The House met at 10 a.m.
The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, our Stronghold and Provident Protector, on this May 15, designated as Peace Officers Memorial Day, we turn to You with great gratitude and heartfelt petition. Today, we pay tribute to all the men and women who serve in law enforcement across this Nation. We thank You for calling them into public service and ask You to be close to them always.

In a special way we commend to You, Lord, our Capitol Police. Each day, with courtesy and professional care, they guide and protect all who work here on Capitol Hill with all our guests and visitors. Willing to stand between us and all that could harm us, they serve with dignity and excellence.

Bless them, Lord, their families and friends. Answer their prayers and reward them for their selfless efforts on behalf of others. They are the shield and barrier in the fence between the law and the lawless, between good and evil.

Peace officers are the last strand of defense in our communities; they stand in our neighborhoods and rural communities protecting America. We pay tribute to those who wear the badge and those who gave their life so that others could live.

We successfully voted to ease the strain of rising food prices and to make a substantial commitment to land conservation and to our farmers. I want to give special recognition to Chairman COLLIN PETERSON for his leadership and for his visit to Missouri to hold an agricultural forum where we have over 100,000 farms, the second most of any State in the country.

Since first being elected, I have been working with local schools and parents to implement a Healthy Kids Initiative. I am proud that this farm bill helps schools provide healthy snacks to students, with over $1 billion for more nutritious, locally grown fresh fruits and vegetables.

And for the first time, fruit and vegetable producers, including the wine producers of Ste. Genevieve, Missouri, will benefit from more than $1.3 billion for new programs that support research, pest management, and trade promotion.

To make the transition from homegrown biofuels from the Midwest and away from dependence on fossil fuels from the Middle East, the bill creates new tax credits to promote the production of cellulosic biofuels.

Thank you, Chairman PETERSON, and all those who supported this new direction for American agriculture.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE
A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6022. An act to suspend the acquisition of petroleum for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and for other purposes.


ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minutes on each side.

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Speaker, yesterday this House passed a bipartisan, veto-proof farm bill strengthening American agriculture.

We successfully voted to ease the strain of rising food prices and to make a substantial commitment to land conservation and to our farmers. I want to give special recognition to Chairman COLLIN PETERSON for his leadership and for his visit to Missouri to hold an agricultural forum where we have over 100,000 farms, the second most of any State in the country.

Since first being elected, I have been working with local schools and parents to implement a Healthy Kids Initiative. I am proud that this farm bill helps schools provide healthy snacks to students, with over $1 billion for more nutritious, locally grown fresh fruits and vegetables.

And for the first time, fruit and vegetable producers, including the wine
And that’s just the way it is.

Asian Pacific Islander American Heritage Month

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

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, today I rise as a member of the Congressional Asian Pacific Islander American Caucus to pay tribute to the millions of Americans of Asian and Pacific heritage for their valuable contributions to our great country.

The district I represent has benefited from the economic and social contributions from the Asian and Pacific Islander Americans. That includes the Cities of Monterey Park, known as Little Taipei, Rosemead and West Covina, as well as other neighboring communities in San Gabriel Valley. In my district, there are approximately 120,000 API residents.

For example, according to the Chamber of Commerce, Chinese Americans own at least two-thirds of Monterey Park’s more than 5,000 businesses.

Many of the constituents I represent came to America in the hopes of providing for their loved ones and plan to reunite with their families.

This month comes at a tough time, especially for many of those of Asian descent, particularly those that were affected by the recent earthquake in China. My sympathies go to their families.

I look forward to continuing to work with the API community and others to bridge the gap to provide better services to all our residents and grow our economy.

COUNTY PAYMENTS: CROOK COUNTY, OREGON

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, by refusing to renew the Federal county payments program, Congress has broken the bond with rural areas all across this country. Counties such as Crook County in Oregon have been affected.

Congress’ inaction means that county’s road department’s been whacked. It’s half what it was 10 years ago. Road improvements needed for the future are being shelved. Maintenance projects are being put on hold.

Crook County Judge Scott Cooper said: “Congress just passed a new farm bill to help get products from farm to market, but without county payments, the products won’t have roads or bridges to go over.”

H.R. 3058 would help solve this. It’s a bipartisan, 4-year authorization for county payments; yet the leadership of this House has held it hostage on the Union Calendar since January 15. That’s 121 days that the Democratic leadership has prevented the House from voting to reauthorize the county payments program.

It’s time to restore the Federal Government’s century-old commitment to rural timbered communities, where Federal lands make up the bulk of the area.

I call on the Democratic leadership once again, free H.R. 3058 for a vote, and keep the roads and schools open in rural America.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BISHOP LEWIS DOLPHIN STALLWORTH, SR.

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Bishop Lewis Dolphin Stallworth, Senior, who passed away after a courageous battle with kidney disease.

Bishop Stallworth was a leader in the community, his influence extending far beyond the church that he founded in 1963. Bishop Stallworth volunteered as a police chaplain, hosted a weekly radio program, and frequently participated in local community functions. He also used his church as a place of learning, opening a school, originally located in the church basement, to educate young people.

He even organized a group of young men known as Stallworth’s Soldiers, counseling them to get an education, stay out of trouble, and become model members of the community.

As evidence of Bishop Stallworth’s enduring character and unparalleled passion, his love for his family, church and community, less than 5 weeks after his death, hundreds have already petitioned the school district to consider naming a school after him.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the memory of Bishop Lewis Dolphin Stallworth, Senior.

CONGRATULATIONS GREATER LATROBE ICE CATS

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

Mr. TIM MURPHY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Greater Latrobe Ice Cats who were crowned Pennsylvania Ice Hockey State Champions on Saturday, March 29.

This is the first championship won by the Ice Cats in their 28-year history and only the second time in school history that a team has won a state championship.

The Ice Cats defeated the Conestoga Pioneers at Memorial Arena in Johnstown.

Head Coach Ron Makoski, who led the team to victory, reminded the players that, win or lose, playing in a State championship would be something that each of the players would remember for the rest of their lives. I have no doubt that each of these players will remember this experience with great pride.

So congratulations to the Ice Cats, the players, the coaches and parents for capturing the Pennsylvania Cup Class AA Championship.

I know the school and community join me in best wishes to the team for their tremendous victory and distinguished season.

LIHEAP FUNDING

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of fully funding the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, known as LIHEAP. With energy prices at record levels, it is critical that Congress provides adequate LIHEAP funding to protect low-income seniors and families from the bitter cold in the winter and the extreme heat in the summer.

Because of rising energy prices and limited LIHEAP funding, 62,000 Pennsylvania households that were supposed to receive funding this year did not. Many of the families across the country who were not able to obtain LIHEAP funds will be forced to decide between paying their energy bill or purchasing other necessities like food or medicine. This is a decision that no hardworking family should have to make.

Madam Speaker, LIHEAP provides millions of low-income Americans with some relief from ever rising energy prices, but there are millions more that could use the help. I urge all of my colleagues to fully support funding for LIHEAP.

A SUPPLEMENTAL FOR THE TROOPS

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

Mr. WILSON. Madam Speaker, today the House of Representatives will debate an emergency supplemental spending bill meant to provide needed resources to our military. It should only provide money for the brave men and women fighting terrorists in Iraq and Afghanistan to protect American families at home. It is, therefore, disappointing that the supplemental bill crafted by the Democratic leadership contains billions of dollars in nonemergency spending.

While there may be components of the bill that should be debated, this is not the time and certainly not the bill to be having those debates while our
troops are desperately in need of additional funding.

Defense Secretary Robert Gates and our military leadership have told Congress that the money is vital to ensuring our troops have the resources they require to defeat terrorists overseas. Including billions of dollars in unrequested spending is a dangerous impediment. I hope my colleagues will instead support the clean supplemental bill introduced by Representative Jerry Lewis of California.

In good faith, our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th.

NATIONAL AMERICORPS WEEK

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, as a cosponsor of House Resolution 1173, I rise today to recognize National AmeriCorps Week.

