying under climate change and current gas prices.

What's the solution? The great Outer Continental Shelf. Billions of barrels of oil, trillions of cubic feet of natural gas. There are. You can't deny it. The eastern gulf, off-limits by appropriation bill. Not resources bill. It's an appropriation bill that puts this off-limits. It's the OCS off the western coast. Billions of barrels of oil, trillions of cubic feet; we can't have it.

What would we do with the $192 billion from ANWR royalties? Let's go and take American coal, United Mine Worker jobs, let's build coal-to-liquid refineries, operating engineer, building-trade jobs. Let's build pipelines. Major organized labor jobs. And let's use it to lower the cost of jet fuel so we don't have the aviation industry going bankrupt. $192 billion would go a long way to do the solar, to do the wind power, to do everything we want to do.

We want more supply, not less. Environmental resources is a national advantage for our country, but we won't take use of it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't really surprise me that our good friends on the other side of the aisle have yet another drilling solution to our energy problems. Because it seems that with every energy problem, they have never found an energy problem that drilling won't solve. When will our colleagues in the minority get it into their heads that we cannot drill our way out of our energy problems?

What I think is amazing is that they have actually finally realized that there is a problem that needs to be addressed. Some of them have finally acknowledged that global warming is a problem. But they still refuse to let go of the tired direction that they continue to want to travel in, which is to prop up their wealthy corporate interests, prop up the oil industry, which is the most profitable industry in this country, with billions of dollars in oil subsidies.

And today's solution, in this motion to instruct, is that we should drill for more oil in a pristine environmental track in Alaska, go off the coast of Florida and the Outer Continental Shelf, drop some oil drills so that we can really severely negatively impact the tourism across the coastal regions instead of trying to make sure that we can truly invest in alternative energy research. Which part of ''No, we need an alternative'' don't they understand?

Well, consistently the voters have said they want to move this country in a new direction. They want to make sure that we invest in alternative energy research and wean ourselves truly off of our dependence on oil. Not just hear more talk about it.

Mr. Speaker, drilling is not the answer. It is inappropriate to suggest that we should have more drilling in ANWR, in Wyoming, off the coast of Florida. We need to make sure that we

can finally step up and make a bipartisan commitment that we will invest in alternative energy research so that we can finally end this energy crisis that we find ourselves in.

I'm glad to see that the Republicans finally acknowledge it's a problem.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity.

Let's look at this in perspective.

We just learned from Mr. SHIMKUS that over the lifetime of ANWR, if we just opened up that area to produce, that we could provide revenues of up to $192 billion on the lease bids and royalties. And we always seem to be looking, at least the bills that keep coming forward from our friends from the other side of the aisle, from the majority, always seem to be trying to raise revenues. And certainly the $6 billion per year that we could get just from the ANWR royalties in bids would pay for the GI Bill that they're going to raise taxes for tomorrow.

Not only is this a bonus that we raise revenue. By the way, we have a deficit that we're running. So I think where we can raise revenues without raising taxes is somewhere we could look.

But over the weekend, I had the opportunity to sit down with a trucking company in Omaha. They were telling me that the average price of diesel across the Nation is $4.50. It's costing them almost a dollar per mile. What does that mean to the consumers? Well, it means that your family budget is going in the tank, literally. That means that when you go to the grocery store, that you're paying higher prices for food, not because some portion of corn is being used for ethanol; what it means is that the transportation costs of the food from the farm to the grocery stores is so high and is being absorbed in the prices at the grocery store.

So that's why your milk is going up, that's why the eggs have gone up, that's why your grain-related foods, like cereals and bread, have gone up. Yes, we need to focus on demand here. But we can also win-win by focusing on supply.

Let's do the right thing. And good job, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding and his work on putting forward a budget that brings us to balance and that is fiscally responsible.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a repeat of what we heard during the 12 years that our friends on the Republican side of the aisle tried to push forward a very failed policy as our friend, Mr. MARKEY from Massachusetts, mentioned with regard to ANWR.

This is a policy that was tried over the years by a Republican Congress with a Republican President, and never once did it pass because of the flaws and challenges that it would present.

What I think we have here is a classic case of what many of us will recall from the George Foreman-Muhammad Ali fight: a case of rope-a-dope where you're trying to deflect what's really going on on this floor tonight. And that is the fact that this budget presented by this Congress will bring us to a balanced budget faster than the President's budget at the same time that it's providing for some fiscal responsibility when it comes to tax cuts, energy policy, how we treat our kids in school, what we do for our kids when it comes to health care. All of that's done in a way that not only brings us to a point of having fiscal sanity in the way we do things, but it does it without having to deal with these gimmicks that we have now with ANWR.

The reality is that if you don't divert the American public's attention to what's going on in this budget, they would be very happy. The fact that we are restoring fiscal responsibility by making sure that anything we propose to do that costs money will be paid for so that we don't continue to see rising budget deficits is phenomenal and it's new.

What we see here is an effort to devote resources to energy that's renewable sources that provides with renewable sources on energy, that provides us with efficient sources of energy that moves us towards solar, towards wind; and we put money there, and we do it in a fiscally responsible way.

□ 1800

We don't cut the moneys that the President never provided for his No Child Left Behind education program. We provide the money. We do all those things, and we do them in fiscally responsible ways.

That's the story in this budget. You don't need to do rope-a-dope to get past that. This is a time for us to move in a different direction. We intend to do so. I urge Members to vote against this motion to instruct.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, let me inquire as to how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). The gentleman from Wisconsin has 13½ minutes. The gentleman from South Carolina has 20½ minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the chairman of the Resources Committee.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT, for yielding me the time.

While the Republicans continue to argue that opening more land is essential to lowering gasoline prices, the facts prove otherwise. We simply cannot drill our way to lower prices at the pump, and let's look at those facts.

Since 2000, the amount of drilling on Federal lands has steadily increased. Between 1999 and 2007, drilling permits on public lands has increased more than 361 percent; yet gas prices, as we all know too acutely, have risen dramatically. There is simply no correlation between the two.

Despite the Federal Government's willingness to make public lands available to energy production, of the 42 million acres of onshore Federal lands currently being leased by oil and gas companies, that's the red column here, only about 12 million are actually in production or producing oil and gas. The industry has this much available to them, and this is all they're using right here. They are obviously stockpiling these leases, and it's been evident for at least the past decade.

In 2007, for example, the government issued 7,561 permits to drill. Yet only 4,704 wells were started. Over the past 4 years, there have been 9,800 more permits issued than the wells drilled.

Today, the oil and gas industry holds in excess of 3,000 permits for onshore oil and gas development that they are not using to increase domestic production.

Now, here's the most important point for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Some would argue that the entire Outer Continental Shelf should be opened to oil and gas development. This is a specious argument as drilling off the coasts of California, Florida or Virginia has been consistently and repeatedly opposed by both parties.

And for those on the minority side who may want to vote for this motion to recommit, just remember: This will be viewed as a vote to allow oil and gas drilling off your shores.

According to the Department of the Interior, the parts of the OCS, primarily the Gulf of Mexico, that are currently open to drilling contain 79 percent of the oil and 82 percent of the natural gas that exists on the entire OCS.

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

Mr. SPRATT. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. RAHALL. And as is the case with onshore, out of the 40 million acres currently being held by oil and gas companies, under lease, in the Outer Continental Shelf, the oil and gas industry has put less than 7 million of those acres into production. It's already there. It's available to them. Yet they're not using it, and they want to go elsewhere to drill.

In a nutshell, the industry has access to most of the estimated technologically recoverable natural gas that's occurring in the Federal OCS, in fact four times as much as is estimated by the Minerals Management Service to occur in the moratoria areas, but the industry is not developing it.

You cannot drill your way to lower gas prices at the pump. The industry has plenty available to them. Let them use what they already have before going into other pristine areas like ANWR.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I hope we will defeat this motion to recommit. I sit on the Energy and Commerce Committee. I've done a lot of work on oil and gas, and I was in my office when I heard all these myths coming from the other side, and I thought we had to come down and refute this.

My friends on this side of the aisle keep saying Congress needs to open more areas to domestic drilling. The U.S. has already increased domestic drilling, and gas prices have continued to climb.

Since 2000, the number of wells drilled on Federal lands has increased by 66 percent, from 3,000 to nearly 5,000 wells. During that same time, the price of gas has doubled.

According to the Federal Government, 79 percent of the oil in the Outer Continental Shelf is already available for leasing. Eighty-two percent of the gas in the Outer Continental Shelf is available for leasing. And still, we open up more lands to leasing in 2006. The U.S. cannot drill its way out of high energy costs.

The other fact that my friends always try to put forth is that environmental laws are stopping oil companies from building refineries. Completely false. In the 2005 Energy Policy Act, we actually put in there a section that, as Secretary of Energy Bodman said, eases the constraints that have strangled new refinery construction. We put that in in 2005; yet no one has ever come forward and said we want to use that provision to put forth more refineries.

The U.S. has actually shut down its refineries. Since 1981, there were 324 refineries. Now, there are only 149 refineries. As chairman of Oversight and Investigations, we have the memos from Texaco, Chevron, Mobil that all said in order to raise our prices we have to shut down refineries, and they've shut them down.

Mergers in the oil industry have affected prices. In 2004, the Government Accountability Office found more than 2,600 mergers in the U.S. petroleum industry since the 1990s.

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

Mr. SPRATT. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. STUPAK. Gasoline inventories actually have a surplus. March 7, 2008, we had a surplus of 22 million barrels of gas more than the previous year. Gas supplies are up. Oil gas demand is actually down. And what do we have? We have a 51 percent increase in that same period of time. Gas went from $3.10 to $3.61 since April 1.

Look, we've had mergers. We've had refineries not being built. We have more exploratory. We have more supply. Supply is up, demand is down, the prices have gone sky-high. Why is that? Look at the profits.

ExxonMobil, first quarter of 2008, $10.9 billion; Royal Dutch Shell, $9.1 billion; BP, $7.6 billion, up 63 percent from last year; Chevron, $5.2 billion; Conoco Phillips, $4.1 billion. That is almost $40 billion in their first quarter. That's why gas prices are so high. That's why this Congress must act to lower gas prices.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Well, I don't know what it's going to take, Mr. Speaker. Indiana is right up there with the rest of the country pushing about $4 a gallon. We'll get people out on the road for vacations this summer, and I don't know what it's going to take for Congress to take dramatic action to lessen our dependence on foreign oil.

I've got to tell you I was little bit encouraged last night, Mr. Speaker. The Democrat majority brought a bill to the floor that actually endorsed the idea that the cost of oil and gasoline is affected by supply and demand. We voted to suspend purchases by the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, therefore lessening the demand on global oil, believing that the price would come down.

Well, today, this motion to instruct conferees is all about increasing the supply. Look, we hear a lot about oil profits; we always have. And no one respects the previous speaker more than me. But who in the world thinks that raising taxes on oil companies is going to lower their prices at the pump?

I mean, for heaven's sakes, we understand as Americans that commodities and the price of commodities are dictated by supply and demand. We simply have to take those measures in an environmentally responsible way to explore and further exploit the resources that we have in the ground, and I speak specifically of the Alaska National Wildlife region and the other areas that are affected by this motion to instruct conferees.

As long as we are going to continue to look at the most volatile area of the world for the majority of our energy needs, we are going to continue to see the extraordinary per barrel prices that we're seeing today, and Americans and Hoosiers are going to be suffering at the pump.

Let's get real. Let's do something about the supply. Let's lessen our dependence on foreign oil. Vote for this motion to instruct conferees so that America can begin to realize on the vast natural resources that this country has.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, a number of folks have mentioned on the other side, brought up stories about talking about the Speaker and what Democrats claim.

In 2005, when the Republican Congress passed the President's energy bill, let me tell you what some folks said. The minority leader at that time says, ''This will lower energy prices for consumers.'' The minority whip, Mr. BLUNT, said, ''Vote for lower gas prices and increase energy independence for America.'' This is what was offered and was sold when you did your energy bill. That's what you claimed.

My colleague from Illinois, Congressman SHIMKUS, says, ''I do believe that it will help us become more independent of foreign oil, will expand our use of renewable fuels, and will make our electricity production and transmission more reliable. All of which will help slow price increases.''

That hasn't been accomplished by any stretch of the imagination. When you passed it at that point, gasoline was at $59 a barrel. Today, as you know, it's 124 bucks a barrel. So it hasn't accomplished any of that goal. This is all what you claimed in your marketing at that point when you had an energy bill on the floor in 2005 because you only had one strategy. You didn't want to do anything about conservation. You didn't want to do anything about renewable energy sources and investment in future technologies. And you didn't want to do anything, as my colleague from West Virginia told you, that there were over 9,800 permits out there, force American companies to start drilling in those permits rather than holding those permits here in the United States where we have some of the energy. There's plenty of that to go around.

What we've done is put a budget together that breaks with the past. It offers a change in the sense it puts our budget in balance. It invests in education over what the President does. It invests in energy technologies for the future, and also, it ensures that the middle class gets a tax cut. This is a budget that's not only in balance but is in balance with our values and our priorities here.

Now, you all have come up with a unique slogan, change you deserve. That's what you've marketed. All you've offered is more of the same, more of the same of $3 trillion of debt, the largest increase in debt in the shortest period of time in American history. That's the change America deserves?

You've offered 10 million children without health care to go walking. Is that change you can deserve?

You've offered an energy policy that has continued to rely on just drilling without looking at conservation, without looking at future technology. Is that change you can deserve?

The American people deserve better, and they're offered here in a budget that is in balance with our priorities, balance with our economic goals. We put resources towards our education,

towards energy technology and towards, in fact, making sure the middle class get a tax cut.

In 2005, when you controlled the House, the Senate and the White House, you put together an energy bill that led America to where it is today. I think the American people deserve a change.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I'd like to yield 4 minutes to a senior member of the Commerce Committee, Mr. UPTON from Michigan.

□ 1815

Mr. UPTON. I thank my friend, Mr. RYAN.

You know, gas prices yesterday in Kalamazoo, Michigan hit $3.99 a gallon. You know, I can remember when our imports from other countries for oil and gas crossed the 50 percent threshold. And then it was 60 percent. In a few years, it's going to be 88 percent of the oil that we consume is going to come from overseas. Sadly, I report that this country is woefully unprepared for the future for a country that's going to need 50 percent more energy by the year 2030.

Now, we've done some things on conservation. We've done some CAFE standards, but that's not overnight, it's going to take a number of years. We've done some things on building standards and appliance standards, lighting. Those things kick in a few years from now. But you know what? I think all of us here, based on last night's vote, believe in the theory of supply and demand.

Worldwide, the demand is going up dramatically. China and India, 10, 15 percent annual growth rates. Our demand has actually declined because of the price by about a percent over the last year, but the supply has stayed the same. Yes, you can talk about more wells drilled, but the old existing wells aren't producing the oil that they used to. From the nineties to now, Alaskan oil has declined by 50 percent. And yet Bill Clinton, when he vetoed the ANWR bill 10 years ago, said, that's 10 years off, we don't need that now. Well, guess what? Ten years later, we need that oil. We need greater supply.

Last night's vote, taking oil out of SPR, 60,000 barrels a day, a lot of us voted for it because that means that the supply is going to go up for consumers by 60,000 barrels a day. So we're onto that. That passed overwhelmingly here in the House. But whether it's Alaska, whether it's offshore drilling—I don't know how many of you here know that China is drilling off Cuba, 45 miles off the Florida coast. China is drilling off Florida, yet we can't do that. I think we have a limit of 100 miles. Eighty-five percent of our offshore drilling is off-bounds. We need to reverse that.

Last year in this House, we had a vote that prevailed by six votes that took land in our BLM lands, public lands out in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, it took it off so that we can't allow the permits to get oil shale. The oil shale reserves there are expected to exceed a trillion barrels. That's more than the Saudis. And we can't even allow the permitting for companies to go in and explore and perhaps increase the supply so that we can decrease the price with such a provision. I look forward to a revote on that same amendment perhaps this year.

The Canadians. I met with a Canadian Minister of Energy a couple of weeks ago, with a Canadian ambassador. They are now successfully extracting a million barrels a day from oil shale in Alberta. And because of a certain section that was in the energy bill offered successfully last year, we can't take that in this country. If you want to increase the supply so that the price can come down, we have to look at domestic resources, whether they be off our shores, whether they be in our own lands and we know that we can produce it safely, or in Alaska as well, ANWR.

We want the oil here. And we want to help have some decreasing pressure on that price that is costing consumers in lots of ways, not only their transportation, but food and all those different things.

So I would like to think that we can adopt this resolution, looking for more receipts for the domestic industry.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, here we have the Republicans engaging in fuzzy math again.

Unlike the eight budgets submitted by George Bush, which are taking this country toward bankruptcy, they're so incredibly out of balance, unlike the 12 budgets given to us by the Republican majority here, this budget gets us to balance by 2012. And guess what? It has nothing to do with the Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge, it's not an issue in the budget. You want to have that debate, let's have that debate in the Resources Committee and other appropriate venues.

But if you want to have that debate, I've got a few things to say. I serve on the Resources Committee. We have 6,669 leases that are out there with the oil and gas industry that aren't producing; 30 million acres of land that's covered by that and offshore. We have nearly a quarter of a million acres in the Naval Petroleum Reserve. Bill Clinton leased our Naval Petroleum Reserve to the oil industry. Guess what? They're not yet developing the Naval Petroleum Reserve. There is a tremendous amount to be developed there. But you want to jump and leapfrog somewhere else for imaginary bits of oil.

Under the most optimistic estimates, there's 100 days in ANWR. Now, we could do better if every American properly inflated the tires on their cars and their trucks and their SUVs. Try and find an air pump these days, they're darn hard to find. You want to do something? Let's have a Federal program to put air pumps out there and get people to fully inflate their tires. There is a sustainable way to cut demand. But the fantasy of ANWR, which the Republicans want to engage in, is to distract us from the speculation, the profiteering by the oil companies, speculation of the commodity markets driving up prices 50 cents a gallon—legislation they passed for Enron, now bankrupt and defunct. And then we have the issue of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We have come together on a bipartisan basis to say let's lower the price of gas at the pump by not buying the most expensive oil in history. They don't agree with us on going after the OPEC countries.

So, you know, let's not talk about something that's potentially 10 years out, that doesn't have anything to do with the budget. Let's talk about real measures on energy. And let's talk about a real budget to get this country back on the path to fiscal sustainability and responsibility.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I'm delighted today that we're talking about energy. I think it's vital because I want to tell you something; if we don't get a lid on energy prices in America, there will be no level of government with a budget that will balance. The cost to heat our schools, the cost to heat our hospitals, the cost to do everything is going to explode. The cost to move goods and services is exploding. And it's about time, Americans.

I had a young lady say to me last week, she said, Mr. PETERSON, I make $320 a week. I used to spend $90 to drive to work, now I'm spending $140. How do I pay my bills? What she doesn't know is she heats her home with natural gas, and the natural gas that we're putting in the ground today for next winter's heating is $11.50. Last year, it was running between $6.50 and $7. She's looking at a 50 percent increase in home heating costs next year, which she cannot meet.

Folks, the average working American is struggling to pay their bills because of energy costs. Our State governments, our county governments and our hospitals and our schools are going to take money away from the classroom to heat those facilities. If this Congress does not address the energy issue, we're going to collapse the economic viability of this country.

Energy runs this country. We've had $2 gas and $10 oil most of our lifetime, with a few spikes in the seventies, eighties and nineties. Folks, we have $125 oil, $11.50 gas. We have not had a storm in the gulf in 2 years that always causes spike prices. We've not had a major country that supplies oil to us all tip over or have a coup that took away the government and took away that supply of oil.

I'm predicting that countries like China, who are amassing energy all around the world, we'll read one of these days where they have purchased all the oil and gas that one of the major contributing countries can produce for the next decade and we won't get any of it.

Folks, if we have a storm in the gulf this summer like they're predicting, and they're predicting them, if we have any kind of terrorist attack on a supply system, $125 oil will seem cheap to us. I'm not sure this economy can handle $125 oil.

I am for every renewable there is, but let's look at the Energy Department's prediction: Oil, gas, coal, nuclear, renewables, hydro and non-hydro, that's their prediction. We've spent $30 billion for renewables. Folks, if we double wind and solar—and I wish we could double it every year—but if we double it, we will still be less than three-quarters of 1 percent of our energy needs.

Where is the renewable coming? The renewable that's grown the fastest is wood waste. With pellet stoves heating hundreds of homes, with factories heating their factories with wood waste, wood waste has been the fastest growing energy renewable.

Folks, America better get serious. And we'd better open our Outer Continental Shelf, we'd better do ANWR, we'd better do the Midwest. Coal-to-liquid, coal-to-gas, wind, solar, we need it all, folks. America is in an energy crisis.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, let me say again, but say more emphatically, what I said at the outset, and that is that ANWR is never mentioned, never mentioned in the budget resolution, never mentioned in the report that accompanies the resolution. So it's wholly out of scope; it has nothing to do with the budget resolution before us, And it's also outside the jurisdiction of our Budget Committee. The jurisdiction over this drilling in Alaska, or wherever in the continental United States, belongs to the Resources Committee, not to the Budget Committee. So if you want to do what they're proposing to do here, you're in the wrong place before the wrong committee with the wrong proposal.

Revenues from ANWR are not provided for in this budget resolution, they're not precluded in this resolution. The Budget Committee does not have the jurisdiction, as my good friend, Mr. RYAN, knows to tell the Ways and Means Committee or any other committee that has the power to produce revenues exactly how to do it. We simply tell them how much, not by what policy. We don't make policy prescriptions as to revenues in our committee. We simply tell the Budget Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, or the other committees that have the capacity to raise revenues or offsetting receipts, or what we have here called negative budget authority.

In addition, if you read the cryptic language of this resolution, you will find it doesn't mention oil, or ANWR either, anywhere in it. You have to make some mighty extrapolations to get to the conclusion that this is talking about ANWR drilling and ANWR oil. It simply says we should issue instructions to increase negative budget authority, which could apply, in my estimation, to selling parkland, selling other assets of the United States which would be negative budget authority just like the revenues coming from a lease for drilling in ANWR.

In any event, this is a red herring when it comes to the resolution before us. It has nothing to do with our budget resolution. Our budget resolution should be looked upon on its own four legs, and let it stand or fall on those merits. I think we've got a budget resolution.

As I also said at the outset, we come to balance by the year 2012. And along the way we accumulate less debt than the President's budget. We limit spending in a reasonable fashion, but we provide more for education, more for the environment, more for energy, more for science and innovation than the President's budget. We protect the income tax cuts for middle-income Americans, we provide tax relief from the AMT for middle-income Americans, for whom it was never intended.

This is a good budget outline for our country and will move us over time, if we adhere to it—and we do adhere to the PAYGO rule throughout the resolution—if we further adhere to it, it will move us to a balanced budget within the foreseeable future.

Therefore, we do not have to vote for this motion to instruct conferees. It's not necessary. We need to go to conference and come back next week with a conference report that we can put to work so the House can get on with its business.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

I'll begin by stating what I said in the beginning, which is, as a person who believes in having a strong and intact budget process, I want to compliment the chairman for getting us to a Budget Resolution, for doing it 2 years in a row. It's not an easy accomplishment. So on behalf of the institution, it's important that we pass these budget resolutions.

□ 1830

The problem is we're not going to pass a good budget resolution. The reason the gentleman's budget resolution achieves a balanced budget is because it contains the largest tax increase in American history. It cuts the child tax credit in half. It repeals the relief for the marriage penalty, raises income taxes across the board, raises capital gains and dividends taxes, brings the death tax back in, and puts us on a path for the largest tax increase in American history by replacing the alternative minimum tax. So, yes, the gentleman's budget does balance because it only increases spending by $280 billion while it increases taxes by $683 billion. That's how the gentleman balances the budget.

But more to the point here, today the House voted to waive PAYGO to give farm subsidies to millionaires. Tomorrow the House is going to support PAYGO. They're going to enforce PAYGO to raise taxes on small businesses.

So this is what we're doing here in this Congress. Whenever it's time to keep PAYGO in place to control spending, it's out the door. It's waived. It's swept under the rug. It's baseline shopping, number cooking, gimmicking, cliffs. But whenever the time comes to raise taxes, that's when we enforce PAYGO.

Mr. Speaker, PAYGO doesn't exist. PAYGO is not in place. It is not being enforced. It is a sham. The only thing that PAYGO does today is give the majority an excuse to raise taxes. It doesn't cut spending. It doesn't reduce the deficit. It just raises taxes to fuel more spending.

Watch what happens tomorrow. Today millionaires get agriculture subsidies because we waived PAYGO; tomorrow, taxing small businesses to create a new entitlement program.

But to the point of this motion to instruct, what we are trying to achieve with this motion to instruct is to try to make this budget a little bit better, a little bit better by talking about the issue of the day, which is people are not being able to spread their paychecks as far as they were before. They can't get as much out of their paychecks because of $4 gasoline.

Why do we have $4 gasoline? Because we don't have an energy policy in this country. And what we are simply saying is one of the reasons is we have so much supply we're not getting: 16 billion barrels at ANWR; 2 trillion barrels in oil shale in Wyoming and Montana; 86 billion barrels in the Outer Continental Shelf.

Let me say that one more time: 16 billion barrels in Alaska, 2 trillion barrels in shale in the Intermountain West, and 86 billion barrels in the Outer Continental Shelf. All off-limits.

If we just did ANWR, according to the CRS, the Federal Government would see a surge in revenues, no new taxes, not even cutting spending, $191 billion; $191 billion, according to the CRS, from just doing ANWR. That's the smallest of all of our reserves. Think what we could do with $191 billion. We could reduce the deficit. We could create a Manhattan Project for research and development for renewable energies to put fossil fuels out of business.

But, no, we're doing none of this. So this is the economic equivalent of shooting yourself in the foot, of cutting off your nose to spite your face. This is not an energy policy.

This is a bad budget resolution that raises taxes on the American workers

and families and businesses. The worst time we should be raising taxes is when we are possibly in an economic recession, and the last thing we ought to be doing is raising taxes on people. Furthermore, with high food prices, high gas prices, we shouldn't be raising people's taxes. That's what this budget does.

So to try to make it a little bit better, let's get some of our own oil and gas from our own country instead of being so reliant on foreigners for it. We're giving the wrong people our money, people who are not our friends overseas.

So pass this motion to instruct. Make this budget a little bit better, and open up production so we can actually truly do something to lower the price of oil and make us less dependent on foreign oil.

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

There was no objection.

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

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 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4040, CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4040) to establish consumer product safety standards and other safety requirements for children's products and to reauthorize and modernize the Consumer Product Safety Commission, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD OF KENTUCKY

Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Whitfield of Kentucky moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4040 be instructed to insist upon the provisions contained in the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) will be recognized for 30 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On December 19 of last year, this body spoke with a resounding voice of approval for our Consumer Product Safety Modernization Act. The measure passed by a unanimous vote of 407–0.

I would like to thank Chairman DINGELL; Ranking Member BARTON; Chairman RUSH; and my predecessor, Mr. STEARNS, for the great job that they did in getting this bill through the House.

H.R. 4040 is a bipartisan product. We worked for 4 months and in the end came up with a stringent but reasoned approach to strengthen the Consumer Product Safety Commission and to vastly improve the safety of our children's products. The result was a bill that creates the toughest lead standard in the world and imposes mandatory safety standards on products for young children. To ensure such standards are met, we require third-party testing and certification of children's products and we nearly double the Consumer Product Safety Commission budget over 4 years to ensure both the new safety standards and the testing and certification requirements are met.

All the new standards and increased enforcement in the world will not help parents unless they also know about dangerous products. We therefore require improved public notice of recalls as well as tracking labels on all children's products so parents can identify recalled toys when they hear about them. We also loosened restrictions to allow the Consumer Product Safety Commission to release critical product safety information to the public when people face an imminent health and safety standard.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 4040. I know that this is a work product that will maximize our opportunity to protect children from dangerous toys and products, and I urge and hope that the House managers will stand by the provisions which passed this Chamber unanimously only 5 months ago and insist upon the measures of H.R. 4040, as passed by the House.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak on behalf of the thoroughly bipartisan legislation underlying this motion. I begin with a commendation to my good friend from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, including Mr. BARTON, the ranking minority member, and the other members of the subcommittee and full committee who have worked so hard on this legislation on both sides of the aisle.

I would observe that this is a thoroughly bipartisan piece of legislation. It passed out of the committee 51–0, and it passed the House 407–0. It is one of the most important consumer protection bills to come before this House in this Congress. It is crucially important for us to have such legislation signed into law this year. And I want to point out that without it, people will remain at risk from dangerous products and from an important Federal regulator who will remain both underfunded and incapable of acting properly to take care of consumers' legitimate concerns with regard to the safety of all manner of products from toys from the very beginning of life right through the time that we enter the graveyard.

On December 19, 2007, the House passed this legislation then without a dissenting vote. It represents extraordinary work by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and it shows how bipartisanship can function, and it shows how an excellent staff on both sides of the aisle working together can bring before us legislation that is in the broad overall public interest. The Senate substituted its version of the bill on March 6, 2008. Some elements of the Senate bill are problematic, but others are indeed worthy of serious consideration by the conference committee. The differences between the two bills are outweighed by their similarities. There is no reason why the House conferees should not return here in short order with a workable, balanced, and strong conference report deserving the full support of the House and upon which I intend to work closely with my good friends on the minority side, as we have so far.

I want to remind my colleagues what the House bill does. It bans lead beyond the most minute amount in products intended for children under 12 years of age. It mandates premarket testing by certified laboratories for lead and other hazards in children's products, and it sees that those laboratories are properly qualified and able to carry out their important responsibilities. It places requirements on manufacturers to enhance recalls. It empowers the Consumer Product Safety Commission, CPSC, to share information about dangerous products immediately. It requires CPSC to provide public access to a database of serious injuries and deaths caused by consumer products, but it does so requiring also that the information be truthful, correct, and properly verified. It prohibits the sale and export of recalled products. It ensures that CPSC effectively shares information with the States. And it bans industry-sponsored travel by CPSC Commissioners and their staff.

I want to observe that the motion is a good one. I support it. I commend my

good friend from Kentucky for his offering of it and for his leadership in the handling of this legislation.

I again want to pay my respects and compliments to my colleagues on the Republican side and to my colleagues on this side for the outstanding way in which they have put together this legislation.

I urge that the House support the motion to instruct offered by my good friend from Kentucky.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for those kind remarks.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would just reiterate I think we have a great product. I think we have a wonderful opportunity in conference to come out with a great product.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, on December 19, 2007, the last day of the session before the holiday season, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 4040, the Consumer Product Safety Modernization Act. The vote was 407–0. Today, with this Motion to Instruct Conferees, we are taking yet another step towards fulfilling our pledge to the American people to protect their children from dangerous products and overhaul the Consumer Product Safety Commission. I am confident that in the coming weeks, we can resolve all of the differences between the House and Senate versions of their respective bills and send a strong piece of legislation to the President that he will sign into law.

We have much to be proud of in the House version of consumer product safety reform legislation. H.R. 4040 was introduced by Chairman DINGELL, Ranking Member BARTON, Ranking Member STEAMS, and me. This historic bill, of which I am the lead sponsor, authorizes desperately needed resources to the Commission and dramatically rewrites the Consumer Product Safety Act, as well as the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, both of which are administered by the CPSC. After decades of neglect, the House bill restores the CPSC to its rightful place of prominence and gives it the necessary tools to grapple with the global marketplace and protect American consumers, particularly children, from dangerous and defective products.

The House bill is the culmination of a deliberative, bipartisan process that entailed countless meetings with consumer groups, industry, and staff of the Consumer Product Safety Commission. In the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection, we held five hearings before our subcommittee markup. The full-committee reported H.R. 4040 as amended with a vote of 51–0. As Chairman of the Subcommittee, I am extremely proud of our collective efforts during this process.

H.R. 4040 has two titles. Title I specifically addresses children's products by establishing the strictest lead standard in the world for children's products and requiring certification and testing. Title II overhauls the CPSC itself, giving the beleaguered agency much needed resources and strengthening its underlying organic statutes. At both the Subcommittee and Full Committee mark-ups, the bill underwent significant changes: We strengthened the lead standard, raised the age requirement for mandatory testing to 12, required CPSC to appropriately tailor their corrective action plans to fit consumer needs, granted emergency recall authority to CPSC, bestowed enforcement authority to state Attorneys General, banned corporate-sponsored travel for Commission employees, and preserved state common law rights of action.

All of these excellent changes were made at the behest of members of the Energy and Commerce Committee who offered their valuable input on how to make the underlying bill better. The House bill is much stronger than the Senate bill in numerous ways, and it is my hope that our friends on the other side of the Capitol will agree to adopt those provisions in the final version that becomes law. Of course, likewise, the Senate bill has provisions absent in the House bill that are worthy of consideration and adoption. Indeed, the final product of a good conference should reflect the very best work of both bodies of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot emphasize enough that ours is a bipartisan bill that, from the very beginning, we drafted in consultation with Democratic and Republican members, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, consumer groups, and industry. I want to sincerely thank the distinguished Chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, my dear friend, JOHN DINGELL, for his unparalleled leadership. This bill simply would not be possible without his guidance. Of course, I also want to thank my friends, the distinguished Ranking Member of the Committee, JOE BARTON, and the former Ranking Member of the Subcommittee, CLIFF STEARNS, for their leadership and unwavering cooperation.

I hope H.R. 4040 returns to the floor in a few weeks in the form of a conference report that the House can pass in unanimous fashion, just as we did on the last day of session last year. If we continue our deliberative approach of bipartisan cooperation, I am confident that we can do so and will eventually send to the President's desk a bill that will become law. I am confident that all of us will be able to go home to our constituents and tell them that we have done our job to protect American consumers and their families from dangerous and defective products.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Motion to Instruct Conferees.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, as a physician, parent, and policy maker, I understand that we need to work together to protect our children. I'm proud to say we have done that. The House crafted and passed a comprehensive, commonsense bill that boosts CPSC funding and personnel, bans lead in children's products, requires third-party product testing, and increases penalties for those who break the law.

I went to the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission labs. I saw first hand the need for more resources.

I went to the International Toy Fair in New York City. I saw first hand the increasing number of toys coming into this country, as well as the measures that industry is taking to keep toys safe.

Our bill takes into account the needs the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the needs of consumers, the needs of the industry, but most importantly, the need to keep our children safe.

The House was able to put politics aside to keep children safe. While also providing more resources in a pragmatic, bipartisan approach. This Motion to Instruct recognizes these efforts and will help this important bill to be enacted into law.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. 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, this 15-minute vote on the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4040 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the Ryan motion to instruct conferees on S. Con. Res. 70; and the motion to suspend the rules and adopt House Resolution 789, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 0, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 320]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden

Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
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
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
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
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—28

Bilbray
Boehner
Bono Mack
Braley (IA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
DeGette
Diaz-Balart, L.
Emanuel
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gordon
Hall (NY)
Hirono
Issa
Lewis (KY)
Mack
Miller, George
Myrick
Paul
Ross
Rush
Schmidt
Shimkus
Westmoreland
Wynn

□ 1907

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 320, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 4040: Messrs. DINGELL, WAXMAN, RUSH, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Messrs. BARTON of Texas, WHITFIELD of Kentucky, and STEARNS.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON S. CON. RES. 70, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on S. Con. Res. 70 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, nays 229, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

YEAS—185

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cazayoux
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Gene
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Nunes
Ortiz
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Scalise
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—229

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

NOT VOTING—19

Bilbray
Bono Mack
Braley (IA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin

DeGette
Gerlach
Gordon
Hirono
Lewis (KY)
Mack
Myrick
Paul
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Schmidt
Shimkus
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1916

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

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 320 and 321, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on No. 320 and "nay" on No. 321.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 320 and 321, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on No. 320 and "nay" on No. 321.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on Senate Concurrent Resolution 70: Mr. SPRATT, Ms. DELAURO, Messrs. EDWARDS, RYAN of Wisconsin, and BARRETT of South Carolina.

There was no objection.

HONORING PUBLIC CHILD WELFARE AGENCIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 789, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 789, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LATHAM. 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 414, noes 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

AYES—414

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
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
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
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
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Becerra
Berman
Bono Mack
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Gerlach
Gordon
Hooley
Lewis (KY)
Mack
Myrick
Paul
Rush
Schmidt
Shimkus
Wynn

□ 1924

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–636) on the resolution (H. Res. 1197) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2642) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken tomorrow.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S HEALTH WEEK

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 331) supporting the goals and ideals of National Women's Health Week, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 331

Whereas women of all backgrounds have the power to greatly reduce their risk of common diseases through preventative measures, such as engaging in regular physical activity, eating a nutritious diet, and visiting a healthcare provider to receive regular check-ups and preventative screenings;

Whereas significant disparities exist in the prevalence of disease among women of different backgrounds, including women with disabilities, African-American women, Asian/Pacific Islander women, Latinas, and American Indian/Alaskan Native women;

Whereas healthy habits should begin at a young age;

Whereas preventative care saves Federal dollars designated for health care;

Whereas it is imperative to educate women and girls about key female health issues;

Whereas it is recognized that offices of women's health within the Department of Health and Human Services, the Food and Drug Administration, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Health Resources and Services Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality are vital in providing critical services that support women's health research, education, and other necessary services that benefit women of all ages, races, and ethnicities;

Whereas the annual National Women's Health Week begins on Mother's Day and celebrates the efforts of national and community organizations working with partners and volunteers to improve awareness of key women's health issues; and

Whereas in 2008, the week of May 11 through May 17 is designated National Women's Health Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes the importance of preventing diseases that commonly affect women;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Women's Health Week;

(3) calls on the people of the United States to use National Women's Health Week as an opportunity to learn about the health issues women face;

(4) calls on the women of the United States to observe National Women's Check-Up Day by receiving preventative screenings from their health care providers; and

(5) recognizes the importance of federally funded programs that provide research and collect data on common diseases in women.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TIM MURPHY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 331. National Women's Health Week is celebrated annually during the week following Mother's Day. The purpose of this week is twofold.

First, we can use it to raise awareness about the health risks all women face, especially the risks that are unique to women. We use it to learn that, for example, heart disease is the number one killer of women, and half a million women die every year in childbirth.

But the second purpose is so we can take proactive measures to improve women's health. We can use this opportunity to remind our sisters, our mothers, our daughters and our friends to get annual checkups and screenings that are recommended for them at their age. And we can use this opportunity to adopt healthier lifestyles that are essential to preventing chronic disease.

As co-chair of the Women's Caucus, I am very proud of several bills that have been introduced and/or passed out during this Congress to address women's health issues.

Last year, we reauthorized the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program to provide low-income women with access to these essential screenings.

We also passed the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act. And nearly every woman in the House is cosponsor of the Heart for Women Act, H.R. 1014, as well as H. Res. 1022 regarding maternal health.

But we are also fortunate to have a few good men, actually more than a few good men working with us, such as the ranking member on this bill, and MAURICE HINCHEY who has taken the lead by introducing this resolution for a few years now, along with MARY BONO MACK.

□ 1930

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution in the House today, and also to have a conversation with the women in their lives about what steps they can take to improve their health.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I also thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for her thoughts and input on this bill, which I'm pleased to be a cosponsor today.

Appropriately, National Women's Health Week began this Monday, May 12, the day after Mother's Day, and this past Monday was National Women's Checkup Day. To this end, we encourage all women to discuss with their doctor the importance of regular checkups, self exams.

We also should note that the government has a Web site on this; it's *www.womenshealth.gov/whw*. There they recommend several tests that women should get on a regular basis.

Also like to mention, as we're focusing on women's health, as my colleague, my friend from California stated, this is also of interest and importance to men. Whether you're fathers or spouses or relatives, it's important to also be supportive of women's health and be supportive of exams they may need to have.

As we focus on this, I want to mention a few other conditions that impact women and the importance of Federal research funding. Fibromyalgia, for example, is a chronic pain illness characterized by widespread musculoskeletal aches, pains and stiffness, soft tissue tenderness, general fatigue and sleep disturbances.

Depression is another very important condition to highlight. Women, during and after pregnancy, for example, are at much greater risk to develop depression, and folks who have a chronic illness are at risk to develop depression.

Oftentimes, we neglect these important symptoms and aspects of health care when meeting with a physician. It is very important to review any concerns that anyone has, that women have when they have their annual exams, such as sleep problems, changes in appetite, mood changes, persistent sadness and other things. These are treatable conditions and not ones to shun in bringing up and discussing openly and honestly with their physician.

We have other things to comment on this, but at this point I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes at this time to the gentleman from New York, MAURICE HINCHEY.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, as the initiator of this resolution, I would first like to take a moment to thank Chairman DINGELL for supporting the resolution and for bringing, being instrumental, rather, in bringing it to the floor today.

I would also like to thank Speaker PELOSI and Mr. HOYER for their determination in bringing this measure to the floor during National Women's Health Week, despite the very crowded legislative schedule.

I would also like to thank Chairman PALLONE and all of the fine members of the Health Subcommittee and their resolve in getting this through the committee and to the floor.

Finally, I'd like to thank my good friends, Congresswoman LOIS CAPPS and Congresswoman MARY BONO MACK for taking the lead with me on this resolution for the third time in a row.

This resolution has the bipartisan sponsorship of 114 Members of this House. Also, the National Council of Women's Organizations fully endorsed this bill on behalf of their 230 member organizations who represent 11 million women across our country.

National Women's Health Week begins annually on Mother's Day. This

year marks the 9th Annual National Women's Health Week.

National Women's Health Week is a week celebrated across America. During this week, families, communities, businesses, government, health organizations and other groups work together to help educate women about steps that they could take to improve their physical and mental health, and to prevent various disease.

This week is also used as an opportunity to educate our population about important health issues that women face.

This resolution recognizes the importance of several things, including preventing diseases that commonly affect women; federally funded programs that provide research and collect data on common diseases in women, and it also calls on women to observe National Women's Checkup Day by receiving preventive screenings.

It is vitally important that women have knowledge about the health risks that confront them, and that they know they can greatly reduce those risks through preventive measures such as a healthy lifestyle and regular medical screening.

Healthy habits should begin at a young age. It is imperative that we take the time to educate young girls on the benefits of exercise and eating right. If these habits start at a young age, it is more likely that they will continue through their life.

It is important and essential we do everything we can to prevent disease. In this spirit, I encourage women to use this week to focus on the necessary checkups and preventive screenings from their health care providers so that they can live long, healthy and productive lives.

I urge full support and passage of this very important measure on behalf of the women of our country.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I now yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), a leader and advocate on women's health issues.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TIM MURPHY) for the leadership that he brings to our Health Subcommittee.

I also want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for her attentiveness to women's health issues. She is an effective advocate.

And to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) for his leadership on the issue, and for honoring us, all women, with the resolution and bringing the resolution forward to the body as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, as has been discussed, this is House Concurrent Resolution 331, and I do join my colleagues in encouraging all of us, not only to support the resolution, but to be effective spokespeople for what the resolution means; that we move forward, actively, to encourage women to gather the information that they need, because indeed, one of the purposes is to encourage women to seek information, to become health conscious and as the gentleman from New York said, to develop those healthy habits.

And it is not only adult women that we are speaking to, but it is to young girls also as they look at diet, as they look at exercise, as they gather information about how to best take care of themselves. And we do encourage them to seek that information, to get regular checkups, to become knowledgeable of the preventive screenings that will help them to stay healthy and to enjoy a better quality of life.

One thing that we also do is encourage women to have that relationship with their primary care physician, somebody that they can go to to gather the information about how to become knowledgeable on taking care of their bodies.

We've talked a little bit about some of the diseases that affect women, fibromyalgia, depression and, of course, postpartum depression, which concerns us all with the young women and those in the child-bearing years.

Heart disease also and some of the screenings that are important for that. And as the gentleman from Pennsylvania said, there is the website where individuals can access this information.

But we do stand together to promote prevention and awareness for disease management so that the women of this Nation are certainly taking better care of themselves, and are knowledgeable on the diseases that could impair their quality of life and their productivity.

Again, I join my colleagues and thank them for the leadership on Resolution 331. And I appreciate the opportunity to stand and speak on the importance of this, and again, encourage all Members, not only to support it, but to actually be certain that we disseminate this information to our constituents.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Seeing as we have no more speakers, we're willing to close at this point and again draw attention and thank Mr. HINCHEY for his support on this resolution. I ask all Members to be supportive of it.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. I want to thank again the authors of this resolution, Mr. HINCHEY, who is here, and MARY BONO MACK, who is also the other coauthor; and to thank the speakers on behalf of this resolution. And again, to remind us all the importance of Women's Health Week, setting aside the time to call attention to the importance of women taking care of their own health and providing the resources so they can do this, because it's women's health at stake, but also, often since the woman is the primary instigator within the family, and often the community as well, of the health of every member, that this serves a purpose that is very important to the health of our Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 331.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CELEBRATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

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

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the modern State of Israel. Since its founding in 1948, Israel has flourished as the only true democracy in the Middle East, and established itself as America's greatest ally in the region.

Mr. Speaker, last August I had the pleasure of visiting Israel with several of my colleagues, where I met with top officials and I toured the country. While I have many fond memories of my trip, I was particularly moved by the people's steadfast devotion to their homeland.

In the town of Sderot, a constant target of rocket attacks from neighboring Gaza, I met a woman who simply said to me, ''We can't move from here. This is our home.'' Her resilience and perseverance is indicative of the spirit of the Israeli people.

Amid constant threat from surrounding countries and terrorist groups, it is critical that the United States stand in solidarity with Israel as she fights to protect her people.

Mr. Speaker, my experience in Israel is one that I will never forget, and I look forward to the day when Israel can live in peace with its neighbors.

COMMEMORATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the State of Israel, like my colleague just before me.

The State of Israel has held out the promise of hope for many who have endured centuries of oppression. It was established by those who sought peace, but has had to endure perpetual conflict.

From the date of its inception, Israel's neighbors declared war upon the country and attempted to destroy it. Two major wars erupted after the initial conflict of 1948, and even today

it must suffer through terrorist attacks orchestrated by those who continue to deny its right to exist.

And yet Israel endures and it flourishes. It has made its part of the desert bloom. It is a model of democracy that the rest of that region would do well to emulate, and it has been a great partner to us in the war on terror, cooperating with us on homeland security matters so that we can be better prepared to counter the kinds of attacks that the Israelis have had to endure for three generations.

I've had the privilege of visiting Israel on two separate occasions, experiences that I will never forget.

And to Israel I say, ''Le Chaim.''

RECOGNIZING ISRAEL'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I too rise to recognize the 60th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel, and to reaffirm the steadfast friendship between our two strong democratic nations.

Sixty years ago today, on May 14, 1948, the State of Israel declared sovereignty and independence as a homeland for the Jewish people. With little resources and seemingly insurmountable obstacles, Israel has become a thriving and prosperous democracy, and has made worldwide contributions in technology, medicine, agriculture and environmental innovation.

When we speak about Israel, too often we focus on Israel's troubles and not on her beauty and her spirit. But what I want to focus on today is her resolve. Since independence, Israel has continually overcome every conceivable roadblock. She has beaten back hostile neighbors during war, and now endures terrible emotional and economic hardship from terrorist cowards who perpetrate hideous violence against innocent victims.

As a critical partner in the fight against terror, and as the only democracy in the region, Israel's strength and security is paramount. Therefore, I encourage this House to continue to pass bipartisan bills in support of Israel and her ability to protect herself from antagonistic neighbors.

The blossoming of a nation that grew from desert sand into a thriving example of democracy, economic progress and cultural diversity is a magnificent achievement for this strong and vibrant country.

I congratulate Israel on all she has achieved in just 60 years, and I look forward to a bright future for this extraordinary nation.

□ 1945

HALLIE ELIZABETH POE—NEW TEXAN

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, as the sun came up this morning bringing a new spring day in America, a new Texan was born at 8:27 a.m. and took her first breath of life. Hallie Elizabeth Poe, a 7-pound, 19½-inch girl was born in The Woodlands, Texas.

Hallie's parents, Kurt and Suzy, are happy with boastful pride, but they can't be prouder than I am because I'm the grandfather!

The miracle of birth is the Good Lord's gift to the people of the world and renews a spirt of hope and freshness. A baby girl is one of the most amazing miracles of life, one of the great joys of life, and one of the reasons why there is a little extra sunshine, laughter, and happiness in life.

Little girls are special. They bring a delight and innocence into the world of ours. I know that Hallie will have the forcefulness of Margaret Thatcher and the southern grace of Lady Bird Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, we pause for this moment in time for this most happy of all events, the birth of a new baby girl.

So there's a new yellow rose in Texas tonight that will obviously bring more warmth and beauty to our world. After all, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing like a little girl.

And that's just the way it is.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut). 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.

MERIDIA INITIATIVE

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, as a former prosecutor and long-time judge in Texas, I'm concerned about, of course, drugs and corruption, especially on the international border between the United States and Mexico. I have great sympathy and compassion for the Mexicans living just south of the border, especially those that have had the problem of dealing with the drug cartels. It's an epidemic that occurs on our southern border with Mexico.

According to the DEA, 500 people were murdered in Nuevo Laredo recently. Most of those cases were never solved, and many of those individuals were peace officers. There have been 400 kidnappings in Nuevo Laredo; 41 of them were Americans, and none of them, not one of those cases, have ever been solved. And we understand now that behind most of those crimes of violence of murder and kidnappings are the drug cartels. What you might be surprised, Mr. Speaker, to find out is that many of those people involved in the drug cartels are former individuals in the Mexican military that were trained in the United States.

The Department of Homeland Security has reported that in the last 10 years also, there have been 250 documented cases of incursions by suspected Mexican military units into the United States. Most of them in Texas, California, and Arizona. Recently, I have been in a place called Neely Pass in Hudspeth County where the Mexican military was photographed coming into the United States.

In order to gain control of access corridors into the United States, drug cartels are hiring hit men from the elite Mexican military force, and this group is known as the Zetas. The Zetas are military deserters that are trained in the United States at the School of the Americas in Fort Benning, Georgia, as an elite force of anti-drug commandos. But unfortunately, after they were trained by Americans, they went over to the dark side. They were sent by the Mexican government to the U.S.-Mexico border to combat drug trafficking, but they switched sides, deserted the Mexican military, and worked for the drug cartels. Officials suspect that there are more than 200 Zetas, including former Mexican police officers.

And the problem isn't just at the border, either. The Zetas operate in the United States. Authorities have believed that the drug cartels and the Zetas are responsible for murders in the United States.