Last night, the House passed this resolution overwhelmingly. Since 1994, nearly 500,000 AmeriCorps have served with thousands of nonprofits, public agencies, and faith-based organizations across America.

Through AmeriCorps, these individuals dedicate their time and energy in a variety of areas to help meet the needs of local communities. In my home State of California alone, more than 7,000 people this year will participate in one of more than 7,500 AmeriCorps programs throughout the State. One such program is coordinated by the Santa Barbara County Education Office in my district. This program provides daily tutoring and reading for over 700 at-risk students, recruits volunteers for additional educational programs, and works to increase disaster preparedness in the schools in the county.

The 62.4 million hours served by AmeriCorps members have bettered the communities and touched the lives of countless Americans. This is the U.S.A. at its best. To all these incredible AmeriCorps members, I commend you and thank you for your service.

PABLO BACHELET

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate my good friend, Pablo Bachellet, the Latin American correspondent in Washington for my hometown newspaper, the Miami Herald. Pablo is leaving the paper to join the Inter-American Bank for Development.

Pablo, the father of two, is a sophisticated and keen observer of the history and politics of Latin America, writing incisively about democracy, diplomacy and security issues, and exploring the rich and sometimes complicated relationships that America has with the people of this dynamic region.

Pablo has traveled extensively in Latin America, writing about everything from hurricane devastation in Grenada and the struggles against drug violence and grief caused by the disco fire in Buenos Aires and U.S. policy toward Mexico or Cuba or Colombia or Venezuela.

Throughout his career, Pablo has always displayed a masterful command of the issues to keep us, the Herald’s loyal readers, informed about a region so important to our interests. Pablo’s extensive experience and knowledge will serve all of us who care deeply about the economic and social progress in Latin America.

My words are not ones of farewell, but ones of welcome for a new beginning and an upward march of a great talent and a warm and thoughtful human being.

Felicidades, Pablo.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1197 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 1197
Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker’s table 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, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider the same in the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. During consideration of the motion to come to the House of Representatives in the Senate amendment with each of the three amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, the Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except that the Chair shall divide the question among each of the three House amendments. The rule makes in order a motion by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to dispense with the usual requirement of a three-fifths vote if the House concurs in the Senate amendment with each of the three amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except that the Chair shall divide the question among each of the three House amendments.

SEC. 3. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the daily issue of the Congressional Record dated May 15, 2008, such material as he may deem explanatory of the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TSAUCHER). The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of this rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consider expedient to ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1197.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, H. Res. 1197 provides for the consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2008.

The rule makes in order a motion by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to concur in the Senate amendment with the House amendments. The rule provides 2 hours of debate on the motion controlled by the Committee on Appropriations. The rule provides for a division of the question on the adoption of the three House amendments listed in the Rules Committee report. The rule provides that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated May 15, 2008, such material as he may deem explanatory of the motion.

Madam Speaker, with a deep appreciation for the importance of the legislation before us today, the Rules Committee has reported out a rule that allows for a full, thorough debate on three amendments critical to the future of our Nation. This process will give each Member ample opportunity to vote their conscience on whether to fund the war or not, place conditions on our Iraq policy or not, or choose to support veterans over millionaires.

The legislation we are about to take up was forged with the idea of consensus. It meets the spending requirements made by President Bush, including the $5.8 billion that he asked for to strengthen the levees in New Orleans. In addition, it does not include a single earmark, except those explicitly requested by Mr. Bush’s administration.

On the other hand, the legislation is not a blank check because it is important to remember why we are really here today. This is the sixth year of the war in Iraq. More than 4,000 United States service men and women, 28 from my district alone, are dead. Tens of thousands have been wounded and physically disabled, and far too many suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder and a host of other mental health issues. What’s more, the civilian death total is devastating. Millions, not thousands, of Iraqi men, women and children are dead. Millions more have been forced into camps or other countries that will accept them.

At a time of economic emergency, when the American family is under siege, the war continues to be waged at
a staggering cost to the American taxpayer and at the expense of our economic security.

A few weeks ago, the New York Times reported on the Bush administration’s practice of paying off supposedly independent military analysts to shape the truth about what was really happening in Iraq. This administration was so concerned that Americans would find out the truth that they paid former U.S. military personnel to read from prescreened, whitewashed Pentagon briefing points about what was actually happening in their name.

This may be the greatest foreign policy disaster in American history, and the American people overwhelmingly are calling for it to end. They have seen that this insurgency is far from being a victory. They have seen the reports of desperate searches for armored vehicles. And we have all seen the reports of desperate searches for inadequate body armor and protective gear for our children.

They were told, “Trust us. We will make sure that your sons and daughters have the equipment that will protect the rebuilding of a foreign nation while their country’s own economy and infrastructure are falling apart.” They were told, “Trust us. We will make sure that your sons and daughters have the equipment that will protect the rebuilding of a foreign nation while their country’s own economy and infrastructure are falling apart.” They were told, “Trust us. We will make sure that your sons and daughters have the equipment that will protect them.”

And I would add that this provision is fully paid for by asking the wealthiest, those who have lost more than 16 percent in 2004, they have saved around $126,000 since that time, we are asking them to give us $500 to help fund the GI Bill of Rights.

At no time ever before in the history of this country have we been burdened with massive tax cuts for the wealthy during a time of war. Obviously this has been a new idea of this administration. These actions of fiscal incompetency by the Bush administration left this country struggling, and American families are paying the price. And no families are paying it more than the families of the men and women who are fighting this war. No sacrifice has been asked from any of the rest of us.

Rising levels of sustained joblessness require us to extend unemployment benefits to those workers who understandably cannot find a job. This bill does just that.

And, as we have all seen, up until this point, the American people have been unfairly asked to shoulder the full weight of the reconstruction effort in Iraq. The underlying legislation requires that U.S. reconstruction aid be matched dollar for dollar by the Iraqi Government, removing some of the pressure from families already struggling to make ends meet.

Furthermore, it prohibits the establishment of permanent bases in Iraq, blocking this administration from saddling the American people with a costly occupation long after the Army is gone.

Our fellow citizens have been sent to fight a conflict and a war far away from home, and we owe them not only our support and our deep thanks, and not only with words, but with the deeds that we commit to in this Congress. This bill is about who we are as a society and the values that we hold.

I am proud to support this rule and the underlying legislation, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
more widely understood as an example. Even before the advent of the television show Law & Order, most of us were familiar with the basics of our criminal justice system. We’re all familiar with our basic rights enshrined in the Constitution. We’re all familiar with our basic rights. We’re all protected from self-incrimination and unlawful searches and seizures. We must be read our Miranda rights when placed under arrest. These basic rights are fundamental, Madam Speaker, accorded to American democracy. We know that there can be no justice without a fair process, and we know that the protection of the rights of the individual is more important than the outcome of any one particular case.

The Bill of Rights and the laws that have been enacted to uphold it aren’t just a cryptic system of rules and regulations. They guarantee, Madam Speaker, they guarantee our civil rights and they guard against tyranny. Without the protection those rights are abridged. Process matters, Madam Speaker. Process matters because process is democracy.

The rules of the House were established for the very same reason. They ensure that the American people, through their elected representatives, have a say in the crafting of laws that govern them. The rules guard against abuses of power, and they ensure that the legislative process is transparent and fair. Thwarting due process is not just arcane political maneuvering around obscure, complicated rules that no one should care about. It subverts the principles of representative democracy. Let me say again, Madam Speaker, the rule that we are considering at this moment very clearly subverts the principles of representative democracy.

The Democratic leadership’s casual disregard for these rules and principles has faced growing criticism in the media. The Politico accused them of “breaking promises,” promises for an open legislative process that followed regular order and the rules of the House. Not surprisingly, the paper cited today’s underlying bill, the supplemental appropriations, as Exhibit A in the Democrats’ assault on an open and inclusive process, which was promised at the beginning of this Congress. That’s not my saying that; that’s an independent newspaper that made that statement.