And there's a second group. The second group is called the Kaibiles. The Kaibiles were a special operations force in the Guatemalan military. Like the Zetas, many of them received training in the United States in counter-insurgency operations. And like the Zetas, many of them deserted the special forces and began to help the drug cartels.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a photograph taken by sheriff's deputies on the Texas-Mexico border, and this is a group of the Kaibiles. You notice they are all in uniform; they all have hoods on them. You notice the first person in the front is carrying an AK–47, and they're bringing cocaine into the United States in backpacks, and this is what has happened to these individuals that were trained in the United States and switched sides.

Now, the reason I bring all of this up, Mr. Speaker, is there is an initiative called the Meridia Initiative where the United States government is proposing to send $1.5 billion in training and equipment south of the American border into Mexico to help combat drug trafficking. While this may sound well and good, unfortunately, the truth of the matter is that we cannot trust the local officials on the Mexican side of the border because of the high rate of corruption because of these individuals that continue to switch sides. And it would be very unfortunate indeed if we sent equipment to the northern portion of Mexico, south of the American border, turned over this military equipment to the Mexican military to have it used against us as shown in this photograph.

It would be better money spent in training to send this $1.5 billion to the southern border to the second front where there is a war going on but keep it on the American side. Let the local officials, the State officials, let the sheriffs along the border use this equipment. Many of them don't even have enough equipment. As one of them has told me, they're outmanned and they're outgunned by the drug cartels.

So keep that equipment, keep that training on the American side of the border. Support the American cause before we turn this equipment and turn this training capability to the other side. And it's a sad fact of life that we can't trust sending money, equipment, and training south of the United States border because of the corruption that occurs in northern Mexico.

So I would hope that Congress, when this initiative comes up, that we have lively debate about this $1.5 billion; and before we send it all south of the border, that we rethink that and maybe spend part of that money, half of that money or most of that money, on the American side and let the border sheriffs of Brownsville, Texas, to San Diego use that equipment to fight the drug cartels, fight the crime on the American side of the border. I think that would be better money spent, American taxpayer money spent.

And that's just the way it is.

NORMALCY IS NOT RETURNING TO IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the American people have begun to receive their recovery rebate checks. Families will use this assistance to deal with the rising cost of food, of gas, and for just hard times in general. So Congress did the right thing when we wrote those checks. But if we want to give our economy another boost, there is one check that we should not write, and that's the check we will soon be asked to write for the continued occupation of Iraq.

This occupation has already cost taxpayers over $1 trillion in direct and indirect costs. And Joseph Stiglitz, the Nobel Peace Prize winner, has calculated that the cost could soar, could, probably will soar to $3 trillion or more. Think what that money could do for our economy if we invested it wisely in job training, education, health care, child care, green technology, and so many other critically important domestic needs.

Some believe that the occupation of Iraq is more important than all of these other needs combined. They believe that the billions of dollars we're spending in Iraq are making things better. The President actually told us recently that normalcy is returning back to Iraq. But Iraq cannot be returning to normalcy when the fighting and dying continues without any letup.

Over 3,000 Iraqi civilians and 170 of our brave troops have been killed so far this year: 3,000; 170. Over 1,100 of our troops have been wounded. Mr. Speaker, does that sound like normalcy to anyone? It doesn't to me. I can't say it, actually.

Iraq cannot be returning to normalcy when over 5 million of its citizens remain refugees. That number equals more than 20 percent of the entire Iraqi population at the beginning of our invasion in the year 2003.

Iraq cannot be returning to normalcy when tens of thousands of armed military contractors roam its streets terrifying the people and accountable to no one.

Iraq can't be returning to normalcy when we're planning for a 50-year foreign occupation, and some voices, in fact, are even calling for a 100-year occupation.

And Iraq cannot be returning to normalcy when fear and destruction continue to grip its people. The International Herald Tribune described the Iraqi people's nightmare in an article published on April 23. It said, ''A simple decision to run an errand or choose an alternate route to work takes on life-altering consequences as the car bombs, stray bullets, rockets, and mortars claim those who merely happen by.''

So, Mr. Speaker, as the war carries into its 6th year, nearly every family is touched by the death of a member of a close friend.

Iraq can only become normal again when it gets its sovereignty back. It can only become normal when it has the chance to rebuild and heal in peace, and that can only happen when we responsibly redeploy our troops and then lead a regional and international effort to bring social, economic, and political reconciliation to that devastated country.

So when we review supplemental funding like we will tomorrow, let's insist on a bill that fully funds the safe withdrawal of our troops but does not include one more cent for an occupation that isn't making us or the Iraqi people any safer.

Mr. Speaker, recovery rebate checks are great, but blank checks for the occupation of Iraq must stop.

AMERICAN RELIGIOUS HERITAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the long American legacy of religious freedom and religious expression that we have inherited as a result of the wise foresight of our Nation's founders.

Throughout our history, we've been a Nation eager to rally to the cry of the motto, ''In God We Trust,'' in times of peace and prosperity or in war and upheaval. This phrase, etched not only on our coins and here in this Chamber but also on our hearts, has captured a truly American sentiment that our great historic experiment in democracy was founded on, and today, thrives in a robust sense of religious freedom.

Religious freedoms were specifically included in our Constitution as a reflection of the colonial experience of religious tolerance and free expression. Yet as religions' detractors would have it, the Constitution's enumeration of American religious freedoms is a paltry clause intended to merely protect us from the forced religion of a repressed central government.

This is a far cry from our Founders' full intentions. America's Founders were indeed careful to ensure that the government did not establish an official religion, but while they were at it, they crafted protection that would ensure our natural religious life would not falter under the machinations of those who would infringe on citizens' religious expression.

The first amendment is clear: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. This amendment does not establish the freedom from religion. Rather, it grants every American freedom of religion.

□ 2000

It is upon this freedom that our land was founded, and it is this freedom that undergirds our strength and national character today.

As founding father John Adams wrote in 1776 on the eve of our independence, ''Statesmen . . . may plan and speculate for Liberty, but it is Religion and Morality alone, which can establish the Principles, upon which Freedom can securely stand end.''

By allowing for and encouraging the free exercise of religion, the Constitution set the stage for a vigorous national religious life. Most Americans are nothing if not a people of religion, committed to lives of quiet reverence to God, the practice of prayer and the exercise of their religion.

Our culture of religious life informs the way we raise families, conduct business and serve our neighbors. Throughout the centuries this culture also illuminated those who governed and served to temper our laws and governmental practices with the timely wisdom of Judeo-Christian ethics.

George Washington recognized that America would succeed if she adhered to the long legacy of religious values informing our public life and policy. In his first inaugural address, he said that ''the foundation of our national policy will be laid in the pure and immutable principles of private morality, and the preeminence of free government be exemplified by all the attributes which can win the affections of its citizens, and command the respect of the world.''

George Washington knew what we know today. A healthy culture of free religious expression keeps our Nation on the right track and our government's policies rooted in the values

that we hold dear: life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. My continual prayer for America is that we never forsake the Judeo-Christian values that ensure these freedoms remain a centerpiece of our great Nation.

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

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IRAQ

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, recently I met with veterans in New Jersey, some of whom had served in the Second World War, and earlier in the day that I met with them, I had returned from a fact-finding trip to Iraq with Representative THOMPSON of California, a colleague on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

I told these veterans that they would not recognize this war in Iraq. From a technological standpoint, the kind of battlefield sensors and intelligence analysis capabilities available to our troops in Iraq are so far beyond anything that was fielded by the military in the Second World War or, in fact, even in more recent conflicts. That's the good news.

The other thing that they would not recognize, the not-so-good news, is that unlike say the Second World War, the United States cannot control the outcome in Iraq or achieve success because we do not know who the enemy is and what constitutes success.

While part of our trip involved classified briefings in which we examined how the intelligence community is supporting our troops, we also had the opportunity to meet at length with General David Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker to discuss the situation on the ground, including the status of the political reconciliation among Iraq's warring factions. The two gave a positive report and spoke of a great deal of progress.

Two outstanding patriots, a good general, a good diplomat, but the presentation that America is making progress toward a successful outcome in Iraq makes sense only if we continually redefine what we mean by success. And for over 5 years, we've been redefining both our rationale for invading Iraq and how we propose to measure success.

First, it was to go after those responsible for 9/11. Then it was to remove Saddam Hussein from power and track down his WMDs. And then it was to bring stability to the region. And then it was to bring free elections and bring all the warring factions together in a model of democracy for the Middle East. Then it was to create a road to peace in Israel through Iraq. And then it was to give the Iraqis more time to organize their government. Now, it seems to be to reduce the number of members of al Qaeda in Iraq, the AQI, which was, of course, zero before it all started.

These repeated rationalizations and redefinitions serve no one's interests, particularly the interests of our men and women of our Armed Forces who we've sent in harm's way in Iraq.

In Baghdad, I met with active duty soldiers, including some from New Jersey. American troops are performing superbly in Iraq under difficult conditions. As I told them, they, and the New Jersey National Guard members who will be deploying later this year, deserve not just our gratitude, but all the support they need to do their job, the wherewithal they need to do their job, and I would say just as much support when they return home as veterans.

Of course, we want our soldiers to succeed. We want the Iraqis to be peaceful and prosperous. We want terrorists and other enemies of the United States to be defanged and defeated. But for that to happen, it must be in Iraq, at least the Iraqis, the Iraqi political factions who must take the lead in ending their civil war.

It's impossible to hide the fact that the limited security gains achieved since last fall have not been matched by political reconciliation on the part of the Iraqis.

Unfortunately, Iraq's central government continues to lack legitimacy in the eyes of its people, as the recent combat in Basra and Baghdad have clearly shown. It is clear that the Iraqi government is, so far anyway, unwilling or unable to take the steps necessary to reach a political settlement that will end the violence.

One of the reasons I voted against the war resolution to go into Iraq in the first place was that Iraq was not a threat to the United States in the wake of the 9/11 attacks and that attacking Iraq would unleash forces we could not control. I was not alone in making those arguments, which tragically have been validated by events.

My latest trip to Iraq has, sadly, reinforced my belief that success is being redefined only once again, and what we need to do is to take decisive action to end our combat involvement in Iraq and refocus our efforts on destroying al Qaeda and eliminating the conditions that breed international terrorism and refocusing our resources on pressing domestic and international needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. RICHARDSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KELLER of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FARM BILL

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. Madam Speaker, today, the House of Representatives debated the conference report on what we in Kansas call the farm bill. Here in Washington, it's now called the Food, Conservation, Energy Security Act, and I note that the word ''farm'' is now missing from the farm bill.

As I indicate to Kansans, there probably is no more important piece of legislation that this Congress will consider than the 2008 farm bill from a Kansas perspective. Certainly, not every Kansan is a farmer, not every Kansan is a rancher, but agriculture is the backbone of the Kansas economy, and policies that we determine here today in the House of Representatives and tonight later in the Senate affect the Kansas economy and a way of life that we have revered in our State for generations.

Agriculture is not only a business. It's not only a way of earning a living. In fact, it's a very difficult way of earning a living. It is the opportunity that we have in our State for sons and daughters to work side-by-side with moms and dads. It's the opportunity for us to pass on values from one generation to the next.

And today, Madam Speaker, I worry that the legislation that we will soon be sending to the President is inadequate to meet the needs of Kansas producers and American agriculture.

In the 2002 farm bill, we passed a security net, a safety net for our farmers, and it's a three-pronged approach to making certain that our farmers are secure and have an opportunity to survive in difficult times, whether those times are difficult because of low commodity prices or difficult because the weather does not cooperate.

And today, Madam Speaker, we chose to reduce that security, that safety net that provides Kansans a future.

I had two criteria in trying to determine whether or not the farm bill was something I should vote for. One: Is this farm bill better? Is the 2007, now 2008, farm bill better than the one that was adopted by Congress in 2002? And clearly, the answer to that is no.

And the second criteria comes from listening to farmers for the last 2 and 3 years about what a new farm bill should look like. In fact, I listened to American producers from across the country. Since the passage of the last farm bill, I've chaired or been the ranking Republican, Republican leader on the subcommittee responsible for all farm programs and participated in 15 hearings across the country. And what I heard time and time again, especially from the folks back home is, whatever you do, JERRY, make certain that we don't lose the direct payment and make certain that crop insurance remains a viable option for us to protect

ourselves from risk. And unfortunately, once again, those two criteria were not met today.

So Madam Speaker, I pledge to my colleagues in the House of Representatives, and particularly my friends on the House Agriculture Committee, to continue to work in a very strong and bipartisan way to see if we can't improve the lives of farmers in Kansas and States across the country.

I served on the conference committee that provided the report that we have had before us today, and I offered amendments and supported amendments that I think would make significant improvements in the 2008 farm bill. They were rejected on straight, party-line votes, and it's a sad day for me because I've always enjoyed my work in the Agriculture Committee because I care about farmers and ranchers, and I care about their way of life. But never has our committee been partisan, and again, I pledge myself to work with my colleagues to see if we can restore the days in which we were in this together on behalf of American agriculture.

Madam Speaker, it's my belief that if we're going to spend as much money as we spend in this farm bill, which is a significant sum of money, we ought to spend it in much more wise and prudent ways than this conference report provides. We owe it to farmers across the country, and we owe it to the taxpayers of this Nation.

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. GOHMERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FIGHTING CRIME

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

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, fighting crime is an issue that is important to most Americans. That is because it is an issue that has a tremendous impact on a community's quality of life.

I think most Members of Congress recognize this simple fact. However, this Congress needs to take action in order to address this problem. On our side of the aisle, we've tried to do our part. Republicans have offered some 100 bills to help fight crime, but so far, only three have been considered on this floor.

These legislative efforts should not be piecemeal, but should instead be part of a grand strategy, to wit: we need to aggressively target those individuals who are responsible for promoting criminal activity in our society.

Our focus should not be on promoting efforts to decriminalize certain drugs, but instead on targeting and jailing drug dealers.

Our focus should not be on protecting the rights of criminals, but instead on protecting the rights of their child victims. More needs to be done, for example, to combat the scourge of predators who stalk young people over the Internet.

Finally, our focus should not only be on adult offenders, but on youthful ones as well. Gang members, some of whom are as young as 12 and 13, and we see intergenerational gangs as well, are extorting money, dealing drugs, and committing acts of violence. They need to be stopped, and that is where my bill, H.R. 3157, the Anti-Gang Task Force Act of 2007, comes into play.

H.R. 3157 will help our local law enforcement communities combat the scourge of gang violence. It authorizes $20 million for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011 to establish new multijurisdictional anti-gang task forces, bringing together State and local prosecutors with Federal officials from the FBI, DEA, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, DHS, and others.

Gangs are mobile, and they often cross jurisdictional lines in order to facilitate the dealing of drugs or to avoid detection by local law enforcement authorities. Thus, a multijurisdictional approach is clearly necessary in order to stop the proliferation of gang violence and gang activity.

My district encompasses a good portion of what is called the Route 222 corridor.

□ 2015

This corridor bisects five cites—Easton, Bethlehem, Allentown, Reading and Lancaster—located in four southeastern Pennsylvania counties. It is uniquely situated in that it is linked directly to New York City, approximately 80 miles away via Interstate 78 and through other easily accessible roads, including Route 222 to Philadelphia, which is 60 miles to the southeast.

So gang violence along the Route 222 corridor, primarily involving drug trafficking and armed robberies, dates back more than a decade and has been a chronic problem affecting each of the five cities within this corridor. The roadways that have allowed commerce to thrive in the region have also strongly benefited the gangs, who can move between the cities with relative ease, thereby making their operations much more difficult to detect and to track. As a result, the 222 corridor has been plagued by gang activity.

Fortunately, we're not standing idly by and letting the gangs take over. The Route 222 corridor is one of six sites around the country that has received funds under the Project Safe Neighborhoods program. This Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) initiative involves a cooperative law enforcement effort between the counties and cities along the corridor, and there have been some notable successes.

First, there have been successful prosecutions of members of the Mafia El Don Gang, which has conspired to distribute more than 50 kilograms of cocaine in the Lehigh Valley. Meanwhile, two members of the 314 and a half Gang, allegedly responsible, according to the U.S. Attorney's Office, for approximately 15 to 20 bank robberies in the Valley, have been indicted. In addition, the initiative is committing extensive resources to outreach of both at-risk youth and their parents in order to discourage young people from joining such gangs. And we have seen intergenerational gang activity in my community.

The Congress would do well to emulate the efforts of the U.S. Attorney's Office and the local District Attorney's offices and law enforcement agencies that are working hard to fight the gang problem in my area. More than talk is required if we want to curb gang activity and end gang-related violence, we need action. That action should take the form of legislation, legislation that targets criminals, promotes Federal-State cooperation, and that comes from both sides of the aisle.

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 Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HULSHOF 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 Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania 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 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 gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PORK-BARREL SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, we come tonight to speak about the subject of pork barrel spending at a time when hardworking, middle-income American families are having to cut back on their spending. They're having to cut back on their spending because their paychecks are shrinking; they're shrinking with the high cost of energy; they're shrinking because of the high cost of food.

Since the Democrat majority took control of the economic policies of our Nation almost 18 months ago, gasoline has now approached $4 a gallon. Milk is already over $4 a gallon. And all over America people are driving to their convenience stores or driving to their grocery stores, making a decision about gasoline and milk.

It's tough times for hardworking, struggling, middle-income families. And yet, the Democrat majority, in their Budget Resolution, the conference report—which, of course, is the agreement between the Senate and the House—their budget today was passed that included a tax increase on these very same families of $3,000 for the average family of four to be phased in over the next 3 years, Madam Speaker. Again, while they're struggling to send their kids to college, struggling to make their mortgage payments, struggling to fill up their cars, this is what's happened.

Well, what is fueling the tax increase that the Democrat majority has imposed upon middle-income families throughout our Nation? Well, there's a culture of spending. They presented a budget that represents the highest amount spent in the history of America. There is a culture of spending, and it is fueled by irresponsible pork barrel spending, also known as ''earmarks.''

Now, when the Democrat majority was in the minority, they made a number of promises. They said earmarks were out of control under the Republican majority. And Madam Speaker, you know, to some extent they were right. But this is a Republican Conference that has learned its lesson. But commitments were made by the Democrat majority that have not been kept.

First of all, the Speaker of the House said we're going to come and we're going to cut earmarks in half. But instead, Madam Speaker, what did we get? Last year, 11,610 items of pork barrel spending put into spending bills by the Democrat majority, the second highest level ever in American history, totaling approximately $17 billion. Now, some people say, well, $17 billion isn't a whole lot of money. Well, Madam Speaker, I hope I'm never in Washington so long that I think $17 billion is not a lot of money. Millions of Americans could pay their annual gasoline bills with the money that's being spent on the pork barrel spending in Washington, DC. That's enough money to preserve the child tax credit, which under the Budget Resolution passed by the Democrat majority is going to disappear. And so I think that is a lot of money. And not only is it a lot of money, it represents waste.

And too often what we see in this pork barrel spending promulgated by the Democrat majority is that we see a triumph of secrecy over transparency, and we see a triumph of the special interests over the national interests, and we see a triumph of seniority and privilege over merit. Now, again, the Democrat majority said they were going to do things differently. Madam Speaker, then minority leader, now Speaker NANCY PELOSI said in USA Today that there has to be transparency. ''I would just as soon do away with all the earmarks,'' right here, USA Today, late 2006. And instead, if we read the spending bills, what we find out is, out of 435 Members of Congress, she's in the top 20, top 20 of pork barrel spending.

Then, chairman of the Democrat Congressional Campaign Committee, RAHM EMANUEL, said, ''Well, for far too long business as usual has involved individual Members doling out favors in appropriations and other bills through earmarks. The American people deserve to know more than who sponsored special interest legislation. They deserve earmark reform that puts an end to special interest earmarking and prevents the practice of earmark abuse.''

Now, Madam Speaker, that's what they said before they became the majority party here. But what do we see now? And don't just take my word for it, but let's look at what just happened today. Today, as the farm bill was passed, what do we have in there? We have, again, pork barrel spending that apparently appears out of nowhere. We have slush funds for ski slopes. We had the language slipped by the Democrat majority into the farm bill that would benefit a Democrat Senator in Vermont. It would require the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service to sell portions of the Green Mountain National Forest exclusively to the Bromley Ski Resort. And the ski resort advertises, ''Bromley's grooming and snowmaking are second to none, and with our 44 trails of varied terrain, from treed glades & true New England cruisers to sun soft expert mogul fields, everyone in your family will be smiling all day long.'' Well, Madam Speaker, I'm not sure the American people, who have to put up with this kind of earmark abuse, I don't think they're smiling. Now, maybe the people who own the Bromley Ski Resort in Vermont, they're smiling, you know, they got a nice little deal in the agricultural bill.

Then we had a quarter of a billion dollars slipped in for the Senate Finance Committee Chairman, MAX BAUCUS, to help the Plum Creek Timber Company in Montana sell a parcel of land to the environmental group called The Nature Conservancy. Now, technically, they get to claim a $250 million tax refund even though they're a nonprofit institution and they don't actually pay taxes.

Now, the language was quite careful, Madam Speaker. It was very careful and clever. They wrote this language, they didn't name this particular earmark, but they wrote it in such a way that it only applies to one parcel of land in the entire United States of America, and that is that belonging to the Plum Creek Timber Company in Montana.

And then, Madam Speaker, we have $170 million for the salmon earmark requested apparently by our own Speaker, NANCY PELOSI. Clearly, there is something fishy in the farm bill.

Now, we were told again that we wouldn't have these earmarks, this pork barrel spending that just kind of drops down from the heavens in these conference reports. We never had a chance to vote on this in the House, Madam Speaker, it just kind of drops down. And so for a Speaker who is supposed to lead by example, who tells the American people that she would just as soon do without earmarks, that she wants an open and ethical and transparent process to slip a $170 million fishy earmark into the farm bill, this is something the American people need to know.

Why are their taxes being raised by $3,000 per family of four over the next 3 years? Well, part of the reason is, Madam Speaker, to pay $170 million for the salmon earmark in the farm bill, to help subsidize the Plum Creek Timber Company, to help the Bromley Ski Resort. So much for cleaning up the earmark process.

You know, we were also told that there certainly wouldn't be any more secrecy in this earmark process.

You know, the former chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee told us that. Yet, that's not the case. Let me quote from the New York Times, not exactly a bastion of conservative thought, on one of the bills that came to this floor last year. ''Despite promises by Congress to end the secrecy of earmarks and other pet projects, the House of Representatives has quietly funneled hundreds of millions of dollars to specific hospitals and health care providers.'' ''Instead of naming the hospitals, the bill describes

them in cryptic terms so that identifying a beneficiary is like solving a riddle. Most of the provisions were added to the bill at the request of Democrat law makers.''

''Some Republicans have complained about what they call 'hospital pork.' '' This is the New York Times reporting this. This, from a Democrat majority who said there would be no more secrecy. And instead, out of all the hospitals throughout the Nation that I'm sure can all use help, somehow the special privilege and secret pork barrel process practiced by the Democrat majority manages to somehow favor a special privileged few and does it in a cryptic secret manner. One more reason that hardworking, middle-income families who are trying to get that paycheck to go a little further are instead seeing that paycheck shrink to pay for more Democratic pork.

And, Madam Speaker, I'm very happy tonight that I am joined by one of the great leaders of fiscal responsibility in this House, one of the most principled Members, one of the most active Members, one of the most courageous Members that I have met in my congressional career. And I am proud that he is a fellow member of the conservative caucus, the Republican Study Committee, a man I am proud to call my friend.

And at this time, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PRICE, for his comments.

□ 2030

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my good friend from Texas for organizing this period of time and for highlighting what Americans all across this land are concerned about, and that is the culture of spending that you talked about, and you mentioned these wonderful promises that were going to be enacted with this new majority.

And there is a culture of spending that continues and persists, but there's also a culture of hypocrisy. It's saying one thing and doing another. It's saying one thing on the campaign trail, and then when you come to Washington, you do something exactly the opposite. And when I go home to the Sixth District of Georgia, that's what I hear about. I hear people say, ''Why on Earth can't people live up to their word? Why can't they do what they said they were going to do when they ran for office?''

And the spending is one of the things that gets them so terribly irritated and so terribly annoyed because they see it. My good friend from Texas talked about selling a piece of the Green Mountains in Vermont to a specific entity. That's using hard-earned taxpayer money to benefit one entity. Madam Speaker, that's wrong. That's not the way we ought to do business here.

In fact, it hasn't been the way forever. There are some wonderful quotes about pork barrel spending, about earmarks. One from Thomas Jefferson, who said that, in essence, if we allow the process of earmarking, pork barrel spending, to go forward, ''it will be a scene of eternal scramble among the Members, who can get the most money wasted in their State; and they will always get most who are the meanest,'' which is a phenomenal quote when you think about it, Madam Speaker, because what we have now are individuals in this House of Representatives who have been so successful in getting earmarks, getting pork barrel money back to their districts that we now have defense contractors in this Nation who are moving their headquarters to one specific district in Pennsylvania because they believe it will benefit them to a greater degree in getting contracts from the Federal Government. A phenomenal thing.

Madam Speaker, this process is corrupt and it's corrupting. When I talk to folks back home about why it's imperative that we stop the earmarking process, something that I believe we must do, and I tell them that it's corrupt and it's corrupting, that didn't have the resonance until I put a face on that, a face that we have seen in this House by so many individuals but it's most championed in a corrupt way by a gentleman by the name of Duke Cunningham.

Duke Cunningham now sits in a Federal prison in California. He does so because he earmarked money for a personal company, that benefited one company, one company, and then they, in turn, benefited him politically. And it's happened on both sides of the aisle. But it's a process that's corrupt and it's corrupting.

Now, why do I mention Duke Cunningham by name, Madam Speaker? I do so because when he came to Washington, he was the individual who was the inspiration for the ''Top Gun'' movie. He was a war hero. He was an American hero. And what happened with the process of Washington was that the corruption and the corrupting influence of Washington spending that is being perpetrated and continued and expanded by this majority, that process corrupted that individual. Now, there were certainly some personal characteristic flaws, but the process itself that remains in place right now and, in fact, is being championed by this majority is a corrupt process and it's corrupting.

Madam Speaker, I would suggest to all of my colleagues that this is a process and a system that has got to end. It's got to end. The American people want fiscal responsibility. They want to make certain that they have financial security and peace of mind. That peace of mind will never come when we have a process that is this sordid, that is this offensive to the American people.

So I want to commend my good friend from Texas for his remarkable leadership in this and so many areas in Congress, a conservative stalwart, an individual who understands the importance of being fiscally responsible at the Federal level and the consequences of not being fiscally responsible, which means that middle class Americans all across this Nation are having more of their hard-earned taxpayer money taken out of their back pocket, out of their wallet, and out of their purses in order to fund the reckless spending, irresponsible spending, culture of spending, and culture of hypocrisy that this majority has brought to Washington.

So I want to commend my good friend from Texas, and thank you so very much for the opportunity and the privilege of joining you tonight. I thank you for your leadership in this area.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for joining us tonight. And, again, I thank him for his leadership here in the House of Representatives in the area of earmark reform, clearly one of the great champions against pork barrel spending and for family spending.

Again, Madam Speaker, I think it's important for us to reflect upon what the Democrat majority said they were going to do and what they have actually done. One of the prominent Members of the Democrat leadership, the gentleman from Illinois, who was, in the last election, the chairman of the Democrat Congressional Campaign Committee, where his job, obviously, is to find things for the Democrats to say to get elected. Well, one of the things that he said on behalf of the Democrat Party was, ''For far too long, business as usual has involved individual Members doling out favors in appropriations and other bills through earmarks. The American people deserve to know more than who sponsored special interest legislation. They deserve earmark reform that puts an end to special interest earmarking.''

But yet, Madam Speaker, the system appears to be alive and well. Now that the Democrats have become the majority party, what do we figure out? Well, let's read from a recent column in the New York Times dated January of this year:

''Representative John Murtha has procured eye-popping chunks of pork for contractors that he helped put in business in Johnstown, Pennsylvania. Every one of the 26 beneficiaries of Mr. Murtha's earmarks in last year's defense budget made contributions to his campaign kitty, a total of $413,250, according to the newspaper Roll Call.'' This is the New York Times. Again, not exactly a bastion of conservative thought.

Now, Madam Speaker, I'm not here to imply that there is anything illegal about that activity. I'm not here to even imply that this in any way, shape, or form breaches House ethics rules. Now, perhaps it should. Maybe that's a debate for a different day. But you know what, Madam Speaker? It doesn't pass the taxpayer smell test. It doesn't do what the Democrats claimed they would do when they were in the minority. And now that they've been elected

to the majority, now that they've controlled this institution for almost 18 months, they are not practicing what they are preaching.

Here's another example. I quote from the newspaper Roll Call: ''A new political action committee, BEST PAC, created by the brother of House Intelligence Committee Chair Representative Silvestre Reyes, raised $50,000 this spring almost entirely from staff and clients of powerhouse lobbying shop PMA Group, and within weeks those same donors reaped millions of dollars in earmarks from Reyes and other Members of Congress closely affiliated with PMA . . . Most of the donations were made on May 7, 4 days before the intelligence panel approved the 2008 intelligence authorization bill, which included earmarks for several donors to the PAC . . . ''

Again, Madam Speaker, I don't imply that this was illegal. I don't imply that this somehow breached House ethics rules. And I'm familiar with the gentleman from Texas, and I believe him to be an honorable gentleman. But far too often what the American citizen sees is he sees his paycheck shrinking to pay for earmarks so that some Member of Congress can preserve his paycheck. And at a time when they are struggling to fill up their gas tanks, at a time when they are struggling to put bread on the table, it is an outrage, it is an outrage that this pork barrel spending continues on. And, unfortunately, Madam Speaker, what we are seeing under the Democrat majority is Members of Congress passing pork barrel spending, earmarks, whether recipients get it, and I guess they're showing their gratitude, and all of a sudden they come up with a campaign donation, and then the campaign donation ends up inuring to the benefit of that particular Member of Congress, and the cycle goes on and on and on. And, again, it may be legal. It may pass the House ethics test. It does not pass the American taxpayer smell test. And even though I've been a Member of Congress now for almost 6 years, I haven't lost my ability to be outraged, and this, Madam Speaker, is outrageous.

And now I'm very happy to say, Madam Speaker, that we have been joined by a distinguished member of our leadership, the chief deputy whip, a great leader in the earmark reform movement in the House, a man I am also very proud to call my friend, and I would be happy to yield now to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership on the issue of the Federal budget and what we should be doing to ensure that we are stewards of the Federal budget just as all the families across this country are expected to be stewards of their own family budget.

Now, Madam Speaker, as a proud Virginian, I would like to point to a few of the origins of the earmark discussion that occurred many, many years ago, frankly, shortly after the founding of this country. And that great Virginian Thomas Jefferson, he wrote a letter to James Madison, another great Virginian, dated March 6, 1796, challenging Madison's proposition for improvements to roads used in the system of national mail delivery, and it was directed at the idea that we should be, as Members, actually directing public funds, taxpayer dollars, into our States.

President Jefferson wrote, in the context of directing Federal dollars, ''It will be a scene of eternal scramble among the Members, who can get the most money wasted in their State; and they will always get most who are meanest.''

I think this shows that the debate around earmarks is not a new one, and I think also that the impression of then Mr. Jefferson is something that we ought to pay attention to and something that we ought to, frankly, pay heed when we are talking about the challenges that we are facing today in this country.

The gentleman from Texas talked about the tremendous lack of confidence that the American public has in this Democrat-controlled Congress. It is stunning to see the public opinion numbers of what the American public thinks about the performance of this Congress. Nothing to be proud of.

I believe that that dissatisfaction, frankly, is grounded, first of all, in the inability of this Congress and this majority to solve the problems that real people are facing in their lives each and every day in their communities. All they hear are solutions based on the premise that this government in Washington somehow needs more of their hard-earned dollars. And over and over again, we continue to hear the message, and we know that this town, that this Congress, and this majority is broken. We are not rising to the occasion, fixing the problems facing the American people. And yet we continue to see a steady stream of bills making their way to the floor where we continue to see proposals to raise taxes, to take people's hard-earned money, and then we see those dollars turned around and appropriated into the earmark process.

My friend from Texas was very accurate in his quotes, right on point. We have heard over and again Members of the majority leadership, when they were in the minority, when they have become the majority leadership, continue to pledge, ''We pledge to make this the most honest, ethical, and open Congress in history.'' That was from then minority leader Ms. PELOSI in 2006.

□ 2045

She then went on to say, ''This is a place where we really need to throw up the shades and pull back the curtains.'' And she said, ''We have to have the fullest possible disclosure, and it has to be on earmarks in appropriations, in authorizations and in taxation. And it has to be across the board, with no escape hatches.''

There was another remark made, ''There has to be transparency. I'd just as soon do away with all earmarks, but that probably isn't realistic.''

Now, again, we need to dedicate ourselves to fixing the problems that this country has to try to address their distrust of this government. And the first thing that we ought to do is be mindful that the many, many earmarks that make their way through this Congress frankly are not out, shone in the light of day as the majority had promised. They are not being held accountable for some of these expenditures that are being made. This is at the crux of the public's distrust of Washington.

And again, while we are facing the prospects of $4 and $5 a dollar gas at the pump, while families have real issues and their pocketbook is being pinched, we continue to see the unbelievable, unprecedented torrent of billions of dollars going into special interest projects and into pork that, frankly, most American people don't approve of.

It should not be about pork. It should be about paychecks. We should be focusing our attention and we should be focusing the investment of taxpayer dollars towards job creation. We ought to be rewarding those people who invest their dollars and give them back more of their hard-earned money so that we can see more jobs created, because we do know that more jobs, longer lasting jobs and a stronger economy will stem from a strong private sector and a free-market system.

And with that, I want to again thank the gentleman from Texas for organizing this Special Order tonight on the very important topic of earmarks. And I yield back.

Mr. HENSARLING. Again, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for coming down tonight and talking again about how the Democrat majority, unfortunately, seems to speak out of both sides of their mouth when it comes to pork barrel spending that is taking away from the paychecks of hard-working middle-income families so that Members of Congress can somehow keep their paychecks.

It is unfair.

And there's a big difference between the two parties. The Democrat party said they would do something about it. And they did. They put the pork barrel spending factory into high gear. The Republicans made mistakes when it came to earmark spending. That is one of the reasons that we lost in 2006.

But, Madam Speaker, we have learned our lesson. And that's why the Republican Conference supports a moratorium, a moratorium on this pork barrel spending, do away with this system and come up with a system that is more transparent and more accountable to the American people.

The Democrat majority hasn't called for anything like that. They are just

doing fine taking money away from middle-income families struggling to put food on the table, struggling to fill up their cars and pickup trucks, take that money away and spend it on monuments themselves and spend it on special interest favors for special interest groups. It has got to stop.

Madam Speaker, another great leader we have in the earmark reform movement in the United States House of Representatives, another fellow member of the Conservative Caucus of the Republican Study Committee is the gentlelady from North Carolina.

And I am happy to yield time to her at this time.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Congressman HENSARLING. I appreciate very much the leadership that you have provided to do this special order tonight.

As you've said, the system is broken. The earmark and pork barrel system is broken. And we have to do something about it.

I will have to confess that in my first 2 years in Congress, I did ask for earmarks. And my earmarks were very transparent. I felt that every project I asked for was very valid and very worthy. They were all designed to help with economic development in my district. The requests came from county commissioners, airport commissions and economic development groups. They all came very legitimately and very openly from the people in the counties that I represented in the Fifth District of North Carolina. And I have no problem at all defending those.

However, what I learned in the process is that this earmark system is badly broken. Not everybody who was requesting special funding was being as transparent as I was being. And I have come to the conclusion that we must have a moratorium on earmarks until we can fix the system.

I believe the American people have become very, very cynical about the Congress and about Washington in general. And I didn't come here to feed that cynicism. I came to Washington because I believe that I have a limited amount of talents that I can use on behalf of the people of my district and on behalf of the people of the United States of America.

And I want to do that. I am very much in love with this country and with what we stand for. And I want to make sure that I have done everything that I can to help this country succeed. It is the greatest country in the world. I have no doubt about that. And we have done enormously good things in the little over 200 years that this country has been formed.

And it is my goal to keep us as a beacon of hope for the world, to keep us as the beacon of freedom for the world, and to do everything that we can to keep the government going in a positive way.

But as I said, we have made mistakes. Democrats and Republicans have made mistakes. But I will have to say that Republicans never promised to make the kinds of reforms that the Democrats promised to make. The Democrats said in 2006 a lot of things to get elected and to take over the majority.

We have all kinds of charts to show they made many, many promises which they have not kept. But I think this one, this promise about earmarks and pork barrel spending, and they are broken promises related to that, has made the American people even more cynical about Washington and about elected officials than they were before. And I frankly don't want to be a part of that.

If we are going to maintain our freedom, if we are going to maintain the type of country that we want, we have to get people engaged in our political process. We have to have people who want to run for office, who want to get out and vote and who want to make sure that we can continue this republic in all the positive ways that it has existed. And frankly, we can't do that as long as we allow people to use the money paid into the Treasury by hardworking Americans for projects that they deem are important.

I don't believe that any Member of Congress should ever be able to appropriate money to have any kind of facility, road or anything named for him or her. That, to me, is one of the worst things that can be done, because it is not our money. It is the money of the hardworking taxpayers. And we have no right to take that money and use it, particularly, again, in these very, very difficult times, as my colleague from Texas said, when gas prices are going up, grocery prices are going up, and the hardworking American families are really struggling to make ends meet.

We came up with a phrase for what the Democrats have done since they got elected in 2006: The House of Hypocrisy. Some of my colleagues are uncomfortable with that because it is a blotch on the House of Representatives which most of us love dearly. But they have turned it into the House of Hypocrisy because they have not kept the promises that they made.

They made lots of promises. And again, I am going to quote some of them because I think we need to do that over and over and over again.

Speaker PELOSI, then Minority Leader PELOSI: ''We pledge to make this the most honest, ethical and open Congress in history,'' Christian Science Monitor, 11/14/2006.

''We will bring transparency and openness to the budget process and to the use of earmarks, and we will give the American people the leadership they deserve.'' This was in a press release issued by Speaker PELOSI 12/11/2006.

Minority Whip STENY HOYER said, ''We are going to adopt rules that make the system of legislation transparent so that we don't legislate in the dark of night, and the public and other Members can see what is being done,'' the Washington Times, 11/25/2006.

Mr. HOYER, again, ''Words will not do it. I have a good relationship with Representative Roy Blunt. I have a good relationship with Representative John Boehner. We'll work together. We'll include them in the decision making.'' ''To the extent we create an atmosphere of mutual respect, the American public will feel more comfortable with Congress,'' Hoyer website, 12/10/2006.

That is what the American people expected from the Democrats when they gave them the majority in 2006. And frankly, many of us were happy to hear the kinds of pledges that they made. And we thought, great, they have been out of power for 12 years. They have learned some things, and things will be better.

DCCC Chairman RAHM EMANUEL, ''Earmark reform must do more than identify an earmark's sponsor. We need to curb the proliferation of unnecessary and suspect earmarks,'' townhall.com 9/12/2006, before the election.

But what has happened is that the Democratic leadership believes they don't have to keep their promises. But House conservatives are going to stand with hardworking Americans and continually demand it. We continue to offer amendments to bills that say, you cannot hide these earmarks. They have been done over and over and over again. Every promise that the Democrats made has been broken. None of them has been kept as it relates to earmarks and pork barrel spending.

We have to hold them accountable. The American people expect us to be accountable. I am accountable to the people that I represent. My work is an open book. The Democrats have found more devious ways to hide earmarks than any of us could ever have thought possible. But we are going to continue to try to ferret out those earmarks and make them public so that the American people will know what they are.

We may not be able to make the Democrats keep their promises. But we are going to reveal when they break those promises and what the consequence of breaking those promises is. We do not need to continue this broken earmark process. We need to stop it. We need to stop pork barrel spending. If we did that, we could reduce spending. We could reduce taxes. We could help the average American family cope with the increase in prices that they are coping with and help them meet those challenges more readily.

I again want to thank Mr. HENSARLING, Chairman HENSARLING, for organizing this special order on the earmark process, for bringing to light the problems that the Democrats have brought to us, and the broken promises that they have before us every day.

And I yield back to my friend from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Again I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for coming here tonight to participate in this Special Order and to try to stand up for the hardworking middle-income American families that are seeing their paychecks shrink. And one of the great

reasons their paychecks are getting ready to shrink even further is because of a budget resolution conference report passed today that includes the single largest tax increase in American history, passed courtesy of the Democrat majority that will pose a $3,000 average tax increase on a family of four of America while they are struggling to fill up their cars and while they are struggling to put food on the table.

Why are taxes having to be increased? Well, Madam Speaker, part of the reason is because of the culture of spending fueled by these wasteful, pork barrel spending earmarks.

□ 2100

They continue to proliferate and explode under the Democrats.

I mean, what kinds of earmarks are the American taxpayer having to pay for? Well, one includes a monument that a single Member of Congress decided to dedicate to himself. It's called the monument to me, to benefit the chairman in the House Ways and Means Committee, CHARLES RANGEL.

Let me quote from the Wall Street Journal. ''New York's Charlie Rangel provided smirks this week when news emerged that the Harlem congressman was humbly seeking a $2 million earmark to celebrate the 'Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service' at the City College of New York,'' that much money so that one Member of Congress can build a monument to himself. These are tax increases on hard-working American families so that Democrat Members of Congress can build monuments to themselves.

Here is another one, let me quote from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. ''Representative Mike Doyle, a Forest Hills Democrat and staunch Murtha ally is an eager apprentice. One major achievement is the Doyle Center for Manufacturing Technology based in South Oakland. Mr. Doyle helped launch the center with a $1.5 million grant.'' Interesting. Here is another monument to another Democrat Member of Congress, and the list goes on and on and on.

Now, as the gentlelady from North Carolina said, not every earmark is bad, but the system is bad. The system fuels a culture of spending that is bankrupting hard-working American families as they are struggling to make that paycheck stretch. It is waste. It's an insult to these families to abuse their earnings in such a fashion.

I am very happy tonight also to see that we have been joined by one of the great conservative leaders in America, a former chairman of the House conservative caucus known as the Republican Study Committee and somebody who has been a mentor to me, a man I am proud to call my friend.

I am happy now to yield time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank my friend and colleague from Texas. I want to compliment him for conducting this special order on earmarks tonight. It's an issue where the American people need to understand what is going on in the government that they elect.

I think most of them, if they harken back to their civics class in high school or grade school, would be stunned at what happens here and would find it, quite frankly, disgusting, because it is. It is a perversion of a system.

We use the term earmark, and we try to describe it. I am not certain that many people at home fully understand how the process works. To some degree, if you don't understand how the process works, you can't understand why some of us think it is so outrageous.

I want to get kind of down to some basics. Let me talk about the equity of the earmark process. Some of us think that we were each elected to come here to represent our congressional districts, and we were also elected in representing them to look at the good of the Nation.

Some of us don't believe that we were elected primarily to come to Washington and take as much money as humanly possible from the other taxpayers around the country and rip it out of their taxpayers' pockets and put it in our congressional districts. I don't remember being taught that in my civics book. Yet, the way the earmark system works in this Congress today, it is outrageously inequitable.

You might say, well, you know my congressman knows the needs of my district, so why shouldn't he get a couple of projects in your district. Every one of your congressmen who gets earmarks come back and say, look, I got you this bridge, or I got this business in our community, this money, and they say, aren't I great.

But, you know what they don't tell you? They don't tell you how much somebody else got. They don't tell you that the congressman three States over got 100 times as much money. They come and say, look, I got us $2 million for this project right in our town. But they don't tell you that the congressman from the State two States over was more powerful than your congressman, and he didn't get $2 million, he got $800 million.

So the taxpayers, you, the taxpayer and the congressman whose district brought home $2 million, you got fleeced to the tune of the $800 million that went to the powerful congressman, and that's how it works. Earmarks in this Congress today go to powerful Members. So if you are the chairman of a powerful committee, or you are in the right position to get it done, you get, literally hundreds of millions of dollars, maybe even billions of dollars for projects that you get to direct.

But, if you were a poor American taxpayer who lives in a district where you don't have a mega powerful congressman, well, your junior congressman, your fairly new congressman, your less-than-powerful congressman, he brings home next to nothing, but he brags about what he brought home. He just doesn't tell you that it was a fraction of what was taken out of their pockets to pay for somebody else.

Mr. HENSARLING. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHADEGG. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HENSARLING. You know, it's interesting, we sit here and assume that a lot of people know what an earmark is and what pork barrel spending is. Probably the best way to define it is money that Congress takes out of their pocket to give to a specific entity that doesn't have to be competitively bid. It can go to one particular corporation. It can go to only one entity, and it doesn't go through any competitive bidding process whatsoever.

As the gentleman said, well, some Members of Congress say I know my district the best, and I am supposed to bring the pork home.

Well, the people in the Fifth District of Texas, they are not so interested in me bringing the bacon home, they want to make sure that Congress doesn't take it out of their smokehouse in the first place.

As the gentleman ably points out, when somebody is getting something for nothing, there is somebody else who is getting something for nothing.

Mr. SHADEGG. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. I am going to go through a description that I think will help people understand what we mean by earmarks and by the kind of a simple earmark that you might think about, and then the more complex, the more subterfuge, the more hidden ones.

First of all, you have powerful Members of Congress get billions, not-so-powerful Members of Congress get next to nothing, but taxpayers pay for it all. The other fascinating process that goes on here with earmarks is the at-risk Members, that is a Member who is in a competitive district and might lose, and their political party wants to help them, oh, they bulldoze money to that Member's district.

But if you have some other congressman who is secure in her District or secure in his district, well, too bad. So you better hope that your congressman is an at-risk Member of Congress because then billions of dollars will be steered to your congressman's congressional district and to your community and to the business and the jobs in that community.

But if you have a secure congressman who gets re-elected each year easily, and he is not powerful, you get a fraction amount of that money or you get zero, once again. Once again, money is coming out of your pocket and being distributed on a completely inequitable basis. It goes to the powerful Members of Congress, it goes to the at-risk Members of Congress to get them reelected.

Let's see if we understand this, my tax dollars go to fund my Federal Government, but they aren't distributed on the basis of merit to the good projects.

They aren't distributed on the basis of need, to people who are in need. They aren't distributed to the Nation's needs. They are distributed to some congressional district because that Member is powerful or to some other congressional district because that Member is at risk of losing his or her seat.

Now if you like your money being distributed on that kind of an unfair basis, then you are for earmarks. Let's talk about kind of an explanation of what earmarks are, as my colleague from Texas just mentioned.

You know, there is the kind of mundane earmark, the routine earmark. A Member of Congress gets asked to do a community project. I happen to like one, they have got a harbor in their district, that harbor needs to be dredged every few years and so they say, look, I just want to go get an earmark to get that dredged. It's asked for by the community, it's needed by the community, and it looks like a pretty innocent fair-minded earmark.

If they were all like that, we might not have any problem as long as they were allocated equally to all 435 districts in the country. Then no one would be taken advantage of. But, guess what, that's not what most earmarks are, at least that's not what many of them are. Many of them are an earmark that goes to a local college or a university or an earmark that goes to a private business. That's my favorite, earmarks that go to private businesses.

I am a congressman, I have a business in my district, and it is not quite making it, or it's a startup, so they come and see me and they say, hey, Congressman, we would like an earmark. Give us some taxpayer dollars because we can't survive in the marketplace. So I steer some money to that small business or that big business in my district.

You know what happens? This is just surprising. Do you know what happens? I would ask the gentleman to join me for a moment. Do you know what often happens? Do you know that often the executives of the company that get that earmark money, your Federal tax dollars, do they make donations to that congressman?

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, as a matter of fact, we have clearly documented that earlier this evening, and it's not just us saying it, The New York Times has said it, and I quote again, ''Representative JOHN MURTHA has procured eye-popping chunks of pork for contractors he helped put in business in Johnstown, Pennsylvania.''

''Every one of the 26 beneficiaries of Mr. MURTHA's earmarks in last year's defense budget made contributions to his campaign kitty, a total of $413,250,'' this from the New York Times.

If the gentleman will allow me, again, under this Democrat majority, what we see too often is that Members of Congress direct earmarks to special interest recipients. They turn around and give campaign donations to the campaign, and then the campaign helps re-elect the Member of Congress, and the cycle goes over and over under this Democrat majority.

Mr. SHADEGG. Taking back my time, I think it's stunning, but I don't like the words ''special interest,'' because that makes you think it might be some kind of a public interest, maybe it's for hungry children or maybe it's for needy families or maybe it's for dental care? No. This is for a private for-profit corporation, a huge business advantage for them and, interestingly, the executives of that corporation just suddenly decide that they like that congressman and send him contributions.

Well, that's pretty interesting, but what about the next level of corruption in earmarks, what about could it have ever happened that a Member of Congress creates a for-profit corporation or creates a nonprofit corporation himself and puts his friends and cronies on the board of directors of that nonprofit corporation or that for-profit corporation and then earmarks money to them? Shocked. Tell me it wouldn't be so.

We are taking earmark money, we are taking taxpayer money, hard-earned money by American citizens, taking it away from them and giving that money to an entity that we created that we incorporated, and we put all the Members on its board of directors and, shock of shock, they donate money back to our campaign or, in some instances, they might hire the congressman's wife or his daughter or his son or some other needy family member.

That's very appropriate. That ought to happen with our taxpayer dollars. That's what we expected when we sent our taxes to Washington that a congressman would take that money and donate it through an earmark, direct it, force it through an earmark, not debate it on the floor of this House, to go to a for-profit or a nonprofit corporation that a congressman created that employs his son or daughter that makes donations back to him.

We haven't even talked about the lobbyist who used to work for the congressman who then went to work for a lobbying firm that seeks earmarks who, by the way, shock of shocks, asked for the earmark, got the earmark, got paid by the for-profit business or the nonprofit business for getting the earmark, and then both executives of that for-profit or nonprofit corporation and the lobbyist, former staffer, donate to the Member of Congress. This is all above board, all wonderful, all that the American taxpayers ought to think happening with their dollars.

Mr. HENSARLING. If the gentleman would yield, it's a good time to point out again what a difference there is between the two political parties on this issue. The Democrats claim they would cut these earmarks in half but they didn't do it. Instead we end up with the second highest number of pork-barrel spending earmarks that we have seen in the history of America. They claim no more secrecy in the process. Yet we know that we have secret earmarks come in to benefit a select number of hospitals.