Even before the new lows of the supplemental, another publication, Investors Business Daily, reported recently on the leadership’s “widening power grab,” accusing them of “anti-democratic” behavior, running a “dictatorship” and “showing little or no concern for holding actual votes or building consensus on issues.” Now, Madam Speaker, those are pretty harsh words, but they are clearly warranted.

The process used to craft the underlying supplemental appropriations bill has been atrocious. Committee work was completely abandoned. Without a markup, without discussion, without so much as consulting Mr. Lewis and the committee members, this bill was concocted behind closed doors. Zero input, zero deliberation, zero consultation. The Senate, of course, stands for that kind of treatment and intends to hold a markup later today before proceeding with its floor debate. But the Democratic leaders in this House apparently deem this to be a lesser body, with no right to see the process.

The Democratic leadership intended to bring this bill up last week. They had to pull it from the schedule because fiscally conservative Members within their own caucus were outraged at the contents. A week later, Madam Speaker, there is now been a backroom deal struck, bringing the remaining Democratic Members on board. How? Bring Members on board by imposing a tax on small businesses in this country, which is exactly what this is. You can’t tax the poor, so we tax the poor. We raised taxes on small businesses by justifying the small business tax as just a tax on the rich. Unless, of course, we are talking about millionaire farmers, and then they like to give them massive government payouts, which is what they did just yesterday in the farm bill.

To add to their inconsistency, they actually waived their own PAYGO rule to fund the farm bill subsidies, and today they refuse to waive the same PAYGO rule and use it as an excuse to levy massive tax increases on small businessmen and women in this country. Only in Washington would such logic be employed.

We became aware of the rough outline of increased spending, along with every other provision of this bill, only through press reports. Some have reported a $183 billion price tag on this bill. Others have said it would be costing at least $250 billion. Various outlets reported on various provisions. But we didn’t get a chance to see for ourselves what was in this massive bill until 3 p.m. yesterday. In fact, the distinguished former Chair of the Committee on Appropriations, the now ranking member, Mr. Lewis, came before us. Within the hour before that 3 p.m. meeting, he had just gotten the copy of the measure.

Most egregious of all, we’re not actually considering a bill here today. We will be voting on three amendments to a Senate amendment to an old House bill that has already passed but was never enacted. Did you catch that? If it sounds gimmicky and underhanded, that’s because that’s exactly what it is. In fact, this morning I heard our colleague from National Public Radio, where he said the crafting of this is tantamount to John Kerry’s very famous line in which he said “I voted for it before I voted against it.” The Democratic leadership knows that a vote on their full package would never pass; so they plotted a way around an actual vote on final passage.

For anyone who missed that, let me repeat. The House will not be permitted a vote on the full underlying proposal. When Investors Business Daily calls this a dictatorship, they seem to have a point.

So what exactly is in this $183–250 billion bill that comes to us without any due process and will pass without a vote? Who can say for sure? But I know that at least $62 billion in new entitlements are included; $11 billion in unemployment insurance, and our friend Mr. Weller will be talking about this in a few minutes; and at least $51 billion in benefits for veterans. Clearly, these are very, very important issues that need to be addressed.

I don’t doubt that the Democratic majority will try to blame Republicans don’t care about our veterans or those facing economic hardship. We hear that time and time again. To the contrary, these are such critically important issues for us that we passionately believe that we must address them in a serious way. It is simply not good enough to slap together a proposal without a single moment of testimony or debate, throw some money at our problems, and call it a day.

The very critical issues addressed in this bill, from funding for Iraq and Afghanistan to international food assistance to the tremendously important domestic programs, all of these deserve a substantive, deliberative process. We should have an opportunity to examine which of these are truly emergencies and which should be included in the regular appropriations process. And all of them should have the benefit of an open debate to ensure that we are addressing our priorities effectively.

This rule allows for none of this, Madam Speaker. It thwarts the rules and traditions that were put in place to guard against abuses of power, and it blocks consideration of even a single amendment, including the very thoughtful and responsible alternative proposed by the man sitting to my right here, the distinguished ranking member of the committee, Mr. Lewis.

He’s offered a clean supplemental appropriation bill that provides our troops the funding they need without bogging it down with all kinds of unrelated items or adding new policy that prevents them from carrying out their mission.

Our hope is to get this critical funding to our troops before Memorial Day, which is fast approaching. That’s not an arbitrary deadline and it’s not a gimmick. Our military commanders have told us that they desperately need this funding now and if we wait to be late for Memorial Day and tell our veterans and our military families that we passed a clean bill that funds our troops and their mission. We
I am going to urge a vote on the rule, and I am going to urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Rules Committee (Mr. McGovern).

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, 5 years ago in a well-orchestrated public relations stunt that featured landing on an aircraft carrier, President Bush proclaimed, "In the battle of Iraq, the United States and our allies have prevailed." Just 2 weeks ago, on the fifth anniversary of "Mission Accomplished," the White House could only express aspersation that anyone would even make a fuss that 5 years have gone by and we're still in Iraq, deeper than ever.

Well, here's why people are making such a fuss, Madam Speaker: Over 4,000 American service men and women killed in Iraq; over 30,000 of our troops wounded or maimed; a continuing U.S. occupation of Iraq; and a mission that is never ending, never defined, and completely open-ended.

Ironically, the USS Abraham Lincoln, the aircraft carrier where President Bush declared victory in Iraq, was just deployed last week for another tour of duty in the Persian Gulf.

Today this House will have a choice to make, whether to continue this war well into next year. Today we will choose whether to support the George Bush strategy of keeping the war going until he can safely get out of town.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I am going to seek an opportunity for him to do just that.

But, unfortunately, the Democratic majority can't advance their flawed policies without shutting down the process. They prefer backroom deals to transparent committee process. They prefer hollow, ill-gotten victories that die after the House vote to substantive, bipartisan legislation that is enacted into law. That's exactly what we need to do, Madam Speaker.

So I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I am going to urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I no longer have the right to comment on the measure.

If there are no other questions or exasperation that anyone would even make a fuss that 5 years have gone by and we're still in Iraq, deeper than ever.

Well, here's why people are making such a fuss, Madam Speaker: Over 4,000 American service men and women killed in Iraq; over 30,000 of our troops wounded or maimed; a continuing U.S. occupation of Iraq; and a mission that is never ending, never defined, and completely open-ended.

Ironically, the USS Abraham Lincoln, the aircraft carrier where President Bush declared victory in Iraq, was just deployed last week for another tour of duty in the Persian Gulf.

Today this House will have a choice to make, whether to continue this war well into next year. Today we will choose whether to support the George Bush strategy of keeping the war going until he can safely get out of town.

Once again, U.S. forces are engaged in some of the most intense combat since the height of the insurgency. Once again, they are battling Iraqi militias, not al Qaeda, in the markets, homes and alleyways of Baghdad. April 2008 was the deadliest month for Iraqi civilians since last August.

The U.N. now reports that 4.7 million Iraqis have been forced by violence to leave their homes. Roughly 2 million of them are refugees in neighboring countries. Another 2.7 million are internally displaced.

What is worse, we don't even have the decency to pay for this war, which has created a mountain of debt that American taxpayers will be paying off for years to come. This generation's mistake is becoming the next generation's burden.

Currently the war costs $2.4 billion each and every week. Reports estimate that the costs of this war, even if we could bring it to an end over the next 2 years, would exceed $3 trillion when we take into account rebuilding our broken military and addressing the needs of our military veterans.

Billions for the care of the severely wounded.

Billions for the care of veterans traumatized by war.

Billions to stanch the flow of suicides by young men and women who have served in Iraq.

And billions more to rebuild and reequip our Armed Forces.

Why can't the Iraqi Government, which is currently running a huge surplus, do more to rebuild their country?

Madam Speaker, I am holding office hours across my congressional district in Massachusetts. These are mainly small towns and communities. Every weekend I meet a steady stream of constituents who come in and who want to talk about the war. People are so disappointed, so frustrated and so angry that this war is still going on. And it is not just Massachusetts. It is Illinois, Louisiana, Mississippi and every other State in the Union.