It has been well documented. They claim they would bring integrity to the system, and yet we continue to see earmarks coming out of this end of Washington D.C., and we see campaign contributions coming in the other end. How convenient.

Then they claimed that we can't continue to tax, we can't continue to have bridges of nowhere for America's children to pay for, but apparently we can have museums to honor Democrat Members of Congress, apparently we can have money going to the so-called Hippie Museum. Apparently we can send money to help the L.A. fashion district with their signage and streetscape improvements.

□ 2115

The Republican Party has called for a moratorium on earmarks. This process needs to be reformed. The Democrat Party likes the status quo as it is. The leader of our party takes no earmarks. The leader of their party claims she would just as soon do without them; and instead, she is in the top 20 recipients of earmarks.

The Republican presidential candidate says I will veto any spending bill with an earmark. And you look at their two presidential candidates, one is in the top 10, and the other, although only in the bottom half, has still managed $91 million of pork-barrel spending.

To add her perspective, I am happy we are joined by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), and I yield to her at this time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding, and for his leadership on this issue.

Getting our hands around waste, rooting out waste, fraud and abuse is something our freshmen class when we came to Congress said we were going to be committed to. And certainly pushing forward earmarks and the issue of pork-barrel spending is something we have committed much of our time in this Congress to.

Madam Speaker, I think it is so appropriate as we talk about this issue that we realize yes, indeed, we have called for a moratorium on earmarks and would encourage all Members to join us, doing so partly because this is an issue that over time has grown and grown and grown.

When you go back and look historically, the first correspondence on this that we could find was Thomas Jefferson writing a letter to James Madison March 6, 1796, and Jefferson wrote commending to Madison did he think of all of the consequences that would come from the proposition of using public money as a bottomless pit, if you will. It is a great quote.

There are quotes from President Monroe in 1822 when he argued that Federal money should be limited to great national works since if it was unlimited, it would be liable to abuse and might be productive of evil. That's 1822, how interesting.

As we look at the period of time through the 1950s and the 1960s and 1970s and 1980s, how this body repeatedly increased spending every single year and increased the use of those earmarks every single year, and how the practice became commonplace.

Well, some of us feel like enough is enough, that the American taxpayer deserves greater consideration. Now is the time for an earmark moratorium.

DEMOCRATS WORKING TO SOLVE AMERICA'S PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here once again speaking on behalf of the majority makers, the freshmen Democrats elected in 2006 to bring change to Washington and who have worked very diligently over the last 16 months to begin to reverse the damage done to this country over the last 7½ years.

It is interesting, I was planning to talk about what I saw as a very encouraging sign over the last few days, the encouraging sign that we had actually solid bipartisan participation in trying to come up with solutions to some of the very daunting challenges that face this country today, including energy prices.

We had a bipartisan vote, an overwhelming bipartisan vote, to restrict additions to the strategic petroleum reserve, something which the President opposes but which overwhelming numbers of both bodies of Congress supported. And I was going to talk about the farm bill in which we had significant Republican participation in coming to grips with a new solution to our farm policy in this country. And I was going to talk about our housing initiatives, how we had significant Republican support last week in trying to craft policies that would help alleviate the serious housing situation we have and to try to keep things from getting worse.

But after listening to the partisan attack that I just heard, I have to respond because what we have heard is something that is almost in a parallel universe. It is interesting that my colleagues from the other side speak as if the last 7 or 8 years didn't exist, as if the Republicans weren't in charge of the entire government from 2001 until 2007, as if the national debt did not increase by $5 trillion during their stewardship of this government, as if earmarks had not been developed into an art form under Republican leadership. It is almost as if there is no history that they choose to remember.

I can understand why they don't want to remember what went on from 2001 to 2006, and before that many of the policies that were developed under Republican leadership in this Congress prior to George Bush's presidency because they don't want the American people to be reminded.

But we know from all of the polls and the voter turnout that we have seen in the last few months, we know that the American people remember what has gone on in these last few years. We know because, as we have seen in a poll over the weekend, when asked which party does the American people trust to deal with the challenges we face as a country, the American people prefer the Democratic policies by a margin of 20 percent, one of the largest margins ever recorded. It is not hard to understand why. What we have seen are failed policies from people well meaning, no question about it, but people who do not believe that government has a role in solving our problems.

We see it when people come to the government, when the average citizen comes to the government for help. We see them in our offices every day, and we talk to them at home on weekends. We know that the American people are hurting. They come to us for help. We know that nurses come to us for help. Teachers come to us for help. Social workers come to us for help. They are dealing with the pain of average American citizens every day, and we are trying to do what we can to help them.

We know that the other side does want to come to the help of American citizens from time to time if they happen to be the CEO of ExxonMobil, if they happen to be the CEO of Chevron, if they happen to be the insurance executives. Those people can always find assistance from the Republicans. But when the average citizen comes for help, no, no, no, we don't want to do that. Government is not in that business.

Well, that's why the American people turned to the Democratic Party in 2006 and said, We have had enough, it is time for a change. We believe that the Democratic Party can help working Americans solve some of the problems that face them.

I think we have made a very, very good start. From the very beginning of our leadership in the 110th Congress last January, we took steps immediately to raise the minimum wage which had not been raised in 10 years. We took steps to change the rules under which drug companies dealt with Medicare. We took steps to end the subsidy of oil companies with huge tax breaks when they are making more money than they had ever made in their history. We worked very diligently, and we talked about earmarks.

My colleagues on the other side want to make it sound like we invented earmarks, which we certainly didn't. We actually provided for the first time some transparency in earmarks. We said if you are going to put an earmark into a bill, then you have to identify that you sponsor that earmark and you have to attest and swear that you did not reap any personal benefit. You had no personal connection with the recipient of that earmark. Those were not the policies under the Republican Congress when they had in their last budget year 16,000 earmarks. No, you could slip them in there. Nobody knew you got the earmark. You could take credit for it if you wanted to, but if you tried to find out who gave money for XYZ, you couldn't find that unless the person actually took credit for it. We changed that. We required accountability in the earmark process.

So it is interesting to listen to my colleagues talk about the horrible leadership that they contend of this Democratic Congress as if the last decade had not occurred. I think the American people have seen through that. I think there is no question that the recent results, not just in polls but in special elections for Congress, reflect the fact that the American people understand that the Republicans are out of ideas. They just are out of ideas. The idea that government will play no role in solving some of the challenges that we have has proven to be a bankrupt idea. They persist in that philosophy, and they persist as of earlier today, and we have to call the attention of the American people that these are not the facts and that there is a very distinct difference between our policies, the Democratic majority, in which we are trying to use government to help the American people while maintaining fiscal responsibility, while maintaining our PAYGO rules so we make sure that we don't add to the Federal deficit and the national debt and that we pay for what we do when we do it.

Now, there is a huge exception to that policy, as we all know. We are going to see it on the House, on this floor in the next few days. We are being asked once again to allocate billions and billions of dollars to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. We are being asked by the President, who now has the lowest job approval in modern history, we are being asked by him to give him a blank check, once again no constraints on his activities in Iraq and Afghanistan, no restrictions on his troops, no new regulations regarding the deployment of troops, just give him the money and let him try to accomplish the mission which he said was accomplished 5 years ago but which has not only not been accomplished in 2008 but which is something, a mission which we still can't define.

I would like to ask the administration, and we have on many occasions, if you want our support, if you want us to continue to fund this failed policy in Iraq, tell us what the mission is. Tell us once and for all what the clear objectives are, and we will listen and we will use our judgment and see if that is the type of thing that the American people will support.

But as always, we still don't have a clear idea what the mission in Iraq is. It changes on a day-to-day basis. We are being asked once again to spend billions and billions of American taxpayer dollars for a policy which no one really can explain.

I think my colleagues, and several have joined me here now, are in the same situation as I am. On a daily basis I speak to people from my district, Louisville, Kentucky, and they say, we need money for this. We have been cut this way. We are going to have to cut services, why can't we just spend a little less in Iraq. Every day I get that question. I probably got it six times today. Why can't we take some of that money we are flushing down the toilet in Iraq and spend it on the American people who are in desperate need of the things that government needs to do. These are some of the issues we are confronted with today.

It is my great pleasure to be joined by two of my colleagues from the class of 2006, the majority makers, Mr. KEITH ELLISON from Minnesota and Dr. STEVE KAGEN from Wisconsin, and I am going to yield to Mr. ELLISON and have him continue this discussion about what we in the majority makers and we in the Democratic majority are trying to do on behalf of the American people.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from the great State of Kentucky. He has been helping to lead our majority-maker class in this leg of our two-term service, and has been doing a fine job of it.

As I start, I want to invoke the memory of two young men, one Robert Dixon and another one, Quising Lee.

□ 2130

These are two young men who are from Minneapolis who were killed in Iraq. There have been 64 Minnesotans killed in Iraq, and Robert Dixon and Quising Lee are two gentlemen who lived in my district.

I'll never forget when I went to go see Quising Lee's family after he was killed. He went to North High School. He was 20 years old when he died, and he was killed in a roadside bomb in Iraq.

Robert Dixon was killed in a roadside bomb in Iraq as well. I wasn't able to go to see Robert Dixon's funeral. I was here. My wife went for me. Kim, thank you for doing that. And she sat there and listened to stories about Robert Dixon and his life and his service to our country and the things he hoped for and wanted.

But I did get a chance to visit the family and go to the funeral of Quising Lee. Quising Lee, 20 years old when he was killed, went to North High School, had his whole life in front of him. Only 20 years old.

It's in the memory of those two young men from Minneapolis that I offer remarks tonight, and on behalf of those 64 Minnesotans that have been killed, and on behalf of those 4,500-some individuals, Americans who've been killed in Iraq, and on behalf of those, probably as many as perhaps 600,000, perhaps even 1 million Iraqis who've lost their lives in Iraq.

That's the spirit in which I approach tonight, my fellow majority makers, because, as you know, tomorrow is the big day we're going to be voting on Iraq appropriation once again.

Just for the facts, I think it's important to point out this will be a three-tier vote. One will be on appropriation for Iraq. I'll be voting ''no.'' The second will be on certain terms and conditions to get out of Iraq. I'll be voting ''yes'' on that. And the third will be appropriations for GI bill and things like that, and I expect to be voting ''yes'' on that.

And so I want to just lay this out tonight because I think people that are listening should know that tomorrow is a big deal. Tomorrow is a big day. We're all going to be casting votes, votes, I pray, of conscience, votes that are not based on licking a finger and sticking it in the wind, votes that we earnestly believe in. No matter what you may conclude about how you should vote tomorrow, I pray that you do it based on your conscience, consistent with your conscience.

And as we sit here tonight, you know, I reflect on the fact that I've been to Iraq once, been to Afghanistan once, look forward to going back. I think it's the responsibility of every Member of Congress to see the place that we have these soldiers struggling to survive in. I don't think it's right to just send somebody there and then just expect that they're going to be fine. We should at least go there, eat with them, sit with them, listen to them, their hopes, dreams, aspirations, what they hope to do if they make it out of there.

I think it's important for us, as Members of Congress, to go to the VA hospitals in our local communities and here in Washington, DC.

I think that what we're dealing with is serious issues, life and death. And more importantly, perhaps most importantly for me, we're dealing with issues of how our Nation works in relation with other nations in the world.

I believe that the United States should aspire to be a good neighbor in the world. I believe that our country, blessed with tremendous economic power, blessed with tremendous democracy, meaning not just elections, but the power to respect minority rights, the power to respect religious diversity, ethnic diversity. In America, we're not saying that people don't discriminate, but it's illegal if you do it, and good people fought and even died to make it so.

So I hope that tonight, as we reflect upon our great Nation, we reflect upon our role in the world, reflect upon not only the hard power but the soft power of America; that we all reflect on the sacrifices that were made to make it that way; and that we say that American history is not written yet, and that greater things are left for us to do.

And the greatness of this country is not bound up in guns and bombs, but, my friends, it's bound up in the goodness of the people and our desire to say that we cannot rest on having a democracy at home, but we should model it for the world, but not impose it or inflict it upon the world; and that we are not the world's police officer, but we could be a good example for what people might want to emulate, and that we should use our power to beat swords into plowshares and make war no more.

I'll be voting ''no'' on that appropriation tomorrow. And so I just want to turn it back, as we reflect tonight, as I reflect on the lives of Robert Dixon and Quising Lee. I know my friends from Kentucky and Wisconsin have some young people, or not so young people who they're remembering tonight as well.

Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman. And now it's a pleasure to welcome Dr. KAGEN from Wisconsin, someone who has been a steadfast advocate for not just the veterans of this country, but for working families everywhere, and has been a champion in trying to bring attention to the serious flaws and opportunities in our health care delivery system.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KAGEN. Thank you for yielding, and thank you for carrying on for the first few minutes before I was able to attend. Our Committee on Transportation just ended its subcommittee meeting at 9:20 this evening where we were hearing some testimony about the possible merger between Delta and Northwest. And it was a very educational seminar, to say the least.

But it's still an example of how we are working hard to gain oversight over these mega mergers, and taking a look at big business and big insurance and big corporations and the big war machine that's now costing Americans millions and millions of dollars every day.

And if you like numbers, my friend, it's $14 million an hour that we're spending in Iraq instead of here at home. It's $338 million per day, $2.4 billion per week, and $10 to $12 billion per month that we have our hard-earned tax money going over to the sands of Iraq and not investing here at home in our own infrastructure, in our roads and our bridges, in our schools and in our social system.

Now, if you like numbers, and I like numbers, I've got a head for numbers. I'll give you the number 300, 200 and 13. 300 percent is the increase in the gasoline price since the current administration took office in 2001; three times as much as what you're paying at the pump as when they started.

Now, my friend, Mr. ELLISON, the right honorable sir, mentioned Iraq and some Iraq tragedies. On Mother's Day I had the occasion, in Wisconsin, to dial up and wish a happy Mother's Day to a fallen soldier's mother, and I spoke

with Donna Opicka. She had lost her son, Dean. And in her words, quote, ''It's not working.''

She's been against our involvement in Iraq from the start. She has two sons that are there. And we will always support our troops, but not a failed policy. And in her words, ''It's just not working.''

They told us oil prices would go down. They've gone up 300 percent.

The Number 200, it's 200 percent, the increase in fuel oil that many people in Northeast Wisconsin rely on to heat their homes. And it was a long winter this year.

And what about the number 13? 13 percent increase in your cost for groceries. Your food went up 13 percent.

My friends, if the cost of our food went up 200 and 300 percent, we'd see a revolution in this country. And so earlier today we passed a farm bill that will fundamentally and dramatically change the way we're feeding ourselves. This farm bill determines what farmers will plant, what they're going to grow and, ultimately, what we're going to eat and what we're going to look like.

That farm bill had the overwhelming support of over 300 Members of Congress, and it's a very good example of how Congress really ought to work, in a bipartisan way, Republicans and Democrats together putting their minds together and working out a way in which we can feed not just our own families but continue to feed the world.

Now, as this increase in energy for food and energy for oil has gone skyrocketing, the food prices have held their own until recently, when the energy cost has crept into our food supply.

At the same time as these costs are going up, your income is going down. The median income went down 2 percent since 2001. So at the very same time that middle class Americans are having a hard time keeping their head above water with the escalation in the cost for energy, both food and oil, their income is not going up.

And so I think people watching tonight have to ask a fundamental question. Whose side are we on? Are we on the side of big business? Are we on the side of big insurance, big oil companies? I think not. We're not sitting in a boardroom. We're standing on the people's floor here in the House. And I'm very honored to work with my Class of 2006, the class I brand America's hope for a real positive and a new direction; not just in our farm policy, not just in our foreign policy, but our domestic policy as well, as we pay attention to and continue to work hard for the American people to give them a fair shake in our future.

And I yield back.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman.

I want to pick up on two of the things that he mentioned because I think these are fascinating contrasts and put into perspective some of the challenges that we face.

First, on the subject of oil prices and gasoline prices, he mentioned that 300, the price of gasoline has gone up 300 percent since 2001. What's interesting is, when you look at what we're now paying in Iraq for gasoline, this is one of the truly astounding and very disturbing aspects of our involvement there.

And again, as my colleague, our colleague, Mr. ELLISON said, we're going to be voting on more funding for the Iraq war tomorrow. The American people need to know that right now we are spending $153 million a month on gasoline in Iraq, $153 million a month. And we're paying $3.23 a gallon for that gasoline. It's probably up since then, but the time that we have the statistics, $3.23 we're paying for gasoline in Iraq.

Meanwhile, the Iraqi people, and Iraq is sitting on one of the largest oil reserves in the world, the Iraqi people are paying a subsidized cost of $1.30 a gallon. Now, wouldn't we all love to pay $1.30 a gallon?

Now, that's unrealistic, but it's interesting that we're paying for the entire reconstruction cost of Iraq, we have up to this point; we're spending all this money to try and stabilize their country, and we're paying $2 more per gallon for gasoline than the Iraqi people are. That's just one of the strange quirks of our involvement there.

Mr. KAGEN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. YARMUTH. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. KAGEN. Does it bother you at all that we don't have any oversight in Iraq, where 20 percent of the money we're putting in, no receipts, no oversight at all, and it's a culture of corruption? Does that bother you at all?

Mr. YARMUTH. Well, certainly. And again, I referenced the fact that not only are we being allowed to, or being asked to write a blank check for hundreds of billions of dollars, as we've been writing for some time now, somewhere over $500 billion total in direct appropriations for the war in Iraq, but we're also being asked to give the Iraqi government a blank check; do whatever you want, no accountability, you get to it when you get to it, you'll decide when things are right for us to be able to leave. It's all up to you. We're helpless.

It's a very uncomfortable position for us to be in.

Mr. KAGEN. Will the gentleman yield again for another question?

Mr. YARMUTH. Of course.

Mr. KAGEN. Does it not astound you that the administration today, and our opposing party, has no answer when we say, look, we are budget red. We have a budget deficit and Iraq has a budget surplus. Isn't it time that they paid for their own reconstruction?

Isn't that a reasonable question?

Mr. YARMUTH. It's a reasonable question which we are addressing in legislation. And I think the American people are totally justified in demanding that the Iraqi people pick up some of the tab when they're running a $70 billion surplus per year.

And I was actually encouraged to hear one of the representatives of the government over the weekend talk about the fact that they intend to do that. But just their intentions don't seem to be much because, again, as you said, there is no accountability method in place.

But I want to reference one other thing. And it's getting off on a little tangent, but you talked about the merger between Delta and Northwest, and that's being examined by the Transportation Committee now, and I'm glad it is.

One of the things that I've been talking about more and more when I'm talking to the good people of Louisville, Kentucky is, you know, we've allowed, over the last couple of decades, maybe 3 decades, companies to get bigger and bigger and bigger in this country. We really haven't enforced the anti-trust laws in this country in 30 years. And we did it because they said, oh, you know, it's a global economy. We need to be able to get big so we can compete.

Well, unfortunately, what they generally mean when they say they want to get big is they want to get big in revenues. They don't want to get big in job creation. They don't want to get big in many things that are the goals that we hold for this country. And when they want to get big, it generally means they want to save money. So they merge, and then they eliminate jobs, and they close facilities, and they destabilize communities, all in the name of being able to compete in the global economy.

□ 2145

And what concerns me is—and we had a hearing not too long ago in the Oversight Committee in which we talked to several of the CEOs of very large corporations, and this was about corporate executive compensation. And I asked three of the executives, When you have these compensation committee meetings when you're deciding what your CEO is going to be paid and what your top management is going to be paid, do you ever talk about the impact of these huge salaries and compensation packages on the morale of your employees? Do you ever talk about how you could make life better for your working people, your employees? Do you ever talk about how you can improve the communities that you occupy, that you serve?

And the answer was very candid, and they said, No. It's always about just how we get the stock price up and how we compensate our executives.

So the question I ask, and it's one that I hope we continue to ask in this Congress, if you want to get big, we need to make sure that your goals are the same as the American people's goals; and I think people on both sides of the aisle would say we have the same goals for the American people.

We want good jobs, we want stable communities, and we want secure families. And if we have a corporate world that has goals that are antithetical to that, then we need to revise our policy on anti-trust allowing these mergers and try to say if you want permission from us to get big and you want to operate in a certain way, we want you to operate in a way that benefits the American people and not just your CEOs and your stockholders.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YARMUTH. Absolutely.

Mr. ELLISON. As we talk about this merger of Northwest Airlines and Delta, I have a number of serious concerns I'd like to point out. One is that Northwest has a pilots' union, has a mechanics' union, has an airline attendants' union. Delta only has an airline pilots' union. And the fact is that Delta is the bigger entity. And so when they merge, what will happen with these organizations that are designed to make sure working people have some rights? I'm very concerned about that.

And I think that's one of the reasons why I think—and I hope and pray we can pass the Employee Free Choice Act, which we already passed through this House, but we have not yet been able to make into law.

I'm also concerned that Delta and Northwest in the future, if they merge, will never compete based on price or based on product. They will never compete because they will be one entity. They won't make each other better, and they won't make each other more efficient. They're just going to bond together and make some money. And of course, they're quite candid, and they tell you they are going to merge so they can get efficiencies. So what is that? Well, that means somebody is getting fired. That means somebody's got to go. You can't have two Employee Relations offices; you can't have two H.R. offices. Can't have two of everything. Somebody is going to go. And at the end of the day, a lot of folks who are paying property taxes, who are raising families, who are doing well, are going to be out of work and lose their jobs.

So I'm very concerned about this. I'm concerned about what consumers are going to pay in terms of ticket prices. I'm concerned about loss of jobs. I'm concerned about the fact that this Justice Department has never seen a merger that it didn't like, and we are seeing an increasing monopolization, oligopolization of our, what should be, competitive markets.

And I would love to see some of these free-market advocates get out there and fight for a competitive market. They seem to not be in favor of competitive markets. They seem to be in favor of really big business, not competitive markets, not free enterprise. These are things that are on my mind, and I think Americans want to know what is this Justice Department going to be about.

Because as I wrap up and toss it back to you, I would like to ask you gentlemen a question. Did you know that in 1980, the average CEO made about 42 times the average worker; but in 2005, which is the last year I have data, the average CEO made about 411 times the average worker? That is a problem. What do you guys think of that?

Mr. KAGEN. It wouldn't be so bad if everybody else was doing that good. The reason it's bad is because we didn't get lifted up at the same time.

Mr. ELLISON. Did the rising tide lift our boats?

Mr. KAGEN. Not the boats in my district, but median income might be $28,000 to $32,000 a year.

When I was home in northeast Wisconsin, I was at a diner, Tina's Roost, in Oconto. And I was meeting with some workers there, and I said, well, listen. We're about to take up this discussion about an economic stimulus package to revitalize our economy and get us out of this upcoming recession; and one of the city workers stood up and took apart some of the six layers of clothing because it was still pretty cold in northern Wisconsin, and he said, KAGEN, look out the window. You can see it right there. The price of gas. You drop the price of gasoline, I have got more money in my pocket. And while you're at it, knock down my health care bills. Those are the two things we could do immediately to put more money in people's pockets.

But my response was very direct and very honest. We're working hard to do that, but it's hard to do it when you have a President who's an oil person and you have a vice president who's an oil person and a Secretary of State who is an oil person. So if you've got oil in the White House, it's hard to move it out until we look forward to that date in November when we get that real positive change that we really need.

So we can drive our economy, but we have to have an energy policy that makes sense, one that is designed in the open and not behind closed doors; an energy policy that will be fashioned towards renewable sources of energy, away from fossil fuels, and it has to make sense for our environment at the same time.

But fundamentally, people are like back home in Wisconsin. A lot of people are like turtles on their back. They just want to get back on their feet and get started. And that's what we did with the energy stimulus bill, and we're also doing that with this housing bill that we put forward, trying to find a pricing floor in the housing market.

Mr. YARMUTH. The gentleman makes some very good points, and one of the things I just mentioned before you arrived was that over the past few days, we've actually done three things in a bipartisan way; and you mentioned one of them. We passed a farm bill with substantial Republican support. The housing bill, we had a number of Republicans join us; and when we dealt with the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in which we said we don't need to be adding any more fuel to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, taking it off the market, decreasing supply when we're at 98 percent capacity; we've never been, in recent history, below 600 million gallons of our 727-gallon capacity; and the bill, the freshman class, we asked the President to do it by himself. The President refused.

So what happened? The Senate yesterday voted 97–1; the House voted 385–25. I think it shows it was a pretty solid idea. There can't be that many people who have bad judgment. Maybe there are. But 97–1, 385–25 are pretty good odds. So we spoke to the President in a bipartisan way.

So there are situations in which we have found ways to work together, and as you said, that's the way it should be; and I think that's a very encouraging sign. Unfortunately, we have a President who doesn't recognize this body as having any say in policy in this country. He believes he is the decider, and despite provisions in the Constitution in article 1 to the contrary which says the American people are the deciders of policy and the laws through their representatives of Congress.

I think we are doing the people's business, and we're doing it in a very responsible way. And I agree totally that it will be wonderful to have a new chief executive in the White House who maybe understands that government is a partnership and the Constitution was written so that it would be—we would have three branches who are not constantly in conflict but who are working together for the American people.

Mr. ELLISON. I think you're right, Mr. YARMUTH, and I appreciate you pointing that point out.

The article 1, that's kind of our theme this year, isn't it? Reasserting the power of the legislative branch.