Now I know, Madam Speaker, that there will be opportunities today to support strong conditions on the war and the redeployment of our troops. We will have the opportunity to vote in support of greatly expanded educational benefits for our military veterans and for a generous response to the emergency global food crisis.

And I thank Chairman OBEY for those initiatives.

But Madam Speaker, I cannot vote for one more dime for this war. Enough is enough. Before he leaves town, George Bush should bring our troops home.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I notice my colleague doesn't spend any time at all talking about the rule which is being considered at this time and shutting down democracy which is the case in point.

The supplemental began as a $180 billion request for funding requirements for the troops for the remainder of 2008. This must-pass emergency legislation has grown to over $250 billion. A whole array of legislative provisions has been added that could have been and should have been addressed by way of regular order during the appropriations process.

Unfortunately, the supplemental will bypass the Appropriations Committee altogether, and through use of parliamentary trickery, avoid the inconvenient input of Democrat and Republican Members who have real expertise in the subject areas involved.

Regular order is designed to ensure that people's voices and interests are heard on serious public policy questions as they move through the legislative process. To have the Democrat leadership cut off the people's right to be heard by such a业余and cunning set of maneuvers results in great harm to the Appropriations Committee and seriously undermines the credibility of the world's most admired legislative body.

Only three or four Members, at most, have provided serious input throughout this misguided process. All Members, Democrats and Republicans alike, should be enraged by this arrogant demonstration of dictatorial control. I know from private conversations with many of my friends on the other side of the aisle that there is a great deal of frustration among Democrats with Chairman OBEY and Speaker Pelosi for their excessive and abusive control of this process.

Madam Speaker, let me assure you that my colleagues and I will continue to exercise every tool available to us to protect the established traditions of the House and the fundamentals of our democratic system. It is clear that Speaker Pelosi is willing to do anything-including stifling the voices of nearly every Member of the House, to win.

I urge all of my colleagues to remember the words of my mentor, Dr. Adeline Gunther. "Gram," as we called her, was the founder and guiding light of the University Religious Conference located near the UCLA campus. Gram said to me, "Always remember, Jerry, what you are not willing to do in order to win, you will be required to do in order to lose."

The outrageous movement of the Iraq supplemental to the House floor, without consideration by the Committee on Appropriations and under a closed rule, is the case in point.

One of the most admired legislative body.

Madam Speaker, let me assure you that my colleagues and I will continue to exercise every tool available to us to protect the established traditions of the House and the fundamentals of our democratic system. It is clear that Speaker Pelosi is willing to do anything—including stifling the voices of nearly every Member of the House, to win.

I urge all of my colleagues to remember the words of my mentor, Dr.
Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Mr. DREIER. I would just like to remind my colleague that 82 percent of the people who fall in the category about which she has just mentioned are small business men and women. And I think we need to realize this is a small business tax.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I take back my time.

We are talking about people who are making over $1 million to pay a small sacrifice for this war where our military families are paying a huge sacrifice.

The question really is, though, what are we doing there? What is the mission of our young men and women? Who is the enemy? Who is our ally? What does victory even look like?

I am not going to vote for another penny for this tragic war except to bring our troops home or to resolve the humanitarian crisis our government has helped create. I am not voting to give farm subsidies to millionaires. I am not voting to give farm subsidies to millionaires.

The last thing we ought to be doing today is raise taxes. The last thing we ought to be doing is tax millionaires. But this tax is going to hit small businesses. These are the job creators in America. This is the worst thing we can do as this economy is struggling.

Yesterday the House waived the PAYGO rule to give farm subsidies to millionaires.

Today, the House wants to enforce PAYGO to raise taxes on small businesses. I fear for this institution. The Democratic majority is taking us over a slippery slope. And I don’t think they are going to be able to put this genie back in the bottle. The committees have been ignored. The budget has been ignored. The rules have been ignored. What is next?

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Today I rise in strong support of the rule and of the domestic priorities the House will consider today as a part of H.R. 2642.

I strongly support provisions to expand and improve the GI benefits for veterans education. Our veterans who have served our country in combat and who are looking to begin to complete their college education deserve GI benefits.

I also strongly support provisions which provide vital support for workers by extending unemployment benefits for an additional 13 weeks. In the district that I represent in California, east Los Angeles and the San Gabriel Valley, unemployment rates are above 8 percent.

This legislation will help to keep food on the table for our families and our workers affected by the declining economy. This legislation appropriately includes a moratorium on seven misguided Medicaid regulations. More than 170,000 people in my district alone in California rely on Medi-Cal for their health care. And although Healthy Families serves more than 18,000 children in my district, another 18,000 children remain uninsured.

If the regulations go into effect in Los Angeles County, we will also devastate our Los Angeles Unified School District and our public hospitals who serve many of our low-income residents.

I am pleased that today we are prioritizing education for our veterans, the health of low-income Medicaid...
beneficiaries, and of course our families and working families. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support the rule and provisions which address pressing domestic needs.

I strongly disagree that small business owners and wealthy millionaires are going to be heavily impacted by this resolution. That is the Republican playbook, trying to tell you that somehow we are going to harm those people that are requiring and calling out for our assistance. This bill addresses their issues.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me say in the name of saying they are taxing the rich, the facts show it. Eighty-two percent of the people who fall in that category are small businessmen and women. That’s just the facts.

With that, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Morris, Illinois (Mr. WELLER), the ranking member of the Income Security and Family Support Subcommittee of Ways and Means.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule. I also oppose the way that the House majority, the Democratic majority, is managing this legislation, bringing forward a fiscal year irresponsible supplemental bill.

I would note, as I recall, on January 29, the Speaker of the House made a statement on the bipartisan economic stimulus package that was about to pass, and Speaker PELOSI said, ‘‘Let’s hope for the Senate to take their lead from us and be disciplined, focused, fiscally responsible, and act in a timely, temporary, and targeted way on behalf of meeting the needs of the American people.’’

I agree with the Speaker that we should act in a way that is timely, temporary and targeted.

Unfortunately, that’s not what the House is being offered today. In addition to a large tax increase, the bill before us today includes an untargeted and overly expensive extension of unemployment benefits.

Consistent with the Speaker’s call for targeting help to those who need it most, I introduced legislation and offered an amendment in the Ways and Means Committee to focus extended unemployment benefits on people and States with relatively high or fast-rising unemployment rates.

Combined with regular unemployment benefits available in all States under my amendment, a total of 39 States with relatively high or fast-rising unemployment rates.

Since the 1950s, Congress has created 7 special or ‘‘temporary’’ extended benefits programs, which can double the length of total unemployment benefits from the 26 weeks to 52 weeks. The logic of these programs is to provide additional weeks of benefits when jobs are relatively hard to find.

Today’s national unemployment rate is a relatively low 5.0 percent. Congress has never created a temporary extended benefits program at such a low unemployment rate. The next lowest unemployment rate when such a program was created in U.S. history was when the last such program was created in March 2002. The unemployment rate then was 5.7 percent—significantly higher than today’s 5.0 percent unemployment rate.

Today’s unemployment rate is significantly lower than average at start of prior extended benefit programs.

It is also useful to compare today’s relatively low 5.0 percent unemployment rate with average rates when prior special Federal programs started. When such programs started, average unemployment rates were far higher than the Nation’s unemployment rate today.

Today’s unemployment rate is 5.0 percent. It is more than 2 percentage points below the average unemployment rate in the month when Congress chose to start such special programs (7.3 percent).
Democrats portray the current economy as another Depression. Here’s how Senator Chuck Schumer put it: “The bottom line is that this administration is the owner of the worst jobs record since Herbert Hoover.” (Press Release, March 7, 2008)

THE DEMOCRATIC “EMERGENCY” EXTENDED BENEFITS PROGRAM IS POORLY TARGETED

Despite today’s relatively low unemployment rate, there are reasonable, arguments for extending unemployment benefits in areas where jobs are scarce. That’s the approach Republicans are pushing in the Ways and Means Committee, but which Democratic Members rejected. This approach would expand a current program that targets Federal funds for extended unemployment benefits on States with high unemployment rates. Temporarily expanding that program would provide more help to workers where jobs are scarce and the added help is needed most.

Early on, Speaker Pelosi seemed to agree with the need for such a “targeted” approach. In her January 29, 2008 statement on the bipartisan stimulus check proposal, the Speaker said: “Let’s hope for the Senate to take their lead from us and be disciplined, focused, fiscally responsible, and act in a timely, temporary, and targeted way on behalf of meeting the needs of the American people.”

Unfortunately, the proposed Democratic program does not follow this “targeted” approach. Nearly all of its benefits—more than $12 billion of the $14 billion in total benefit spending (not counting administrative costs) in the coming year—would be paid regardless of local unemployment rates. That’s poorly targeted, and not fiscally responsible.

UNDER THE UNTARGETED DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM, FEDERAL BENEFITS WOULD BE PAID IN MANY STATES WITH BELOW AVERAGE UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

One key reason why the Democratic program is poorly targeted is because extended unemployment benefits would be paid in all States, regardless of the availability of jobs there.

In March 2008, a full 15 States had unemployment rates under 4 percent. Another 17 States had unemployment rates between 4.0 and 4.9 percent. That makes 32 States—two thirds of all States—with current unemployment rates under 5 percent. Those are very low unemployment rates by any measure. Another 13 States have unemployment rates between 5.0 and 5.9 percent.

That leaves just 6 States with unemployment rates of 6 percent or higher, which is the Democratic Members’ own definition of “high unemployment.” Under their own criteria, 45 States today are “low unemployment” and only 6 are “high unemployment” (including D.C.). But all States would receive Federal funds to pay extended benefits to workers.

CURRENT LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYMENT RATE IS BELOW THE AVERAGE SINCE 1980

Democratic Members have suggested that record numbers of workers today have been out of work for long periods. Actually, the current share of all workers who are long-term unemployed use now against those who have been out of work for more than 6 months—is below average.

The average long-term unemployment rate for all months since January 1980—covering nearly three full decades, and including two of the longest expansions in U.S. history—was 1.0 percent. So in the average month in the past generation, 1 percent of the labor force had been out of work for more than 6 months.

How does that compare with today? The long-term unemployment rate in April 2008 was 0.9 percent—below the average for the past generation. That means fewer current workers are long-term unemployed than in the typical month in the past 28 plus years.

That’s hardly the case Democratic Members have been making an “emergency” situation this is. In fact, current conditions are better than average when it comes to assessing how many American workers are unemployed for long periods.

LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYMENT TODAY IS BELOW AVG. IN 1994 WHERE DEMOCRATIC LEADERS ENDED THE EXTENDED BENEFITS PROGRAM THEY CREATED

Some Democratic Members seem to think whether you support creating a special extended benefits program—and under what terms—determines whether you support workers or not. One even said it was “unconscionable” to try and target extended benefits to only those in high unemployment States, as Republicans have proposed and even the AFL-CIO apparently supports.

Yet when Democrats last held a majority in Congress in 1994, they ended a special Federal extended benefits program. The Democratic Majority in Congress back then allowed that program to expire in April 1994. But back then a significantly GREATER share of unemployed workers were long-term unemployed than today—1.0 percent then versus less than 18 percent today.

Was it “unconscionable” to “turn off” that prior special program in April 1994? Weren’t they “leaving workers out in the cold” or “shutting them out” or whatever metaphorical phrase Democrats use against those who support a more targeted approach today, when conditions are objectively better in terms of long-term unemployment?

THE UNTARGETED DEMOCRATIC EXTENDED BENEFITS PROGRAM WOULD DRAIN FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNTS

Some Democratic Members claim there are “plenty” of Federal funds to pay for these benefits. Are they right?

To answer that, you have to ask what are the chances this special program will last only 12 months. As a fact, it’s since 1970 none of the 5 special programs created by Congress ended as originally proposed; every one was extended. So chances are high that program created now wouldn’t stop after just 12 months, either.

In fact, the average total duration of such programs is about 30 months. The untargeted Democratic program would cost about $1 billion per month. So if its length is “average,” the total cost will reach $30 billion. That’s almost the balance in the Federal unemployment trust funds, which were cut off in 1994.

But remember this program would start at a record low unemployment rate. Also, such programs tend to operate until the unemployment rate falls to the level where it started, or less. So let’s assume the program starts now and runs as long as one following the 2001 recession that started and stopped only when the unemployment rate fell below 5.0 percent. That program would operate for 47 months— from now until April 2012—cost $47 billion or more and fully drain the Federal unemployment trust funds, which currently hold just $35 billion.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Amendment 3 concerns unemployment compensation. It’s estimated that in the first 6 months of this year, 1.3 million Americans will exhaust their benefits. The number of long-term unemployed Americans is almost twice as high now as it was in the last recession.

This is targeted at the long-term unemployed wherever they live. The Republican approach, Mr. WELLER’s approach, the President’s opposition, it’s not targeted. It misses tens of thousands of people who are unemployed for more than the 26 weeks. I come from Michigan with a high unemployment level. I want all the unemployed long-term to be covered wherever they live.

I think it’s time that the minority and the President get out of the offices they reside in and get into the shoes of typical American families.

I read a letter that came from a person in Roseville whose husband had lost his job as a machinist: ‘’The job market as bleak as it is today, the fear that unemployment benefits may run out is something no family should have to face. My husband has been actively seeking work since his layoff, but there’s simply nothing to be had right now. It is never seen him look so sad and upset in all our nearly 30 years of marriage. The President and Congress must be made to understand that what is happening to the workers of this country, and most especially, to the people of Michigan is not something they’ve chosen for themselves.’’

Opposition to extension of unemployment compensation is unconscionable. I urge support for amendment 3.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 7 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. In light of the fact there is much more time remaining on the other side, may I ask the distinguished Chair if she might proceed and yield some of her time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise enthusiastically to support this very important rule.

I congratulate the very strategic design of the Appropriations Committee. This is tough, and I thank the Rules Committee for listening to us as we presented our amendments.

But I rise today to say that war is ugly. But we applaud and appreciate the young men and women on the front lines. We forever honor them. Just a few months ago, I was in a room listening to returning war veterans from Iraq, and they gave us these words, horrible stories, such as calling the
Iraqis hajis or sand niggers, telling us about the impact on their families, how many families were destroyed, how many have attempted to commit suicide.

I offered an amendment that many focused on the idea that everything we have asked the soldiers to do through the 2002 resolution has been done, and, therefore, it should expire. The President has no more authority to continue this war.

I wanted to debunk the actions of what happened to the Vietnam vets and call for a national day of celebration, a national day of honor for all the returning war heroes that will come home. This is what we should be doing today as we vote against the funding of this war in Iraq. It is important to stand for these soldiers.

But I am glad that we have extended GI benefits for veterans’ education. Some of them were telling us that they are now being denied these benefits because of their opposition here in the United States. I am apprised of these dollars, but, my friends, that don’t damage specialty hospitals that are in our rural and inner city areas who are helping us.

I am grateful to what the Appropriations Committee did on world and food hunger as it is a disaster. I am apprised that we have monies for refugee assistance and the Merida funding.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. The Merida initiative is funding for this horrible drug war between Mexico and its own citizens that’s spilling over into the United States. I am appreciative of these dollars, but, my friends, we have got to stop the utilization of drugs here in the United States.

It looks like it’s McDonald’s where they send these various drugs. When I say that, I am not talking about McDonald’s, but, I am suggesting that the pinpoints of where these drugs are dropped off in the United States, it is tragic. As we send more money and more money to Mexico, we have got to begin to devise a new policy for drug opposition here in the United States.