I want to pick up on a theme that Dr. KAGEN mentioned a moment ago as he was laying out how he was speaking with some workers in northern Wisconsin.

I was talking with some workers in Minneapolis recently, and we're kind of like cousins, Minnesota and Wisconsin. Folks had talked about how their pay has been stagnant and they haven't seen much of a pay increase except in the late nineties. But the prices of everything seems to be going up: health care, housing prices, and all of that. And what people did in the early part of this decade is they were able to get money out of their houses, right, which has led us into the foreclosure crisis.

But what are people doing now that housing prices are flat? Well, they're turning to credit cards. Charge it. They're putting it on the plastic. And I think this is a big deal because I think we need to know that people are essentially consuming not out of savings, they're consuming out of pay-day loans, credit cards. They used to do it out of the equity of their houses. And this is a serious problem, and people cannot consume out of their savings but have to consume out of debt.

And what it has caused us in our economy today, gentlemen, is that we have seen the credit card debt jump from 6.7 percent in the first quarter of this year, a credit card increase of 6.7 percent in the first quarter of this year to a whopping $957.2 billion. This is a very serious issue for our economy.

That's why we need a high-wage strategy. We need to put more money in people's pockets by reducing the costs of education, housing, health care, gasoline, and by saying that folks are going to have a fair, decent wage that they're going to be able to earn; and we need a strategy to pull those things together for the American people.

Mr. KAGEN. What we did the other day in terms of trying not to put more petrol into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is to increase the supply. And the President said what we should be doing is increasing supply by drilling more. But there's a fallacy in that argument. There are thousands of acres available for drilling on public land, and they're not drilling.

So the fallacy is the price of oil is going to shoot up and up and up as long as we have fewer and fewer oil companies that are chasing down the oil. But we cannot drill our way out of this energy crisis. We can't drill and burn and drill and burn. We're going to end up choking on our own exhaust. We're going to inflate the temperature so much in this globe that we're going to melt not just the ice caps but our future at the same time.

So we need to have that energy policy that is not based on increasing supply but finding alternative sources of energy.

Mr. ELLISON. What do you think about an energy policy that would incentivize the production of cars that get 100 miles to the gallon? They're out there. The technology is there. There are a lot of things that we're looking at here in Congress that could help people go a long way. You plug that thing in at night when the load is a little lower, nonpeak hours. What about getting some of these light bulbs that don't use as much energy? What about converting some of these old windy buildings so they don't waste as much energy?

Mr. KAGEN. We're doing that with the Department of Energy building because our Transportation Committee has decided that the energy building, the Department of Energy, should be led with some solar power. It's called future fitting. And if you future fit your home, put up solar cells, not to take it off the electrical grid but knock down your electric footprint, your carbon footprint, you will save much in your electric bill and also in terms of the CO_2 production in the atmosphere.

These are the little things that when they add up, when thousands of homes across the country begin to future fit their homes, we can gain a great deal of energy independence and stimulate the economy. People underestimate the millions of jobs that can be created by future fitting their home, and we have to help them out here in Congress to create that legislation to incentivize that.

Mr. YARMUTH. Exactly.

I would say you made the right statement. We will never drill our way out of the energy crisis, but we can invent our way out of the energy crisis; and the private sector is in the process of doing that. We need to give them the boost. We need to give them the incentives. We need to provide the tax credits, and in fact, we have tried to do that. And if anything, I think, represents a clear distinction—there is probably nothing that represents a clear distinction between the President's party and ours than the way we have handled the ideas of incentives.

The Republican Congress in 2005 voted a 15—well, the number is vague—but it's around $15 billion a year in tax incentives to the oil companies to drill. We've tried to take that tax incentive away, that subsidy, and put it into the types of innovative technologies that will be the answer to our energy crisis, will make us independent of imported oil, and oil totally, and will stimulate and create new economies and new economic opportunity in this country.

□ 2200

Mr. ELLISON. I've got to ask the gentleman to yield on this one.

What is the opinion of you two esteemed gentlemen on the $40.7 billion ExxonMobil cleared? I mean, that's not revenue, that's profit, and yet and still, this President does not want to take away their incentives, their oil subsidies. What kind of sense does that make? Can somebody please rescue me from my ignorance?

Mr. YARMUTH. That didn't make since in 2006 when they made $38- or $39 billion. It didn't make sense last year when they made $40 billion. It doesn't make sense when they made over $40 billion. Record profits every year since we gave them this huge tax subsidy.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, let me ask you this, do you think there will come a day when the folks in the White House might just say, they might not need that subsidy after all?

Mr. YARMUTH. Well, ironically, in a way, this President did say that because in 2004, when he was campaigning for reelection, he said once oil passes $55 a barrel, the oil companies will not need any incentive to drill. That was his campaign statement in 2004.

Mr. ELLISON. That's the problem. He just doesn't know that oil is not $55 a barrel, but actually hit about $126 a barrel. He just doesn't know. Somebody ought to send him a news flash.

Mr. KAGEN. Let me put it in a different perspective, if you will allow me to. It's not about profits. I'm in favor of profits. We have a capitalistic marketplace. I'd like people to be profitable. It certainly beats the alternative of being negative in red ink.

But let me submit to you that the oil that we're pulling up out of the ground hasn't changed in millions of years. The gold we're mining out of these mines, it's the same gold as it has been for millions of years but it costs more. It costs more because the purchasing power of your United States dollar has declined.

So there's a decline, a reevaluation south of everything you own and everything you do. Every working man and woman today is earning money that has less purchasing power than before, and it's because of our failed economic policy of this administration and the Republican party, the philosophy of borrow and spend and borrow and spend.

You cannot borrow your way into national prosperity. You cannot spend your way into prosperity. We have to have a fiscally responsible and socially progressive House and Nation, and when we do that, when we reinstill these values, we'll begin to grow our way out of this current recession and restore some balance to our economy, wherein an oil company may not have to make that much money at the expense of every consumer who is struggling just to keep their head above water.

Mr. ELLISON. You put your finger on a very important issue. You used the word ''philosophy,'' and I think it's a good time to talk about the philosophical framework that I believe is crumbling before our eyes.

The idea that the middle class doesn't matter, that the wealthiest among us—and let me just tell you, I'm one who says, thank God that you were able to do really, really well. I'm not against people in the top 1 percent. I mean, I'm like great. But I think people in the top 1 percent say, you know what, I climbed up the ladder and I'm going to leave it there so other people can climb up the ladder, too.

But the philosophy that I think we have seen over the last 8 years is the philosophy that says, you know what, we're going to give every opportunity, every incentive to the people at the very tiptop; we're not going to make sure people in the middle are making it. And what eventually happens is that those people there in the middle don't have anymore money to spend. They are now spending out of debt, and then what happens is that they can't even afford the basic necessities of life, which then is going to have an impact on the consumer sector and on corporate America.

Seventy percent of the whole GDP is what we spend, consumer spending, but we ain't got no money. And so the point is, we are literally killing the goose that laid the golden egg. We need to say that we need new politics where the market is a part of our life but not a holy, sacred grail. The market helps to propel productivity, but is not all there is. But we have alongside the market, a regulated market, a market that makes sure that competition is

present, a market that says that consumers cannot just get stuck and gouged and pinched and pulled and taken advantage of, and a market that says that we want to have innovation and room for small producers so that there's this competition over goods and services and brand and innovation and, of course, price.

We need a new market that has the middle class as the VIP of this economy, not the CEO.

Mr. KAGEN. I think that you're headed toward the philosophy that I think America really believes in, getting back to the basics and putting the letters U–N–I–T–Y, unity, back into community.

Mr. ELLISON. Oh, yeah.

Mr. KAGEN. We can do that by helping to evolve our health care system back to community-based ratings so there is no discrimination against any citizen, not just because of the color of their skin but their skin chemistry, not just the content of their heart but the arterial content of their heart.

So we have to get back to a place, again, where American traditional values are reinforced here in Congress. I think that's the hard work, the working ethic. That's the hard work we have been doing here during these past 15 months that we got here.

Mr. YARMUTH. There's another element to the philosophy that I think we need to talk about now, and I see it in discussions that we have in our caucus meetings, and I think it's a growing realization that we have to embrace as a philosophy in this body that we can't think just to the next election cycle. We have to start thinking very long-term, and we have to start thinking about investment and investments that will pay off over the long run but will not get us any immediate gratification or recognition so that we can get votes at the next election.

And you mentioned health care, and that's certainly an area in which we have to start investing because every dollar we spend on early childhood health care we know pays off 10, 20 times down the road. You can't see it today. The CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, won't score it and say, okay, you can take credit for that, but we know that it happens. If children are tended to early on, preventive care, diagnostic work, we catch a hearing problem, a sight problem, you catch them before they get obese, we know how much that returns in savings down the road.

The same way with infrastructure. We've neglected infrastructure in this country for far too long. We know we have to make investments in infrastructure, but those are the types of investments that do pay off. It's not like Iraq where every dollar, once you shoot a bullet, once you shoot a rocket, that's money gone. There's no investment there, no return on investment.

But infrastructure, health care, medical research, if we could spend, let's say we spent $100 billion over the next 10 years and we were to cure cancer and diabetes, you're the doctor, it would save trillions of dollars long-term.

Mr. KAGEN. Absolutely.

Mr. YARMUTH. And so we have to start thinking I think in that long-term, let's invest money now. You're right, you can't spend your way to solve these problems, but you can invest your way. And I think there's sound, solid, predictable results that we can get from these types of investments.

Mr. KAGEN. But that requires judgment. It requires good judgment at every level of our government, not just a mayor or a county board member, but here in Congress and in the White House. And this is why this next election, I'm looking forward to having the opportunity to work with a President who has good judgment and a philosophy that believes in prevention, not just in health care, but by preventing going to war, you prevent human tragedy and you save tremendous amounts of money.

Mr. ELLISON. That's why I really believe that we need a philosophy and a President who believes in the philosophy of the common good. The common good because, you know, as Representative YARMUTH refers to infrastructure, that's another word for our common wealth. That's our common wealth. That's what we all own together. That's the roads, the bridges, the dikes, the levees, the transit. That's the universities, the public school system. That could be a health care system that we own together, that's ours. And that's all of these things that when we invest in them, they pay dividends back.

Like you just said, that military spending is a one-way good. You shoot that bullet, and it's gone. But when you build that road, all of us who use it for even just our businesses, just to truck stuff over it, are using it, that's a return on investment. Those of us who go to school on it, that's a return on investment. Those of us who use it just for recreation, that's a return on our investment.

It's our common wealth, and we need to get back to the idea that, you know, America is a country where we have our common good and we share it, and we believe it and we have a common wealth that we share and we keep and we promote. And our market is a part of the common wealth, but it's in service to the people of the country. It's in service to tap into the creativity and the productive power of the people so that they can produce goods and services for the people of this country.

Our markets are another, not just to produce goods and services, but to improve our social life because in that way, when I'm allowed to do my thing, right, I can be more happy, more productivity, more creative. And if I had health care and if I had a pension and if I had a school system that my kids could go to, boy, I could sit in that garage and come up with all kind of cool stuff.

The fact is we've got to get back to this place where it's about the common good, it's about the common wealth, and not about just me for me and I don't care about anybody else. Greed essentially elevated to a political philosophy, we've got to get away from that. It has not served us well.

Mr. YARMUTH. Well, the gentleman makes a wonderful point, and I'm reminded in a very kind of maybe indirect way of a movie that came out back in the early seventies, and it was called ''Rollerball.'' It was remade several years ago in a very different way. But the movie early in the 1970s was a science fiction movie, futuristic, looking to an era in which geopolitical boundaries had ceased to exist. And the world, instead of being divided into countries, was divided into economic entities.

So James Caan, who starred in that movie, played Rollerball, a futuristic game, for the Energy Corporation, and they played against the Communications Corporation. And then there was the Food Corporation, and that's the way the world was divided.

And sometimes when you see ExxonMobil with its volume of revenue and profits and some of these other enormous corporations, you say maybe we're not too far from that.

So we have to decide, as a Nation, it's one thing to say the world is flat, but that doesn't mean the world has lost its distinctions yet and its delineations into Nations that have souls and have people who believe in their commonness, their common mission, their common ambitions. And that's something that I think every American wants to retain. We don't want to lose that.

And I think when we essentially wash our hands in Washington and say corporate America, corporate world just go at it, do what you want to do and we'll take whatever you give us, we're not too far from that unfortunate scenario in ''Rollerball.''

Mr. KAGEN. Let me make a comment about that if I may, and many people would like to say, well, why can't government run itself like a business. And in one sense, we can because in business there are three questions you have to ask yourself: Will it work? Will it be profitable? And the third most important question is, is it the right thing to do?

These are the three questions we can ask ourselves as well here as we begin to fashion legislation. Will it really work? Is it going to have the outcomes that we hoped that it would, whether it's health care or a housing bill or a farm bill? Will it work?

Secondly, is it going to be profitable? Will it be something for generations to come? Seven generations forward will feel that was a good investment of your time and your natural and national resources?

And finally, is it the right thing to do? Is it the ethical thing to be doing?

These are the three questions that apply to business. These are the three questions I think apply to our government, and I'm happy to say what we've been working on here in the 110th Congress, all three of these questions have been asked and answered, and we're doing the right thing for America. We're really moving it in a very positive direction.

Mr. ELLISON. I would say, and we have about maybe 5 or 6 more minutes to go tonight. I just want to say it's always a pleasure to be on the floor with the difference makers, the majority makers. It's an honor to be able to stand in front of the American people and to project a progressive vision that includes us all, that allows us to share in a common good and a common wealth together and also allows us to, you know, embrace the fact that we are an economy, that our society embraces the free market as well, that we look at these two things as complementary and not one superior to the other, that we see them as something that enhances our life together.

□ 2215

And I just want to say, as you mentioned, Mr. YARMUTH, that I don't think Americans want to be under a corporatocracy. I think we like our national identity.

And I'll say that you should know that before the 1870s, the corporate entity was nothing close to what it is today. As a matter of fact, you couldn't even own one unless the charter was issued by the State, the same as it is today. That's the thing; we think of these things as somehow natural or inevitable, but corporations are creatures of the State. Without a State charter, they don't exist. And we should say that corporations should ask, does it work, does it make money, and is it the right thing to do? That is a perfectly legitimate question. And I look forward to the day when that question is asked by all of us.

So with that, I again thank you two gentlemen, and also salute the majority makers. And I look forward to a day when we have a cooperative and productive relationship with the executive.

Mr. YARMUTH. That will be a nice day. And, you know, just following up a little bit on that thought, the image that I get in my mind when I look out over the economic landscape sometimes is that we have a lot of very wealthy, very powerful people who are just playing Monopoly with America, that this is just a game for them. And there are the little houses and the little trains and all the little pieces that are on the Monopoly board, and it's funny money. Unfortunately, it's funny money that many people are being deprived of because of the great concentrations of wealth in this country.

And I don't want to sound like somebody who's saying, oh, we've got to redistribute the wealth, we've got to make sure everybody has the same thing. That's not what any of us are talking about. But as Mr. ELLISON pointed out before, we have seen the greatest separation of wealth, disparity in wealth in this country than we've seen in almost 100 years. And we've let the pendulum swing much too far to one side so that we've allowed the very wealthiest people to become incredibly wealthy, and almost everybody else has been treading water.

As we said, we have not been floating everybody's boat; in fact, we've been drowning a lot of people. And we've got to make sure that everybody has a boat. And I think that's one of the things that this Congress is committed to.

So I would like to yield to my friend, Dr. KAGEN, for some closing remarks as we wind down this version of the majority makers.

Mr. KAGEN. Well, I would close by thanking you for the opportunity. It's been a long day, another 15-hour day for both of us. And I want to thank the American people for tuning in tonight. And you can guarantee one thing, that we're working hard for you. We're on your side. We're going to protect our country. We're going to grow our economy, expand the middle class, and defend our planet against global climate change. And on that positive note, I yield back my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you, Dr. KAGEN. It's wonderful to be here with you tonight, and also with Mr. ELLISON.

And one of the things, I guess if I could capsulize what we've said tonight and what the majority makers feel more than anything else, that in this country every person matters. Every individual matters, and every individual deserves our attention, our concern, and our action. And that's what we've been doing for 16 months and pledge to be doing for the rest of our tenure in office.

So with that, once again, thank you for joining me tonight.

MAN-MADE GLOBAL WARMING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPACE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I preface my remarks with a personal statement that, while I am opposed to the advocates of man-made global warming theories, I am committed to a clean and healthy environment, to purifying our air, our water, and our soil; all of this for the sake of the people of this planet, including my three children, Anika, Tristan and Christian. I do this not because of some paranoid theory that humans are changing the climate of the world, but instead, I am very concerned about the health of the people of the world and, thus, committed to clean air, clean soil, and clean water.

Thus, we have, today, to take a look at the issues of global warming and pollution that confront our society because there are enormous implications to this whole discussion of what has been called ''man-made global warming.''

Only 18 months ago the refrain ''Case closed: Global warming is real,'' was repeated as if the mantra from some religious zealots. It was pounded into the public consciousness over the airwaves, in print, and even at congressional hearings, ''Case closed.'' Well, this was obviously a brazen attempt to end open discussion and to silence differing views by dismissing the need for seriously contrary arguments and seriously listening to both sides of an argument. And rather than hearing both sides of the argument, this was an attempt to dismiss arguments even though the person making the arguments might have a very impressive credential or might be a very educated scientist or someone else who should be listened to.

And yes, there are dozens, if not hundreds, of prominent scientists and meteorologists, the heads of science departments at major universities, and others, who are highly critical of the man-made global warming theory. There is Dr. Richard Lindzen of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He has been adamant in his opposition, as has a Bjarne Andresen of the University of Copenhagen, Adreas Prokoph, a professor of earth sciences at the University of Ottawa, Dr. William Gray, a famous hurricane expert and former President of the American Meteorological Association, and Dr. Kevin Trenberth, the head of the Climate Analysis Section at the National Center of Atmospheric Research. All of these are respected scholars, all skeptical of the unwarranted alarmism that we are being pressured to accept.

But their views and those of so many more prominent scholars and scientists don't matter. The debate is over. Al Gore has his Nobel Prize, and the film, ''An Inconvenient Truth,'' its Academy Award. So shut up and get your mind in lockstep with the politically correct prevailing wisdom, or at least what the media tells us is the prevailing wisdom. And no questions, please, the case is closed. We heard that dozens and dozens of times.

So what is this theory that now is so accepted that no more debate is needed or even tolerated? The man-made global warming theory may be presented as scientific truism, but it is not. It is a disturbing theory that the Earth began a warming cycle 150 years ago that differed greatly from all the other warming and cooling cycles in the Earth's past. This warming cycle of 150 years ago, we keep being told, is tied directly to mankind's use of fossil fuels, basically oil and coal, which, of course, oil and coal and these fuels, these so-called fossil fuels, have powered our industries and made modern civilization possible.

Fossil fuels, we are told, puts an ever-increasing so-called level of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, and

the most prevalent of these gases, of course, being carbon dioxide, CO_2. This increase in CO_2 causes the warming that we are supposedly experiencing today. This man-made warming cycle, according to the theory, is rapidly approaching a tipping point when the world's temperatures will abruptly jump and accelerate with dire and perhaps apocalyptic consequences for the entire planet.

For skeptics of this hypothesis, the consequence of accepting this theory, the consequences are far more dire than any of the consequences we're supposed to be suffering out of a predicted rise in temperature. And by the way, that rise in temperature, of course, isn't really happening, which we will discuss a little bit later.

If one accepts this as fact rather than theory, this idea that man-made global warming is overwhelming our planet, then one would be expected to also accept controls, regulations, taxation, international planning and enforcement, mandated lifestyle changes, lowering expectations, limiting consumer choice, as well as personal and family sacrifices that are all going to be necessary for us to save the planet from—well, from us.

It really takes a lot to frighten people into accepting such personally restrictive mandates that would result from implementing a global warming-based agenda. People's lives will change if we decide to implement a global warming-based agenda. Yes, people's lives will change, but not for the better if we have to end, for example, discount airline tickets and cheap travel.

Most people who listen to the global warming advocates don't understand that the global warming advocates believe that jet planes are some of the worst CO_2 polluters, and thus they have to be restricted, according to the theory. So how many people really do want to end the cheap airline tickets that can be had over the Internet?

Obviously one of the goals will be to severely restrict the use of private automobiles. Sure. Now, we know that. The fact that the automobile has been targeted for the last 20 years certainly suggests that automobiles are on the hit list. But don't worry, we may have to give up our automobiles, but the rich and the government officials will still have their private jets, their Suburbans, and even their limousines. But the rest of us, of course, will be relegated to public transportation. And we will have very limited travel rights unless we can, of course, afford the higher and higher prices.

Global warming predictions appear designed to strike fear into the heart of those malcontents who just won't willingly accept the mandates in their lifestyle changes that are needed in order to save the planet. These people, of course, won't accept things like higher food prices, which will come with an implementation of global warming mandates. And of course they certainly won't accept less meat in their diet. That's right, part of the manmade global warming theory and how we're going to solve this is to wean mankind away from meat.

A 2006 report entitled ''Livestock's Long Shadow'' to the United Nations mentions livestock emissions and grazing, and it places the blame for global warming squarely on the hind parts of cows. Livestock, the report claims, accounts for 18 percent of the gases that supposedly cause the global warming of our climate. Cows are greenhouse-emitting machines. Fuel for fertilizer and meat production and transportation, as well as clearing the fields for grazing, produce 9 percent of the global CO_2 emissions, according to the report. And also, cows produce ammonia, causing acid rain, of course.

Now, if that's not bad enough, all of these numbers are projected in this report to double by the year 2050. Well, not only are we then going to have to cut personal transportation, which will keep us at home, but when we stay at home, we can't even have a bbq. And heck, they won't even let us have a hamburger.

I would like to point out that before the introduction of cattle, millions upon millions of buffalo dominated the Great Plains of America. They were so thick you could not see where the herd started and where it ended. I can only assume that the anti-meat, manmade global warming crowd must believe that buffalo farts have more socially redeeming value than the same flatulence emitted by cattle. Yes, this is absurd, but the deeper one looks into this global warming juggernaut, the weirder this movement becomes and the more denial is evident.

Ten years ago, for example, the alarmists predicted that by now we would be clearly plagued by surging temperatures. In testimony before Congress 20 years ago, now, says James Hansen, a man who has repeatedly challenged people who simply want to make sure that his views are balanced off at NASA, but NASA's James Hansen 20 years ago predicted CO_2 would shoot up and global temperatures would shoot up by more than one-third of a degree Celsius during the 1990s.

So a rise in temperature was predicted, and it would lead to what? Rising sea levels. In the end, we'll have rising sea levels, perhaps even cities under water, droughts and famines, and of course an increase in tropical diseases. Yes, tropical diseases. Sometimes it's difficult for me to hear it when certain environmentalists use that as an example, considering the fact that tropical diseases, namely malaria, has killed millions of children in the Third World because the environmentalists have been successful in banning DDT. But that's another issue.

□ 2230

But the point is there are serious consequences, perhaps unintended consequences to following nonsensical extremism in the arena of the environment.

So were the predictions of global heating correct? Forget ''case closed.'' The question needs to be answered. Were all of these predictions correct? Mr. Hansen said it would rise by a third of a degree just a little over a decade ago. And the answer is that the predictions of a decade ago have turned out to be dramatically wrong. Temperatures during that decade rose only one-third of the jump predicted by Hansen, a modest 0.11, one-third of what he had predicted.

Furthermore, numerous and powerful hurricanes that were forecast by the National Hurricane Center, for example, at NOAA and others, well, by now we haven't seen such a trend, and by now we were led to believe there would be a drought and a melting of the ice caps would be clearly upon us. My beautiful Sierra Nevada Mountains in California were due to heat up, dry up, brown up, and burn, burn, burn. Yep, during the entire Clinton administration, we heard these predictions over and over again. During the Clinton administration, we saw scientists produce study after study predicting the horrific impact of the unstoppable onslaught of man-made global warming, which we were led to believe would be overwhelming us right now. Right now. Of course, if there was even a hint that the conclusion of their research wouldn't back up the theory of manmade global warming, these scientists wouldn't have seen one red cent from the Federal research pool during the Clinton administration.

In a September, 2005, article from Discovery Magazine, Dr. William Gray, now an emeritus professor of atmospheric science at Colorado State University and a former president of the American Meteorological Association, was asked if funding problems that he was experiencing and has been experiencing could be traced to his skepticism of man-made global warming. His response: ''I had NOAA money for 30 years, and then when the Clinton administration came in and Gore started directing some of the environmental stuff, I was cut off. I couldn't get any money from NOAA. They turned down 13 straight proposals from me.'' This man is one of the most prominent hurricane experts in the world, cut off during the Clinton-Gore administration because he had been skeptical of global warming.

In fact, Al Gore's first act as Vice President was to insist that William Harper be fired as the Chief Scientist at the Department of Energy. Now, why was that? Well, that's because William Harper had uttered words indicating that he was open minded to the issue of global warming. So off with his head. They didn't want someone who was open minded. They wanted someone who was going to provide grants based on people who would verify this man-made global warming theory. Now, that was 1993 when Mr. Harper

was relieved, the first year of the Clinton-Gore administration. So for over a decade, all we got was a drumbeat of one-sided research, setting the stage for the false claim that there is a scientific consensus about whether or not man-made global warming is real.