Vote against the funding for the war. The underlying other amendments are very good.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1197, Rule providing for the consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642—Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008. While I offer my support for amendments No. 2 and No. 3, I must oppose amendment No. 1. While amendments 2 and 3 contain provisions beneficial to the American people, designed to improve our economy and protect our young men and women, amendment 1 continues a disastrous policy of providing unrestricted funding to continue the Bush administration’s war in Iraq.

I offered amendment No. 1 because I stand with the American taxpayers who have paid over $600 billion to finance the misadventure in Iraq. I stand with the 4076 fallen heroes who stand even taller in death because they gave the last full measure of devotion to their country. Last November, I was proud to vote for H.R. 1591, a supplemental spending bill that would have provided funds for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, which included a timetable for the redeployment of U.S. troops. Though this bill passed the House by a clear majority, the President opted to veto this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I must oppose amendment No. 1. This amendment provides a total of $162.9 billion for the Department of Defense for FY 2008 and FY 2009, funds that are handed over without any strings. The amendment does not withhold funding for the Iraq war, a war that so many of my colleagues in Congress oppose, and which only 32 percent of Americans now support. The amendment does not require that war funds can only be used for the responsible redeployment of American armed forces. Madam Speaker, I voted against the 2002 Iraq War Resolution. I am proud of that vote. I have consistently voted against the administration’s practice of submitting a request for war funding through an emergency supplemental appropriations process which would subject the funding request to more rigorous scrutiny and require it to be balanced against other pressing national priorities. I cannot support legislation that provides the President with the resources to prolong his ill-advised war effort unrestrained.

I rise today in strong support of amendment No. 2. This amendment lays out a responsible U.S. policy toward Iraq, requiring that troops begin redeployment from Iraq within 30 days, with a goal of completing the withdrawal of combat troops by December 2009. As a Member of both the Out of Iraq and the Progressive Caucuses, I am proud to vote for legislation that, like other measures passed by this Congress, begins the process of withdrawing U.S. men and women from Iraq.

In addition, Madam Speaker this legislation specifically requires that any agreement between the United States and the government of Iraq committing future U.S. forces must be specifically authorized by Congress. The governments of Iraq and the United States announced the regular framework agreement,” a long-term, bilateral pact, to be completed by July 31, 2008. This negotiated agreement is to be based on the “Declaration of Principles for a Long-Term Relationship of Cooperation and Friendship Between the Republic of Iraq and the United States of America,” signed November 26, 2007, by Iraqi Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki and President Bush.

Under the Declaration of Principles, the parties will negotiate a security agreement, under which the United States will support the Iraqi government and security forces in providing security and stability and fighting al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups. The Declaration of Principles envisions an agreement setting forth a wide-ranging set of commitments, which will cover issues including politics, economics, and security. In hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, administration officials have indicated that the President intends to negotiate this agreement as an executive agreement, not subject to Congressional approval. It is essential that any agreement which commits future U.S. troops to the defense of Iraq is outside the purview of existing authorizations, and such an agreement must be submitted to the Congress for approval. This legislation also prohibits the establishment of permanent bases in Iraq.

Madam Speaker, amendment No. 2 requires that the Iraqi government step up and pay its share of Iraqi reconstruction efforts. I am concerned that the United States has paid and continues to pay a disproportionate amount for Iraq reconstruction, especially when the Iraqi government reportedly has a $25–30 billion budget surplus this year. To date the United States has appropriated more than $45 billion for Iraq reconstruction. American funded reconstruction programs have included the training and equipping of Iraqi security forces.

This resource-rich country is still facing problems including a lack of technology, damage from previous mismanagement, the effects of looting, and water intrusion. Iraqi oil production is currently at around 2 million barrels per day. The price of oil has skyrocketed to over $100 a barrel and Iraqi oil exports are generating an estimated $56.4 billion this year alone, according to the GAO, yet it is U.S. taxpayers who continue to foot the bill for Iraqi reconstruction. The government of Iraq is stashing its money in global banks, including a reported $30 billion in the U.S., instead of investing this money in the development of crucial Iraqi infrastructure. This legislation requires the Iraqi government to take responsibility for the future of its own nation.

There are a number of other key provisions in this amendment. It requires the President to reach an agreement with Iraq to subsidize fuel costs for U.S. Armed Forces operating in Iraq so that our military pays what Iraqis pay. It requires that troop’s meet the Pentagon’s definition of “combat ready” before they are deployed to Iraq. Prohibits troops from being deployed longer than Pentagon guidelines recommend and requires that troops have adequate time at home between deployments. This legislation makes substantial strides toward cleaning up contracting in Iraq, expanding current law to make all contractors working in war zones subject to prosecution for offenses that would otherwise be in violation of U.S. law; extending the statute of limitations for fraud cases during wartime; and amending the Federal criminal code to prohibit profiteering and fraud involving contractors overseas. In addition, it prohibits interrogation techniques not authorized in the Army Field Manual, a provision necessary in eliminating torture.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

Madam Speaker, the third amendment to H.R. 2642 provides over $21.2 billion for much needed domestic programs and foreign aid. By extending unemployment benefits, expanding veterans’ education benefits, and placing a moratorium on the administration’s seven Medicaid regulations; this amendment gets us closer to where the Economic Stimulus package should have taken us.
This amendment would provide increased funds for food aid, military hospitals, and the reconstruction of the Louisiana levees.

As many of you know, we are facing an international food crisis. According to the International Monetary Fund, IMF, global food prices have increased an average of 43 percent. In fact, since March 2007, wheat has increased by 146 percent, soybean has increased by 71 percent, corn by 41 percent, and rice prices have increased by 29 percent, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Many factors have played into this crisis. In China, India, and other emerging markets experiencing rapid economic growth, consumers are increasing their demand for food, oil, and energy supplies. Rising energy costs have directly raised the cost of agricultural production. Adverse weather-related events have lowered crop yields, particularly affecting wheat harvests. Depreciation of the U.S. dollar accounts for part of the increase in U.S. food prices, while increased production of biofuel has raised the price of corn.

Sad to say, approximately 1 billion people—or one sixth of the world’s population—subsist on less than $1 per day. Of this population, 162 million survive on less than $0.50 per day. Overall, increased food prices particularly affect developing countries, and the poorest people within those countries, where populations spend a larger proportional share of income on basic food commodities.

That is why I, along with other Hunger Caucus members hosted a forum on the food crisis and what it is doing to our children. We met with leaders of the international aid community to come up with pragmatic solutions to the global hunger crisis, both in the short-term and the long-term.

In my district I submitted an appropriations request for the Houston Food Bank to expand their collection and distribution of food to the good people of Houston. We each have to do our part, not only in our district by supporting much needed programs and organizations, but across this great Nation and the rest of the world.

This amendment would provide $9.9 billion, $496 million above the President’s request for the State Department, USAID and International Food Assistance. It is simply unacceptable in this day and age that children are going hungry. We have millions of dollars to bailout Bear Steams, let’s find that same money to help our families and our children.

Expanded GI Benefits for Veterans Education

As champion for veterans, I am especially pleased to see the expansion of education benefits to veterans under the GI bill.

Extended Unemployment Compensation

The number of Americans looking for work has grown by 800,000 over the last year, and the number of American jobs has declined by 260,000 since the beginning of 2008. This supplemental would extend unemployment benefits for workers who have exhausted their benefits by up to 13 weeks in every state as well as an additional 13 weeks in states with high unemployment.

Protecting the Medicaid Safety Net Act of 2008 (H.R. 5613)

The Bush administration sought to cut services and payments to American families by adding seven different Medicaid regulations to the stimulus. This amendment places a much needed moratorium on those regulations giving back to our seniors, families, and those with disabilities as well as cut payments to safety net providers.

Refugee Assistance

$675 million, $454 million above the President’s request, to address the refugee crisis in Iraq and elsewhere.

Merida

This amendment would give $461.5 million, $88.5 million below the President’s request for the initiative to provide counter narcotics and law enforcement assistance in Mexico, $400 million, and Central America, $61.5 million.

Military Construction

The $4.6 billion for military construction, $2.2 billion over the President’s request, including $939 million for BRAC, over $210 million for the military child care centers that the President announced in the State of the Union but never funded, and $992 million for military hospitals to prevent the types of problems that faced Walter Reed.

Bureau of Prisons

This $178 million urgently needed to meet rising incarceration costs and growing inmate population. The administration would have paid these costs with cuts to state and local law enforcement.

Cleening Up Contracting (H.R. 3328 and H.R. 5712)

Increases accountability and transparency in Federal contracting by requiring companies that receive more than 80 percent of their revenue from the Federal Government to disclose the names and salaries of their top officers, and requires Federal contractors to report violations of Federal criminal law and overpayments on contracts over $5 million.

Mr. Dreier. Madam Speaker, I understand that my good friend from Cleveland was unable to get time to from his side of the aisle.

And so at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Cleveland, the Democratic Presidential candidate, Mr. Kucinich.

Mr. Kucinich. Madam Speaker, I regretfully oppose this rule, not because I lack appreciation for the work of my colleagues in trying to craft a bill that would get consensus, but because we are right back to where we were in January of 2007. We made a commitment that we would take control of this Congress and would end the war.

Now, with this bill, we are saying we will set a goal of 18 months from now. So what happens 18 months from now? We have to end this war by stopping the funding.

In this bill we are telling the Iraqis they are going to have to pay for the reconstruction. We are telling the Iraqis they are going to have to give a discount price for oil, so they are going to subsidize the war against their own country.

We are losing a lot in this war, not only hundreds of billions of dollars, not only the lives of our troops, not only the injuries, but we are also losing our sense of humanity and compassion. There have been over 1 million innocent Iraqis killed as a result of this war.

Vote against this rule.

Ms. Slaughter. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Inslee).

Mr. Inslee. Madam Speaker, I support this rule, in part, because it allows Congress to finally rein in an out-of-control policy by the administration in Iraq.

For too long our Congress has stood by while an administration has pursued a course in Iraq fraught with peril, with no plan for its conclusion, with no meaningful plan for international involvement, to end this problem in Iraq. While Congress has not reinied in this administration, the American people have been raising a hue and cry for relief from this negligent lack of plan in Iraq.

I came across, a few weeks ago, some work that some citizens had done to provide an exit strategy from Iraq. This is a plan called A Responsible Plan to End the War in Iraq. It was organized by a group of citizens, a woman from Carlsbad, California named Darcy Burner. It is endorsed by considerable military thinking, endorsed by Major General Paul Eaton, U.S. Army, retired, former Security Transition Commanding General in Iraq; Dr. Lawrence Korh, a former Assistant Secretary of Defense in the Reagan administration; Brigadier General John Johns, specialist in counterinsurgency and nation-building; Captain Larry Seagust, U.S. Navy, retired, former commander of the USS Iowa and Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Policy Planning.

Here is a plan that has considerable parallels to the amendment we will be allowed to offer to finally having some responsible plan to end the war in Iraq. A meaningful timetable, a statement about permanent bases, meaningful requirements for not overburdening our military. It’s time, simply, for Congress to act. This rule allows us to do so. We should pass it.

Mr. Dreier. Madam Speaker, may I inquire again how much time is remaining on each side?

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. Dreier. Madam Speaker, with that, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from Brooksville, Florida (Ms. Ginny Brown-Watte).

Ms. Ginny Brown-Watte of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. I am the lead Republican on the post-911 Veterans Education Assistance Act. Congress needs to increase benefits for those fighting in our military to cover the true cost of college education, and that is what that bill does. Despite my obvious support for this provision in the supplemental, I am
saddened because I cannot vote for its passage as part of amendment 3 today. I cannot because the Democrats have chosen to include an egregious tax on small businesses in amendment 3. While claiming this tax is for America’s veterans, in reality the majority of it is being funneled to the House’s penchant to send foreign aid money to governments, many of whom do not support the United States of America.

However, when the fortunes of this Nation’s veterans are at stake, the majority would stop doing that with me.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Let me yield to my very good friend from Wichita, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee and who has worked long and hard here, for 1 minute.

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

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman from California.

Madam Speaker. Washington is broken and it needs to be changed. This rule is poorly devised and the underlying bill is poorly conceived. This bill did not go through the committee process, it is unprecedented and it violates the intent of the rules of the House. Why is this important, Madam Speaker? Well, the American people would not allow the Democrat leadership to cancel the next election. The American people would not allow one person to determine who our next President is going to be; but on a smaller scale, that is exactly what has happened on this bill.

The Speaker of the House has determined what is in this bill, not the appropriate committee. An election was cancelled. There was no vote. The representatives of the people did not have a voice in this process. We did not have any committee hearings. This is not the democracy were Washington is broken and it needs to be changed.

The rule accepts this violation of our own House rules, that’s why I ask my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule because Washington is broken and it needs to be changed. We have to change the process here because Washington is broken and it needs to be changed.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I hope the House will forgive my laryngitis today.

Madam Speaker. I have just heard complaints from the minority side of the aisle about the process by which this proposal is being brought to us. This criticism about process comes from the same crowd that brought a $40 billion proposal to the floor 2 days ago. They were championing that proposal through either the Appropriations subcommittee or the Appropriations Committee. That criticism comes from the same crowd——

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. No. I didn’t interrupt you. You always ask someone to yield in order to interrupt their train of thought. I would appreciate if you would stop doing that with me.

Mr. DREIER. That is not my goal, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin controls the time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, ahead of time, I will not yield to anyone until I have completed my statement.

This criticism on process comes from the same crowd that stood by and allowed 30 pages of unread material to be surreptitiously and anonymously slipped into the conference report on the defense bill after the conference report had completed action, language which insulated the drug industry from liability in cases where their products injured the health of customers.

This criticism comes from the same crowd that several years ago blocked the ability of this House to vote on a single matter that had anything at all to do with the most significant domestic appropriation bill, the Labor-Health-Education bill. They simply wrapped it into other items and refused to allow the House to work its will on any piece of that proposal which had more than 500 programs which were insulated from House review.

This criticism comes from the same crowd that brought three supplemental appropriation bills to the floor without running those bills through the Appropriations Committee or subcommittee.

Now they say that they want one vote on the package all put together. Well, let me tell you, what we are trying to do is to avoid Members having to look at everything in one package. What are we trying to do is to give them a straight up-or-down vote, a straight up or down vote, whether you want to provide funding for the war or not. It is a procedurally neutral approach.

If you want funding for the war, you vote “yes” and if you don’t want it, you vote “no.” That way you can’t hide on that issue. It stands out there alone, and people see where you stand.

We are also having a separate vote on whether or not we should impose conditions on the administration in exchange for the use of that money, straight up-or-down vote, clean shot at it, can’t hide behind any other issue.

And thirdly, we are taking the administration’s other requests and two priorities of our own and putting them together in a third amendment, again separate, not tied into a big package, out there so that Members can choose up or down whether they want to do that or not. I make no apology for that.

Now we are being lectured about the fact that this is a bloated bill. Out of all of the appropriated items in this bill, all but $2 billion are requested by the administration. Congress has the temerity to be asking to spend 1 percent of this bill. The rest the President takes ownership of.

Secondly, we are being told, Oh, it’s terrible because we’ve taken a military bill and “larded” it up was the term that the gentleman from Janesville used, that we larded it up with unemployment compensation and with the expanded GI Bill. Well, I suppose additional unemployment compensation benefits may look like lard to a Member who makes $50,000 a year; but to people who have exhausted their unemployment benefits and have been out of work for 6 months, it doesn’t look like lard to them; it looks like basic bread, and I think we should be ashamed of the fact that we haven’t provided this sooner.

It also may look like lard to the gentleman from Janesville for us to say that we want to provide expanded education benefits to the GIs who fought this war. But I would remind every Member of this House, this is the first war in my knowledge where we have never had any sense of shared sacrifice. The only people in this society who are being asked to sacrifice are the veterans and the military families. They have been sent to Iraq and Afghanistan again and again and again, and we have the quaint idea that we ought to be able to take 6 percent of the cost of that war to date, 6 percent, and devote it to expanding education benefits for people who have been wearing the uniform of the United States.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin 2 additional minutes.