Unfortunately, for all those scientists who went along with the scheme, now, over a decade later, there is a big problem. Contrary to what all those scientists living on their Federal research grants predicted, the world hasn't been getting warmer. In fact, for the last 7 years, there has been no warming at all, which has been verified even by, for example, Michel Jarraud of the World Meteorological Organization. He's their Secretary General. He reluctantly admitted that global temperatures have not risen since 1998, according to a BBC article. Global snowfall is at record levels and there are fewer, not more, hurricanes.

Furthermore, there is some melting in the Arctic. We all know that there is some melting in the Arctic because we hear about it over and over again. In fact, NBC did some special on the melting of the Arctic and how bad it is and showed the pictures of penguins sitting on a diminishing piece of ice in the Arctic. Except there was a problem with that story. You see, penguins don't live in the Arctic; they live in the Antarctic. There are no penguins in the Arctic. So NBC had it wrong. Somebody must have told them that the penguins from the Arctic were being victimized by global warming. In fact, in the Antarctic, where the penguins are, there is a buildup of ice. It is getting cooler. And in the Arctic, of course, we do recognize there has been a warming in the Arctic, likely due to ocean currents that have changed in the last few years and not due to CO_2 that comes from somebody's SUV.

After hearing about the extinction of the polar bear, which has been drummed into our heads, we now hear that—and by the way, just today the polar bear was put on an endangered species list. But are the polar bears really disappearing? We now hear from Dr. Mitchell Taylor from the Department of the Environment under the Canadian territory of Nunavut and other experts, I might add, who suggest, yes, all but one or two species of the polar bears are flourishing. Yes, of the twenty-odd species, there are perhaps one or two that are suffering and not doing well, but all the rest of the species of polar bear are expanding. In fact, we don't have a situation with fewer polar bears; we've got more polar bears. Yet our government is putting the polar bear on an endangered species list, saying that if the ice cap melts, the polar bears will all be going away because their habitat has been destroyed.

Unfortunately, the debate on this case is not closed. So explaining emerging obvious differences between the reality and the theory needs to be addressed by the people who have been advocating global warming. The case is not closed. The gnomes of climate theory now have to come up with explanations for us of why it was predicted that the weather would be this way at this time and it is not. Why is it that basically we've had stable weather, if not a little cooler weather, for the last 8 years?

The first attempt to basically cover their tracks about this noticeable dichotomy in what they predicted and what was happening happened a few years ago, and it went very slowly but very cleverly. The words ''climate change'' have now replaced the words ''global warming.'' Get that? Every time you hear it now, half the time they are going to be using the words ''climate change'' where those very same people were so adamant about ''global warming'' only 4 or 5 years ago. So no matter what happens now, now that they've changed it to ''climate change'' rather than global warming, whatever happens to the weather pattern, whether it's hotter or cooler, it can be presented as further verification of human-caused change. If you just had ''human-caused warming,'' it would have to be at least warming for them to actually have any verification of what they were trying to say. But right now by using ''climate change,'' they can bolster their right to be taken seriously upon recommending policies, even though no matter what direction the climate goes, it is justified by how they are labeling themselves.

I'm sorry, fellows. Do you really think the world is filled with morons? When it comes to bait and switch, used car salesmen are paragons of virtue compared to this global warming crowd. Excuse me. It's not the ''global warming'' crowd now; it's the ''climate change'' crowd. Of course, they don't want any of us to own automobiles; so what the heck. They can act like used car salesmen because there will be more jobs for them as being advocates in the climate change arena.

We just need to ask ourselves, if a salesman gives a strong pitch and claims something that is later found to be wrong, totally wrong, when does one stop trusting that salesman? Then if he starts playing word games, changing the actual words that he's using about the same product rather than just admitting an error, isn't it reasonable to stop trusting him?

Yes, Al Gore and company, we have noticed that you are now saying ''climate change'' rather than ''global warming.'' I know that people tried to slip it in, but we have noticed, and there is something behind this that the American people should take note of. Why has that changed? Well, that's because the world has not been getting warmer in these last 7 years, as they predicted it would be.

So instead of word games, what these advocates need to explain is what is happening in the real world today and why it doesn't match what they said was going to happen based on their ''case closed, man-made global warming is real.'' They must realize that someone is bound to notice that last winter was unusually cold and that chilly weather seems to be the trend. It actually snowed in Denver just less than a month ago, and people have commented on the chilliness of the weather this year.

So now we see a beehive of activity going on. Those federally funded scientists are trying to save some modicum of credibility by adjusting their computers and coming up with some explanations that keep man-made global warming as a theory but explains away the current dichotomy between what they said would happen and what is actually happening. Of course, computer models were used to justify their hysteria and their hysteric warming predictions to begin with. So now the computer's information input is readjusted and we can see all these things coming out of it.

Well, there's a lot of questions that need to be answered and a lot of things that were told to us that obviously are not true and are not consistent with what's been going on and what we see happening around us today.

And why is this of such concern to us? Why are we concerned that global warming as a theory has been presented and that it's false, and why should we be so concerned that it's being accepted? What could be the negative results of just accepting it from some people who might be very sincere, very sincere and concerned about the planet?

Well, what happens in such cases as this is that we have situations that occur and people then actually come to the point where they are focused on aspects of what's going on in the world that will not make it better but instead have terrible consequences in and of themselves.

For example, a deadly cyclone just brought death and destruction to Burma, and it was a horrible thing. Burma is a country that is run by a vicious dictatorship, and after the cyclone went through Burma, the dictatorship wouldn't even permit our supplies to be given to those people of Burma. Well, Al Gore is so committed to this idea of global warming, which, of course, most people call ''climate change,'' that when commenting on Burma, instead of talking about the monstrous nature of the Burmese regime, instead he had to say, ''The trend toward more category five storms—the larger ones and the trend toward stronger and more destructive storms appears to be linked to global warming and specifically to the impact of global warming on higher ocean temperatures in the top couple of hundred feet of the ocean, which drives convection energy and moisture into these storms and makes them more powerful.''

What should Al Gore's reaction have been? Well, what it should have been was ''The Burmese regime is despicable. The Burmese people are suffering. They are dying by the hundreds

of thousands. It is despicable for this dictatorship not to permit our aid in.'' But instead that was ignored, and what Al Gore did focus on ''This is a chance for me to explain global warming,'' as the quote I just gave suggested.

□ 2245

Well, the Burmese cyclone hit Burma. If you take a look at what Al Gore's words were, he is trying to say that it is because of the warming of the water. I have in front of me, which I will submit as part of the RECORD, a satellite image of ocean temperatures taken by NOAA on May 5 which suggests the ocean in the area of the Burmese cyclone is one of the coldest water areas on Earth.

So what the heck is Mr. Gore talking about? What is all this mumbo jumbo? Again, he is warning about global warming because he is grasping at an attempt to try to verify in some way his predictions that have been all wrong for the last 5 years.

Dr. William Gray, for example, as I mentioned, the former chairman of the American Meteorological Association, a pre-eminent hurricane expert, has noted ''there is no reliable data available to indicate increased hurricane frequency or intensity in any of the globe's seven tropical cyclone basins.'' So hurricanes and cyclones are not a product of global warming. Dr. Gray, I think, has more credentials than Mr. Gore. But most convincingly, the most convincing part of this is that no matter what Al Gore says about the warming of this water, that is not what we are hearing from other sources.

I will now submit for the RECORD indications that actually the water temperature is not warming and is expected to cool, especially in the northern areas of the world.

So what is really important here is that we take a look and we see that the world is not warming and that those people who have been advocating this are grasping to try to find a way out of the fact that they are telling us that we need to adopt the policies that they want for our country, yet their predictions on the weather were wrong.

What is happening is, and the articles that I will submit for the RECORD show, is that some of the organizations that were predicting that we would be in global warming now are telling us that, yes, there will be global warming. We are not giving it up. But it is going to be 10 to 15 years from now and not in the last 10 years, as was predicted.

In fact, as I said, we actually have this article that suggests that the sea around Europe and North America will cool slightly during the next decade, and the Pacific will be about the same. And the article suggests that it will be a ''10-year time-out for global warming.'' This is based on studies that were conducted by organizations that only a few years ago were predicting that global warming would be so evident to us today. Well, they have to say something I guess.

To understand all of this nonsense, you have to go back and look at the basic assumptions that are being used by global warming alarmists. They believe that excessive amounts of manmade CO_2 are being deposited into the air which causes a greenhouse effect that warms the atmosphere. They call this the ''carbon footprint.'' That is what we are led to look for. We don't want to look in Burma for this vicious dictatorship causing the death of hundreds of thousands of people because of the repression. They won't even let our supplies in. We have to blame it on global warming causing a cyclone which hit Burma. No. I don't think so. But carbon footprinting is now what we should look at.

The global warming analysts want us to judge everything by its carbon footprint. What that means is how much CO_2 is being released because of that activity, because they believe it is CO_2 that causes the planet to warm.

This concept, just like these other extrapolations that we get from computers, is wrong. It is dead wrong. A rise in CO_2 comes after global temperature increases, not before. This has been observed in ice cores by prominent scientists, yet ignored by those screaming their warnings at us. That's right. Ice cores indicate that there have been periods, many periods, of warming and cooling in the history of the world. But the warming that has happened preceded the increase in the level of CO_2 in the world. That is why we have warming. That is why we can't say that if we control CO_2 that it is going to prevent the climate from warming.

Obviously, if the CO_2 increase comes as a result of the warming, by changing that, the warming is still going to be with us. Well, that is getting things to the core. And I don't mean a pun by that in terms of the ice core, but the fact is that this evidence is confirmed by ice cores.

So take note that the very argument upon which global warming is built has been proven to be false and that manmade global warming advocates will not address that issue. I have been in hearing after hearing. I have been involved with debates on this thing. When you tell them ''no,'' and you name several scientists, and I will be happy to do that for the RECORD, who are indicating that the CO_2 increases come after the warming of the planet, well, that issue just isn't addressed.

After all, the case is closed. We don't need to discuss any of those type of details. To cite one example of experts' findings on this, by the way, is Tom Scheffelin of the California Air Resources Board who stated on November 5, 2007, that ''CO_2 levels track temperature changes between 300 to 1,000 years after the temperature has changed. CO_2 has no direct role in global warming; rather, it responds to biological activity, which responds to climate changes.''

The fact is that the global warming community is jumping through hoops and bending over backwards struggling to find one little glint of new information to cover their arrogant attempt to stampede humankind into draconian policies and to cut off the debate and dismiss the debate without addressing the issues. The government-financed propaganda campaign to convince us that manmade global warming has been and continues to be a major threat, this propaganda is a cacophony of gibberish presented as a scientific explanation.

Go back and look at what Mr. Gore's words were about that cyclone. That same sort of putting together of pseudoscience wording in order to impress people is seen time and again. There are facts now evident, of course, that this can't be ignored. And Mr. Gore's mumbo jumbo notwithstanding, the predictions have been wrong. And the CO_2 premise is wrong. The methodology that has been used has been wrong. The observations have been wrong. And the attempt to shut up those people who disagree has been wrong.

I remember Al Gore labeling me a Stalinist because when I chaired the subcommittee on Research and Science Education, I insisted that both sides be presented. There was a study on research and the environment, a subcommittee of the Science Committee. And I insisted when I was chairman of the committee that expert witnesses on both sides be present at hearings and that they address each other's contentions. Well, to him, that is Stalinism. Well, I would suggest that the propaganda campaign of the manmade global warming alarmists has far more in common with Stalinism than does insisting that both sides of an argument be heard.

One has to really believe that he or she has a corner on the truth to make such a complaint as the one that he was making against me. He must feel really safe in saying that he knows the truth and that is in order to justify not having both sides of an argument presented at a hearing. Of course, Mr. Gore's documentary, ''An Inconvenient Truth'' by its own title suggests that it should be taken as the truth. And I won't go into the numerous debatable points and outright errors that are presented in the film. Something far worse has recently emerged concerning the fundamental veracity and truthfulness of Vice President Gore's film.

In the film, there are numerous film segments of climate and environmental incidents to add credibility to the alleged scientific points that were being documented in the film. However, what we see is not necessarily what we are getting. The audience is being given questionable information and questionable views because what they are seeing is not necessarily a documentary view but, instead it is a special effects creation in an attempt to convince the viewers that they are watching an actual occurrence of something.

Specifically, let me note that the film portrays a huge cracking and

breaking away of a large portion of the polar ice cap. I have not seen the film, but I am told the scene is awesome and somewhat overwhelming, leaving the audience feeling that they are witnessing a massive occurrence, and this massive occurrence, of course, Mr. Gore conveniently ties to human activity, the human activity he wants to regulate and of course the human activity that he will profit from if we have this carbon credit scheme instituted by the various governments of the world.

Unfortunately, that view of the breakaway of the ice there in the Arctic is a total fake. It is not National Geographic footage of a huge breaking away of a portion of the ice cap. It is not firsthand, grand photographic evidence of the ice breaking. Instead, what the audience is looking at is an example of special effects. It was not the ice cap that was being looked at. It was Styrofoam. That's right. Styrofoam.

And the real sin of all of this was not only the sin of presenting Styrofoam and trying to trick people into thinking they are watching something real, the ice breaking away, but that we haven't heard about it. I have only seen this in one or two publications. We haven't heard about it.

If such a trick and attempt to deceive was done by a conservative, I could tell you that that conservative would be tarred and feathered in the media. In fact, if there is anything wrong, I am sure that one or two points that I have in this speech are debatable, and I am sure that those will be looked at with a microscope. And if I am wrong, even a little bit, they will try to use that to just say ''don't listen to anything he says.'' But Mr. Gore can present the breaking away of Styrofoam and present it to us as if it is really happening. And he doesn't even apologize or comment on it when it is found out. Al Gore has no comment on this deception.

Maybe it is inconvenient for him to comment because, yes, it might hurt his credibility. And after all, the world is getting warmer in these last 7 years, which is just the opposite of what he predicted. And of course, maybe his predictions were based on a Styrofoam computer model. But we will go into that later.

Well, the first time I met President Gore was during my first term in Congress back in 1989 and 1990. Al Gore then was a United States Senator. And he marched into the Science Committee room followed by a platoon of cameras and reporters. He sat in front of the Science Committee, and he demanded that President Bush, that is George W.'s father, declare an ozone emergency. And he waved in his hand a report of evidence that an ozone hole was opening up over the Northeast United States.

A few days later, the report touted by the Senator was found to have been based on faulty data, data collected by one so-called researcher flying a single-engine Piper Cub with limited technology and not much expertise. Senator Gore was demanding emergency shutdowns of factories and manufacturing plants in the Northeast. It would have had dire consequences for the American economy and for those people who worked in those plants. But they be damned, because we are out to save the planet.

Now does anyone here see any type of a pattern here, the ozone hole that wasn't there and then we are going to have this drastic action in order to save the planet? The scare tactics, the Chicken Little-ism and all the rest of these types of things that are trying to create hysteria, this isn't a new tactic.

Let's look at some of the past examples of the nonsense being portrayed as science.

□ 2300

Cranberries, yes, cranberries, shield your children from Ocean Spray. That's right, the cranberry industry suffered a loss of nearly $20 million back in 1957 when it was determined that perhaps cranberries, there was something wrong with the cranberries. In fact, later on it was admitted to be just a mistake.

But the cranberry industry went to hell for 2 or 3 years. But if you are not growing cranberries, what do you care about cranberry farmers? No, you care about people. Many peoples' lives were destroyed because over a 2- or 3-year period, cranberries were basically labeled as something that they should not have been labeled, and it was a catastrophe for them, just like perhaps those people that worked in factories that would have been closed up had we taken that ozone scare seriously.

Then there was the scare over cyclamate. Cyclamate was used in everyday items like soda, jams, ice cream. It was a sweetening element, it's very low in calories, that industry, it was a very fine product and generated an enormous profit. In the early 1970s, the FDA banned cyclamates. I remember very well.

People spent billions of dollars building this industry. It was a great industry, but it was labeled as a cancer hazard after someone, some kind of a researcher, force-fed rats the equivalent of 350 cans of soda a day. By giving these rats the equivalent of 350 soda cans a day, 8 out of 240 got sick.

Well, even that was a faulty test, and eventually the truth prevailed and cyclamates were labeled okay, they were given an okay. That was after about 10 years. Canada, by the way, never banned cyclamates, but in order to protect us and save us, and it was a terrible situation, yes, the cyclamate industry never recovered.

The damage, however, was done. This episode has had serious consequences, because when the cyclamates were banned, that led to the introduction of what, high fructose corn syrup, so, yes, and with all of the obesity and problems that come with high fructose corn syrup. That first got its hold in the food business at a time when cyclamates were thought to be the answer, but they were banned.

So we have had examples of this over and over again, another American industry that was decimated by a rotten theory that had hazardous consequences for implementing.

The next example of fear mongering, of pseudoscience, happened in 1989. February 26, 1989, that evening thousands of Americans tuned into ''60 Minutes'' and heard Ed Bradley say the most potent cancer-causing agent in our food supply is a substance sprayed on apples to keep them on the trees longer and make them look better. That's the conclusion of a number of scientific experts. And who is at risk? Children who may someday develop cancer.

That one story, by the way, snowballed into a media blitz, a feeding frenzy, Meryl Streep testified before Congress, spouting off, again, pseudoscientific nonsense. Parents tossed apples out the window, schools removed applesauce from the cafeteria and, of course, replaced that with much safer nutritious substances like ice cream and pudding.

Of course, there was only one problem, the Alar didn't cause cancer, the apples definitely didn't and even the Alar didn't. The study was based on bad science, and 20,000 apple growers in the United States suffered major financial harm.

Okay, so by now such alarmism has become a political tool that scares people to try to get them to do things. That's what we are facing with global warming, excuse me, climate change.

The Three Mile Island incident is another example of this. You remember Three Mile Island, a near disaster in Pennsylvania which, basically, coupled with the movie ''The China Syndrome'' led to a total halt in the development of nuclear energy as a means for producing energy in the United States.

The Jane Fonda movie, ''The China Syndrome,'' coupled with a mishap at a nuclear power plant, that was, I might add, a mishap that no one suffered any health consequences, no one died, no one was hurt. Yet it was presented to the public as this catastrophe, and that led to a shutdown of the efforts of building any new nuclear power plants.

Ironically, of course, nuclear power is the most effective means of producing power with no carbon footprint. Again, it was a total con job on the nuclear energy industry.

What about the ozone hole over the Antarctic? We are told that it would grow and grow for decades, and it was totally out of control.

Well, Boyce Rensberger, Director of the Knight Fellowship of Massachusetts Institute of Technology says that ozone depletion is a cyclical event, expanding and contracting throughout the eons of history. Here is a scientist from MIT telling us that the current

ozone depression has been simply part of a reoccurring cycle, not as a result of the use of chlorofluorocarbons, meaning your aerosol cans.

So, what we have got is a situation where at a gigantic shift of expense, of shifting away from aerosol, we have basically accomplished nothing because the ozone hole opens and closes on its own. I might add, we know now, of course, there have been many cycles of warming and cooling, and is this a natural thing? Well, if you consider the sun being natural, yes.

Instead of saying that CO_2 that's coming out of the use of fossil fuels is causing our climate to change now, as compared to all the other times it changed in the past, maybe these people should look at the sun, and maybe there are natural cycles where you have sunspots and it causes warming and cooling on the Earth.

Could that be an explanation? Well, let's think about it. Otherwise, how do we explain the fact that on Jupiter and Mars we have cooling and warming cycles that seem to be matching some of the cycles here on Earth. Well, maybe there are some SUVs up there on Mars.

Well, the last example, one of the last examples, of course, that I have in my memory of people trying to be frightened into supporting policy with this kind of alarmism has been acid rain. The acid rain was supposed to decimate our forests, destroy our fresh water bodies and roads, our buildings and sidewalks, and, what happened? That was just an onslaught that was going on, I worked for Ronald Reagan at the time, he was just beaten without mercy for his unwillingness to take costly action aimed at thwarting acid rain. He insisted on waiting for an in-depth study to be completed.

While he waited, of course, he was vilified as if he doesn't care about the environment, he doesn't really care about whether or not our environment is being destroyed by acid rain which is being caused by us. Well, a 10-year study was going on, Reagan knew about it. He waited, as he well should have, and there was a study by the Nation Acid Precipitation Assessment Project and was submitted to Congress in the 1990s. It minimized the human impact on the acidity on the water and especially the rain in America's northeast. The issue died quickly after that report, and it just went away.

After all of the intense attacks on Ronald Reagan, once that report was in, it just sort of went away. Well, one reason it went away, maybe there was another alarmist scheme to go to.

Yes, there was, one was emerging about this time, and it was on the cover of Time Magazine 30 years ago. This was probably the most pitiful of all of these alarmist attempts. It was, three decades ago, the scientists were warning us about global cooling. We were told early that we were on the edge of another ice age.

Well, unfortunately, that one went away very quickly because the temperatures immediately didn't do what they said it was going to do, and the temperatures actually did not go down dramatically or freeze. It did get a little bit warmer during those days. It was one of those warming cycles, it went up for a few years and it went down.

It was getting warmer, so even as those predictions of frozen gloom and doom, they just changed the words, those same people were making the predictions of frozen gloom and doom now were sort of talking about global warming gloom and doom. You guessed it, so global cooling became global warming almost overnight. Now, after global warming, climate change comes almost overnight.

So the scare tactics are nothing new. It is tied to a tried-and-true method of how to try to manipulate people to accept things they wouldn't otherwise accept. Unfortunately, there are long-term negative consequences that will be very clear to our future generations. Of course, they are being lied to all the time.

I often asked students from my district, who are here visiting in Washington, whether they believe the air in southern California is better now or worse now than when I went to high school in southern California 40 years ago. A huge percentage, maybe 80 percent of these students, believe that the air quality of 40 years ago was dramatically better than today. Of course, that's not just a lie, that's a big lie.

This generation has every reason to be optimistic about the future, and they are being lied to, being told that they are poisoned, and things are getting worse and worse. In fact, man-made global warming is going to devastate the whole planet any way. No, these kids now, when I tell them that, no, when I went to high school, the air pollution in southern California was much worse than it is today, they are incredulous.

What is all this lying about? Why are all these children being lied to? Why are we all being lied to?

I remember as a college student, the first Earth Day—I am quoting someone here—''I remember as a college student at the first Earth Day being told that it was a certainty that by the year 2000, the world would be starving and out of energy,'' writes Dr. John Christy, a professor of atmospheric science at University of Alabama.

Dr. Christy goes on to say ''Similar pronouncements today about catastrophes due to human-induced climate change sound all too familiar and all too exaggerated to me as someone who actually produces and analyzes climate information.''

So, we are told that polar bears are dying, but they aren't. As we have known that we have all of these other predictions, we are told that the polar ice caps are melting, but now we know that the polar ice caps are melting yes, only in the Arctic, but in the Antarctic, ice is actually growing.

Hurricane Katrina, we were told would only be the first of many horrendous hurricanes to hit the United States in the next few years but, of course, no hurricane equal or close to has been on the horizon. In fact, a hurricane that was just as strong as Katrina hit the United States 100 years earlier, long before this effective ''global warming.'' So when you look at facts like this, an honest debate is long overdue but yet we see an attempt to shut down an honest debate.

I will submit an advertisement, the Hill newspaper from the Environmental Defense Action Fund, and it says ''What's next? The Bond-Voinovich Cigarettes Aren't Addictive Act?'' What they are saying, it's a cute way of saying, anybody who questions global warning, it is the equivalent of saying that cigarettes aren't addictive. Well, that's a great way to dismiss someone's arguments without addressing them. It says here, ''Some senators,'' this is in the add, ''are asking you to ignore . . . an international scientific consensus.''

Well, let's put it this way, we hear that, there is a consensus over and over again. There is no consensus. The world is not getting warmer, and I would submit a list of 400 members of the scientific community who do not agree with a man-made global warming theory and, I might add, I quoted numerous very prestigious members of the scientific community already in this speech. So what we have is alarmism at its worst, and the consequences will be very, very severe if we let these people get away with this.

Now, what we have done is we have, again, permitted people to make their case without having to defend their case. This is never more evident than in the dealings with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which is the United Nations panel.

I will submit several statements that indicate that the IPCC was wrong in its approach, in its entire methodology in trying to determine whether or not global warming, whether there is global warming and whether or not it is caused by man-made activity.

So with this said, we need to look and say, What is the negative impact of all of this lack of truthful information? What could possibly happen? If someone says well, aren't we all against pollution? So what if someone is making a claim that global warming exists and it is caused by humankind and in reality it is just the pollution that we are both trying to get it at. Well, that just doesn't work.

The fact is if we accept this theory of man-made global warming, we will be focusing our activities on trying to eliminate CO_2 rather than eliminate toxic substances from our air. If I am concerned about my children, my three triplets, Christian, Anika and Tristan, I am concerned about their health, that is something that I think I share with every parent. Their health is not in any way threatened by CO_2. CO_2 is

nontoxic. It is threatened by NO_X and other toxin materials that come out of engines in cars and other sources. So if we only focus on CO_2, we will end up focusing on the wrong target.

What we need to do is make sure that we develop clean energy sources, not because of global warming but because of the health of our children. And also, we need to be independent of foreign sources. The fact is that foreign sources of oil, because we are not developing our own oil resources as a result of the dynamics created by the global warming juggernaut that we have been experiencing, the fact is that we have not drilled for our own oil. We have not focused on real alternatives to energy like nuclear energy. The fact is that we need to make sure right now that we do our very best not to be captured by this, what I consider to be one of the greatest hoaxes that I have seen in my lifetime, but instead focus our efforts on accomplishing something that is real and positive for the people of the world and the people of the United States of America. We should be drilling for oil so that the terrorists overseas are denied the revenue when we are forced to buy oil from countries that are allied with these terrorists.

We need to make sure that we develop better engines, and make sure that those engines are not putting pollutants into the air and forget about the CO_2, go to the pollutants.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I will submit these articles for the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CUMMINGS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today until 1 p.m.

Ms. RICHARDSON (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for May 13, 2008.

Mrs. SCHMIDT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a family medical emergency.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today before 5:15 p.m. on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NEAL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. FOXX) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, May 21.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, May 21.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 15, 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:

6563. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement Vice Admiral Mark J. Edwards, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6564. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's notification of payment-in-kind compensation negotiated with Germany for the return of U.S.-funded improvements at 30 small sites, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2921(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6565. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a report to Congress on the use of Aviation Continuation Pay (ACP) for Fiscal Year 2007, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 301b(i); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6566. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 04-08 informing of an intent to sign the Memorandum of Understanding Between the Secretary of Defense on Behalf of the Department of Defense of the United States of America and the Department of National Defence of Canada Concerning Operation and Support of Advanced Extremely High Frequency Military Communications, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6567. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003 a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Burma declared by Executive Order 13047 of May 20, 1997, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6568. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6569. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 08–31 concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Australia for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6570. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting determination and memorandum of justification for suspending prohibitions on certain sales and leases, pursuant to Public Law 103-236, section 564; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6571. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6572. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6573. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6574. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6575. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6576. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6577. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6578. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6579. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6580. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the report on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act covering the six months ended June 30, 2007, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 621; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6581. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Justice Programs' Bureau of Justice Assistance for Fiscal Year 2006, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3712(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6582. A letter from the Chairman, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting a report of amendments to the sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary, together with the reasons for these amendments, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(o); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6583. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-8-55, DC-8F-54, and DC-8F-55 Airplanes; and Model DC-8-60, DC-8-70, DC-8-60F, and DC-8-70F Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0216; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-122-AD; Amendment 39-15435; AD 2008-06-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to

5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6584. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0346; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-202-AD; Amendment 39-15436; AD 2008-06-24] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6585. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200, A330-300, A340-200, and A340-200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0396; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-282-AD; Amendment 39-15438; AD 2008-06-26] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6586. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 Series Airplanes and Airbus Model A300-600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28944; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-239-AD; Amendment 39-15430; AD 2008-06-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6587. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10-10 and DC-10-10F Airplanes, Model DC-10-15 Airplanes, Model DC-10-30 and DC-10-30F (KC-10A and KDC-10) Airplanes, Model DC-10-40 and DC-10-40F Airplanes, Model MD-10-10F and MD-10-30F Airplanes, and Model MD-11 and MD-11F Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0201; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-163-AD; Amendment 39-15433; AD 2008-06-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6588. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 0070, 0100, 1000, 2000, 3000 and 4000 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-29030; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-284-AD; Amendment 39-15432; AD 2008-06-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6589. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Corporation, Ltd Model 750XL Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0034 Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-097-AD; Amendment 39-15428; AD 2008-06-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6590. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Goodrich Evacuation Systems Approved Under Technical Standard Orders (TSOs) TSO-C69, TSO-C69a, TS0-C69b, and TSO-C69c, Installed on Various Boeing, McDonnell Douglas, and Airbus Transport Category Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28370; Directorate Identifier 2003-NM-239-AD; Amendment 39-15349; AD 2008-06-27] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6591. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model EC130 B4 Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2007-28229; Directorate Identifier 2006-SW-23-AD; Amendment 39-15434; AD 2008-06-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6592. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0303; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-047-AD; Amendment 39-15441; AD 2008-06-29] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6593. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; APEX Aircraft Model CAP 10 B Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0057 Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-102-AD; Amendment 39-15445; AD 2008-07-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6594. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-200, -300, -300F, and -400ER Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0203; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-105-AD; Amendment 39-15384; AD 2008-04-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6595. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Wheatland, WY [Docket No. FAA-2007-28649; Airspace Docket No. 07-ANM-10] received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6596. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited Model DHC-6 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27192; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-008-AD; Amendment 39-15350; AD 2008-03-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6597. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. TFE731-2C, -3B, -3BR, -3C, -3CR, -3D, -3DR, -4R, -5AR, -5BR, -5R, -20R, -20AR, -20BR, -40, -40AR, -40R, and -60 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2007-27891; Directorate Identifier 2007-NE-14-AD; Amendment 39-15349; AD 2008-02-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6598. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135 Airplanes; and Model EMB-145, -145ER, -145MR, -145LR, -145XR, -145MP, and -145EP Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0051; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-001-AD; Amendment 39-15352; AD 2008-03-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6599. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS 355 F2 and AS 355 N Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2008-0043; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-31-AD; Amendment 39-15340; AD 2008-02-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6600. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Model 45 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25174; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-007-AD; Amendment 39-15328; AD 2008-01-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6601. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0183; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-146-AD; Amendment 39-15376; AD 2008-04-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6602. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757-200, -200PF, and -200CB Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0226; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-016-AD; Amendment 39-15404; AD 2008-05-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6603. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28382; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-179-AD; Amendment 39-15382; AD 2008-04-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6604. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF340A and SAAB 340B Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0333; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-236-AD; Amendment 39-15379; AD 2008-04-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6605. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 707 Airplanes and Model 720 and 720B Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0264; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-212-AD; Amendment 39-15378; AD 2008-04-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6606. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0335; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-292-AD; Amendment 39-15380; AD 2008-04-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6607. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Taylorcraft A, B, and F Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0286; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-086-AD; Amendment 39-15381; AD 2008-04-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6608. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 707 Airplanes, and Model 720 and 720B Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28381; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-164-AD; Amendment 39-15383; AD 2008-04-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6609. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B4-600, A300 B4-600R, A300 C4-600R, and A300 F4-600R Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0172; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-225-AD; Amendment 39-15353; AD 2008-03-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6610. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR Model ATR42 and ATR72 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0334; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-206-AD; Amendment 39-15385; AD 2008-04-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6611. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Falcon 2000, Falcon 2000EX, Mystere-Falcon 900, Falcon 900EX, Fan Jet Falcon, Mystere-Falcon 50, Mystere-Falcon 20, Mystere-Falcon 200, and Falcon 10 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28941; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-276-AD; Amendment 39-15386; AD 2008-04-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6612. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E5 Airspace; Eagle Pass, TX [Docket No. FAA-2008-027; Airspace Docket No. 08-ASW-3] received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6613. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Skowhegan, ME [Docket No. FAA-2007-0244; Airspace Docket No. 07-ANE-94] received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6614. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; State College, PA [Docket No. FAA-2007-29375; Airspace Docket No. 07-AEA-06] received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6615. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tappahannock, VA. [Docket No. FAA-2007-29264; Airspace Docket No. 07-AEA-04] received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6616. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to Class E Airspace; Du Bois, PA [Docket No. FAA-2005-22489; Airspace Docket No. 05-AEA-017] received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6617. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Muncy, PA [Docket No. FAA 2007-0023, Airspace Docket No. 07-AEA-08] received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6618. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Montrose, PA. [Docket No. FAA-2007-0165; Airspace Docket No. 07-AEA-11] received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6619. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Lewiston, ME [Docket No. FAA-2007-0245; Airspace Docket No. 07-ANE-95] received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6620. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Pottsville, PA. [Docket No. FAA-2005-22490; Airspace Docket No. 05-AEA-018] received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6621. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; St. Marys, PA. [Docket No. FAA-2005-22492; Airspace Docket No. 05-AEA-020] received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6622. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E5 Airspace; Black River Falls, WI [Docket No. FAA-2008-0024; Airspace Docket No. 08-AGL-4] received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6623. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Springfield, CO [Docket FAA No. FAA-2007-27430; Airspace Docket No. 07-ANM-4] received May 12, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1197. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2642) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–636). 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. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 6047. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to mandate early access by desperately ill patients to treatment use of new drugs under clinical investigation for a serious or immediately life-threatening disease condition for whom no comparable or satisfactory drug or other therapy is available; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 6048. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide for the protection of child custody arrangements for parents who are members of the Armed Forces deployed in support of a contingency operation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HODES, Mr. McNERNEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont):

H.R. 6049. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for energy production and conservation, to extend certain expiring provisions, to provide individual income tax relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 6050. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide mandatory imprisonment for life for persons raping young children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 6051. A bill to amend Public Law 110-196 to provide for a temporary extension of programs authorized by the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 beyond May 16, 2008; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. MICA, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 6052. A bill to promote increased public transportation use, to promote increased use of alternative fuels in providing public transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. FORTUÑO):

H.R. 6053. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to focus on price stability in establishing monetary policy to ensure the stable, long-term purchasing power of the currency, to repeal the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and 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 Mr. DELAHUNT:

H.R. 6054. A bill to establish a United States Human Rights Commission to monitor compliance by the United States with international human rights treaty obligations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. HARMAN:

H.R. 6055. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish requirements and issue a nationwide public safety broadband license, to establish a grant program to fund administrative and operational costs of the licensee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. CANNON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. McGOVERN):

H.R. 6056. A bill to authorize the Archivist of the United States to make grants to States for the preservation and dissemination of historical records; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 6057. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit preleasing, leasing, and related activities in the Beaufort and Chukchi Sea Planning Areas unless certain conditions are met; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 6058. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide Federal penalties for home invasions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 6059. A bill to clarify the use of Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grants for corrections and community corrections programs, to enhance the data made available by the National Adult and Juvenile Offender Reentry Resource Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut):

H.R. 6060. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to enable increased federal prosecution of identity theft crimes and to allow for restitution to victims of identity theft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COSTELLO (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BEAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. WELLER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. HARE, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 6061. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 219 East Main Street in West Frankfort, Illinois, as the ''Kenneth James Gray Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. KLEIN of Florida):

H.J. Res. 84. A joint resolution expressing the commitment of Congress to continue to make it a priority to fight anti-Semitism and to promote tolerance at home and abroad; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.J. Res. 85. A joint resolution expressing the disfavor of the Congress regarding the proposed agreement for cooperation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHADEGG:

H. Con. Res. 349. Concurrent resolution honoring past and current members of the Armed Forces of the United States and their families by encouraging every American to wear a red poppy on Memorial Day as a sign of admiration and thanks to those individuals who died to preserve freedom and democracy in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H. Con. Res. 350. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States, through the International Whaling Commission, should use all appropriate measures to end commercial whaling in all of its forms, including scientific and other special permit whaling, coastal whaling, and community-based whaling, and seek to strengthen the conservation and management measures to facilitate the conservation of whale species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. WEXLER):

H. Res. 1194. A resolution reaffirming the support of the House of Representatives for the legitimate, democratically-elected Government of Lebanon under Prime Minister Fouad Siniora; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DREIER, and Ms. FALLIN):

H. Res. 1195. A resolution expressing condolences and sympathy to the people of the People's Republic of China for the grave loss of life and vast destruction caused by the earthquake of May 12, 2008 in Sichuan Province; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PUTNAM:

H. Res. 1196. A resolution electing a Minority Member to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself and Mr. WEXLER):

H. Res. 1198. A resolution commending the people of the Montenegro on holding free and fair presidential elections on April 6, 2008, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's decision at the Bucharest Summit to invite Montenegro to enter into an Intensified Dialogue, and the reforms and progress undertaken by Montenegro since its declaration of independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. ROYCE):

H. Res. 1199. A resolution commending the Orange County Water District and its employees for their sound financial management and innovative groundwater management, water quality, water efficiency, and environmental programs, on its 75th anniversary; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SUTTON:

H. Res. 1200. A resolution honoring the dedication and outstanding work of military support groups across the country for their steadfast support of the members of our Armed Forces and their families; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 82: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 154: Mr. ROSS and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 303: Mr. CANTOR.

H.R. 368: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. MICA, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 522: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 981: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1069: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1185: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1589: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1647: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 1665: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1738: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 1881: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1888: Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 2021: Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 2032: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2472: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2493: Mrs. DRAKE and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 2506: Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 2717: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 2744: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2762: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2802: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 2818: Mr. NADLER and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 2991: Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 3089: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3186: Mr. SOUDER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3187: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3202: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 3232: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. WATERS, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3245: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3282: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 3622: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3681: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 3700: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 3800: Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 3817: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 3819: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 3961: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4059: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4199: Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 4218: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 4221: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 4304: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H.R. 4318: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 4335: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 4461: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 4544: Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 4789: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HODES, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 4836: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 4900: Mr. HILL, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BERRY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 4926: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BARROW, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 5134: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 5268: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 5426: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 5444: Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 5450: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.

H.R. 5454: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 5515: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 5534: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5580: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 5606: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 5629: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 5632: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 5674: Mr. WU and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 5684: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 5686: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 5700: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 5705: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5731: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 5740: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 5775: Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 5784: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 5804: Mr. BACA and Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 5838: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 5846: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 5857: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 5869: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 5873: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 5898: Mr. Fortuño.
H.R. 5902: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5906: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 5908: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 5924: Mr. PUTNAM and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 5941: Mr. KAGEN.
H.R. 5944: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 5950: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 5958: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 5960: Mr. SPACE.
H.R. 5965: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5971: Mr. TERRY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 5978: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 5984: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. HELLER.
H.R. 5995: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
H.R. 5998: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 6009: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 6026: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 6029: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. HARE.
H.J. Res. 79: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. STARK.
H. Con. Res. 134: Mr. CLYBURN.
H. Con. Res. 216: Mr. LUCAS and Mr. WALBERG.
H. Con. Res. 244: Mr. FORTUÑO and Ms. BERKLEY.
H. Con. Res. 296: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mr. KINGSTON.
H. Con. Res. 299: Mr. GORDON.
H. Con. Res. 305: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H. Con. Res. 332: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Con. Res. 334: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H. Con. Res. 336: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. HELLER.
H. Con. Res. 341: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. REHBERG, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KELLER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. COSTA.
H. Res. 111: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H. Res. 389: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H. Res. 896: Mr. BARROW, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. WEINER.
H. Res. 937: Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 977: Mr. ALLEN.
H. Res. 1010: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H. Res. 1019: Mr. CARSON.
H. Res. 1022: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. GRANGER.
H. Res. 1028: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H. Res. 1078: Mr. PAYNE.
H. Res. 1110: Mr. BUYER.
H. Res. 1122: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H. Res. 1137: Mr. RAHALL.
H. Res. 1144: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H. Res. 1177: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. KAGEN.
H. Res. 1179: Mr. WELLER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H. Res. 1185: Mr. STARK, Mr. WELLER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. COOPER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. FATTAH.
H. Res. 1191: Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. WATT, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HARE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. SPACE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HILL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. PALLONE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Earmark Disclosure Statement for the House amendments to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642—the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2008. Neither the House amendments nor the explanatory statement contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. However, the following tables are submitted disclosing those earmarks included at the request of the administration:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

[Dollars in thousands]

Project name	Location	Amount	Request by
Child Development Center	AK: FortWainwright	17,000	Administration
Child Development Center	CA: Fort Irwin	11,800	Administration
11th Marine Regiment HQ, Amory, BEQ	CA: Camp Pendleton	34,970	Administration
5th Marine Regiment Addition, San Mateo	CA: Camp Pendleton	10,890	Administration
Armory Intelligence Battalion, 16 Area	CA: Camp Pendleton	4,180	Administration
Armory, Regiment & Battalion HQ, 53 Area	CA: Camp Pendleton	5,160	Administration
BEQ & Mess Hall HQ (13) Area	CA: Camp Pendleton	24,390	Administration
EOD Operation Facility	CA: Camp Pendleton	13,090	Administration
ISR Camp—Intelligence Battalion	CA: Camp Pendleton	1,114	Administration
JIEDDO Battle Courses	CA: Camp Pendleton	9,270	Administration
Military Police Company Facilities	CA: Camp Pendleton	8,240	Administration
Public-Private Venture, Phase 6B	CA: Camp Pendleton	10,692	Administration
Public-Private Venture, Phase 2A	CA: Twentynine Palms	1,074	Administration
Regimental Combat Team HQ Facility	CA: Twentynine Palms	4,440	Administration
JIEDDO Battle Courses	CA China Lake NAWS	7,210	Administration
JIEDDO Battle Courses	CA: Point Mugu	7.250	Administration
Child Development Center	CA: San Diego	17,930	Administration
Recruit Barracks	CA: San Diego MCRD	43,200	(1)
JIEDDO Battle Courses	CA: Twentynine Palms	11,250	Administration
Child Development Center	CA: Beale AFB	17,600	Administration
Child Development Center	CO: Fort Carson	8,400	Administration
Soldier Family Assistance Center	CO: Fort Carson	8,100	Administration
JIEDDO Battle Courses	FL: Whiting Field NAS	780	Administration
Child Development Center	FL: Eglin AFB	11,000	Administration
Classrooms & Battalion Dining Facilities	GA: Fort Benning	30,500	(1)
AIT Complex I, Phase I	GA: Fort Gordon	32,000	(1)
Child Development Center	GA: Fort Gordon	7,800	Administration
Soldier Family assistance Center	GA: Fort Stewart	6,000	Administration
Hospital Repalcement	GA: Fort Benning	350,000	(1)
Child Development Center	HI: Schofield Barracks	12,500	Administration
Transitioning Warrior Support Complex	KS: Fort Riley	50,000	Administration
Hospital Replacement	KS: Fort Riley	404,000	(1)
Child Development Center	KY: Fort Campbell	9,900	Administration
Soldier Family Assistance Center	KY: Fort Campbell	7,400	Administration
Child Development Center	KY: Fort Knox	7,400	Administration
Soldier Family Assistance Center	LA: Fort Polk	4,900	Administration
Starbase Complex 6, Phase 1	MO: Fort Leonard Wood	50,000	(1)
JIEDDO Battle Courses	MS: Gulfport NCBC	6,570	Administration
Child Development Center	NC: Camp Lejeune	16,000	Administration
JIEDDO Battle Courses	NC: Camp Lejeune	11,980	Administration
Maintenance/Operations Complex 2/9	NC: Camp Lejeune	43,340	Administration
Child Development Center	NC: Fort Bragg	8,500	Administration
Hospital Addition/Alteration	NC: Camp Lejuene	122,000	(1)
JIEDDO Battle Courses	NJ: McGuire AFB	6,200	Administration
Child Development Center	NM: Cannon AFB	8,000	Administration
Warrior in Transition Facilities	NY: Fort Drum	38,000	Administration
Child Development Center	OK: Fort Sill	9,000	Administration
Student Barracks	SC: Fort Jackson	27,000	(1)
Recruit Barracks	SC: Parris Island MCRD	19,900	(1)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

Project name	Location	Amount	Request by
Child Development Center	TX: Fort Bliss	5,700	Administration
Child Development Center	TX: Fort Bliss	5,900	Administration
Child Development Center	TX: Fort Bliss	5,700	Administration
Child Development Center	TX: Fort Hood	7,200	Administration
Warrior in Transition Unit Ops Facilities	TX: Fort Hood	9,100	Administration
AIT Barracks	TX: Fort Sam Houston	47,000	(1)
Child Development Center	TX: Fort Sam Houston	7,000	Administration
Burn Rehabilitation Center	TX: Fort Sam Houston	21,000	Administration
JIEDDO Battle Courses	VA: Yorktown NWS	8,070	Administration
AIT Complex 1, Phase 1	VA: Fort Eustis	50,000	(1)
Child Development Center	VA: Fort Lee	7,400	Administration
Administrative Building	Afghanistan: Bagram AB	13,800	Administration
Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	Afghanistan: Bagram AB	5,100	Administration
Ammunition Supply Point	Afghanistan: Bagram AB	62,000	Administration
Bulk Fuel Storage and Supply, Phase 3	Afghanistan: Bagram AB	23,000	Administration
Bulk Fuel Storage and Supply, Phase 4	Afghanistan: Bagram AB	21,000	Administration
New Roads	Afghanistan: Bagram AB	27,000	Administration
Power Plant	Afghanistan: Bagram AB	41,000	Administration
East Side Helo Ramp	Afghanistan: Bagram AB	44,400	Administration
ISR Ramp	Afghanistan: Bagram AB	26,300	Administration
Parallel Taxiway Phase 2	Afghanistan: Bagram AB	21,400	Administration
Strategic Ramp	Afghanistan: Bagram AB	43,000	Administration
Rotary Wing Parking	Afghanistan: Ghazni	5,000	Administration
Consolidated Compound	Afghanistan: Kabul	36,000	Administration
Counter IED Road—Route Alaska	Afghanistan: Various Locations	16,500	Administration
Counter IED Road—Route Connecticut	Afghanistan: Various Locations	54,000	Administration
Hot Cargo Ramp	Iraq: Al Asad AB	18,500	Administration
Landfill	Iraq: Al Asad AB	3,100	Administration
South Airfield Apron (India Ramp)	Iraq: Al Asad AB	28,000	Administration
Water Supply, Treatment & Storage Ph III	Iraq: Baghdad IAP	13,000	Administration
Convoy Support Center Relocation, Phase II	Iraq: Camp Adder	39,000	Administration
Multi-Class Storage Warehouse	Iraq: Camp Adder	17,000	Administration
POL Storage Area	Iraq: Camp Adder	10,000	Administration
Wastewater Treatment & Collection System	Iraq: Camp Adder	9,800	Administration
Hazardous Waste Incinerator	Iraq: Camp Anaconda	4,300	Administration
Landfill	Iraq: Camp Anaconda	6,200	Administration
Fighter Ramp	Iraq: Balad AB	11,000	Administration
Foxtrot Taxiway	Iraq: Balad AB	12,700	Administration
Helicopter Maintenance Facilities	Iraq: Balad AB	34,600	Administration
Juvenile TIFRIC	Iraq: Camp Constitution	11,700	Administration
Landfill	Iraq: Camp Marez	880	Administration
Landfill	Iraq: Camp Ramadi	880	Administration
Aviation Navigation Facilities	Iraq: Camp Speicher	13,400	Administration
Landfill	Iraq: Camp Speicher	5,900	Administration
Military Control Point	Iraq: Camp Speicher	5,800	Administration
Rotary Wing Parking Apron	Iraq: Camp Speicher	49,000	Administration
Landfill	Iraq: Camp Taqqadum	880	Administration
Landfill	Iraq: Camp Warrior	880	Administration
Landfill	Iraq: Fallujah	880	Administration
North Entry Control Point	Iraq: Qayyarah West	11,400	Administration
Perimeter Security Upgrade	Iraq: Qayyarah West	14.600	Administration
Entry Control Point	Iraq: Scania	5,000	Administration
Water Storage Tanks	Iraq: Scania	9,200	Administration
Landfill	Iraq: Victory Base	6,200	Administration
Level 3 Hospital	Iraq: Victory Base	13,400	Administration
Wastewater Treatment & Collection System	Iraq: Victory Base	9,800	Administration
Water Treatment & Storage Phase II	Iraq: Victory Base	18,000	Administration
Facilities Replacement	Iraq: Various Locations	72,0000	Administration
Overhead Cover-eGlass	Iraq: Various Locations	135,000	Administration
CJTF–HOA HQ Facility	Djibouti: Camp Lemonier	29,710	Administration
Dining Facility	Djibouti: Camp Lemonier	20,780	Administration
Fuel Farm	Djibouti: Camp Lemonier	4,000	Administration
Full Length Taxiway	Djibouti: Camp Lemonier	15,490	Administration
Network Infrastructure Expansion	Djibouti: Camp Lemonier	6,270	Administration
Water Production	Djibouti: Camp Lemonier	19,140	Administration
Western Taxiway	Djibouti: Camp Lemonier	2,900	Administration
Communication Center	Kuwait: Camp Arifjan	30,000	Administration
Strategic Ramp	Kyrgyzstan: Manas AB	30,300	Administration
Expeditionary Beddown Site	Oman: Masirah AB	6,300	Administration
Facility Replacements	Qatar: Al Udeid AB	40,000	Administration
Northwest (CAS) Ramp	Qatar: Al Udeid AB	60,400	Administration
Logistics Storage Warehouse	Qatar: Al Udeid AB	6,600	Administration

[1] The Committee learned through hearings, site visits, and Departmental briefings that trainee and recruit facilities and medical treatment facilities are two high priority areas in dire need of additional funds. The projects included were identified by the Department as high priority projects and were not included at the request of Members of Congress.

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

[Dollars in thousands]

Project name	State	Amount	Request by
Repair and restore authorized protection and floodwalls.	LA	393,000	Administration
Complete authorized protection.	LA	359,000	Administration
Plaquemines Parish-non-Federal levees.	LA	456,000	Administration
Outfall Canals—pumps and closures.	LA	704,000	Administration
Inner Harbor Navigation Canal protection.	LA	53,000	Administration
Armoring	LA	459,000	Administration

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

Project name	State	Amount	Request by
Reinforce and replace floodwalls.	LA	412,000	Administration
Storm-proof pumping stations.	LA	90,000	Administration
Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (100-year protection).	LA	1,077,000	Administration
Westbank and Vicinity (100-year protection).	LA	920,000	Administration
Southeast Louisiana (interior drainage).	LA	838,000	Administration

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5534: Mr. ALEXANDER.