Mr. OBEY. We pay for that by providing what the majority leader refers to as a patriots’ premium, a one-half of 1 percent increase in taxes for the most fortunate people in this society who make more than a million bucks a year.

If you think that is even a close question, whether we ought to put the GIs before those fortunate folks, then it is no wonder you lost the seat in Mississippi 2 days ago.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me yield myself 30 seconds.

Let me begin by apologizing to my friend from Wausau. The notion of engaging in debate on the House floor is something I feel strongly about, and I am always happy to yield to people when they make requests for me to yield. I was simply asking my friend to...
yield because of the fact that the $40 billion post-9/11 supplemental about which my friend complained and referred to as "this crowd" came to this floor under unanimous consent, a bipartisan agreement.

And in the supplemental appropriations, Madam Speaker, about which my friend referred, never, never, denied a motion to recommit to the minority. And I ensured as chairman of the Rules Committee at that time the right of the minority would, in fact, be maintained.

Madam Speaker, I am very happy to yield 1 minute to my friend from Auburn, Washington, the former sheriff, DAVID REICHERT.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule. Yesterday the Culberson-Reichert-Shays Iraqi reconstruction amendment was offered and subsequently ruled out of order before the Rules Committee.

The intent of this amendment was to allow the billions in Iraq to continue and at the same time reduce the burden on American taxpayers. Since April 2003, United States taxpayers have spent more than $66 billion in reconstruction in Iraq.

That would have allowed us to begin to reduce American taxpayer dollars going to Iraq for reconstruction. This amendment would have directed that U.S. taxpayer dollars going to Iraq, to come to Iraq in the form of loans, would have enabled the Iraqis to still have a steady flow of reconstruction funding should they be unable to draw down their own funds.

Now is the time, especially with skyrocketing oil prices, for the Iraqis to stand up and take responsibility for their own reconstruction. In order for the Iraqi Government to stand up their economy, they must take the responsibility, they must bear the costs for reconstruction of their own country, not the American taxpayer. I oppose this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I continue to re-
serve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, is the distin-
guished Chair of the Rules Committee the final speaker for the majority?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me say at the outset, and again the last thing I want to do is offend my friends by asking them to yield at any point, but I would be happy to yield to him if he wants to respond to what I am about to say. And that is, the fact of the matter is we have in this Congress the single highest number of closed rules in the 219-year history of the Republic. Never before this, the United States Congress had such a period of closed rules. I will tell you, it is absolutely outrageous. Why, because we were promised something that was much, much different than that.

On a supplemental appropriations bill, my good friend, the chairman of the committee said, "The majority leadership decide to obliterates the legislative process. They discarded a bipartisan committee product, and they threw in unrelated, partisan political items that characterized a full partisan agenda. They have taken abusive power to a new level."

Madam Speaker, let me say that when we did that, we provided the minority a right to have a bite at the apple, a motion to recommit. They had an opportunity to offer a proposal. I will tell you it is just plain wrong to see what has been taking place here.

I am going to urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question so I can amend the rule to simply give Republicans one simple bite at the apple, something we always guaranteed the now-majority.

Mr. LEWIS, the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations, introduced a bill on Tuesday, H.R. 6062, a clean supplemental, to provide troop funding without further expansive spending. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule to make in order an alternative motion to concur by Mr. Lewis which would simply state that the House concurs in the Senate amendment with an Amendment consisting of the text of H.R. 6062. This way the House has the opportunity to send the Senate a clean supplemental to get our troops the money that they desperately need without the hocus-pocus, three-in-one vote political gamesmanship that we have before us at this moment.

It's simply the right thing for us to do to send that clean supplemental. Madam Speaker, at this point I would like to ask unanimous consent to have the text of the extraneous material and the amendment included in the Record.

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

There was no objection. Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, it's just one simple bite at the apple, something we always guaranteed the Democrats when we were in charge. It's one amendment. We're just trying to help the Democratic majority become the majority that they promised that they would be. It's not too late. Let them do it, Madam Speaker.

Vote "no" on the previous question. Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining? The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 1½ minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, let me say to my colleagues, voting for this rule gives the President not only what he has asked for the funding of the troops, but allows the people in the House who oppose that to have an opportunity to vote "no."

We also note, in response to Mr. REICHERT, that it does have an orderly withdrawal of troops beginning in December 2009, ending in 18 months. This is a well-crafted piece of legislation of which I am extremely proud. I urge everyone to vote for the bill and rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. DREIER is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1197 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER OF CALIFORNIA

Strike section 2, read section 3 as section 2, and add at the end the following:

SIC. 3. Prior to consideration of the motion specified in section 1, and without intervention of any point of order, the Chair shall direct, in order for Representative Lewis of California or his designee to offer the motion specified in section 1, and without intervention of any point of order, the Chair shall direct, in order for Representative Lewis of California or his designee to offer the motion specified in section 1.

Such a motion shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SIC. 4. The motion referred to in section 4 is a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2622 with an amendment striking the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment and inserting in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 6026 as introduced on May 13, 2008.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote 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 doing.

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, 1929, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the dem-

mand for the previous question prevents the House from exercising the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1969, a member of the majority party offered a resolution. The resolution defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph C. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitz-

gerald, 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, the House Majority Leader (through Mr. LEWIS) said: "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution and [has] substantive legislative or procedural 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 Com-

mittee in the 109th Congress, (page 56).

Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information form Congressional Quarterly's "Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who may require 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 to report 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 an amendment to the resolution and who controls the time for debate thereon."

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken; and the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER, Madam Speaker, on that, I demand 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 House Resolution 117, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 5614, H.R. 406, and H.R. 5872.

The vote was taken electronically, and there were—yeas 221, nays 195, not voting 14, as follows:

[Vote list]

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 195, not voting 14, as follows:

[Vote list]
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

NOT VOTING—12

Bono Mack, Gibilterra (VT)
Browns, Gary (IN)
Brownlee, Blaine (OR)
Buchanan, Bill (SC)
Bucks, Don (TN)
Byrne, Kevin (TX)
Cohen, Stephen (NY)
Conaway, Joe (TX)
Cox, Tom (PA)
Dreier, Chris (NJ)
Ehlers, Michael (MN)
Einhorn, Irwin (NJ)
Emerson, Karen (MA)
Farley, James (RI)
Fellers, Tom (ME)
Fong, Eddy (CA)
Frank, Jo (NY)
Frelinghuysen, Scott (NJ)

NOT VOTING—18

Bono Mack, Gibilterra (VT)
Browns, Gary (IN)
Buchanan, Bill (SC)
Byrne, Kevin (TX)
Conaway, Joe (TX)
Cox, Tom (PA)
Dreier, Chris (NJ)
Ehlers, Michael (MN)
Einhorn, Irwin (NJ)
Emerson, Karen (MA)
Farley, James (RI)
Fellers, Tom (ME)
Fong, Eddy (CA)
Frank, Jo (NY)
Frelinghuysen, Scott (NJ)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote), Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

☐ 1213

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to authorize the production in palladium of Saint-Gaudens Double Eagle coins as ultra-high relief numismatic coins and bullion investment coins in order to provide affordable opportunities for investments in precious metals, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 325, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

ALICE PAUL WOMEN’S SUFFRAGE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 406, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 406, as amended.

The question was taken.

A motion to reconsider the vote was laid on the table.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered taken.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 1, not voting 20, as follows:

(Roll No. 326)

YEAS—412

Abercrombie (HI)  Blackburn  Capito
Ackerman (NY)  Blumenauer  Carper
Aderholt (AL)  Blunt  Carnahan
Akkin  Bosner  Cardona
Alexander (TN)  Boyland  Carnahan
Allen (PA)  Boren  Carnes
Alltmont  Boswell  Carson
Andrews (MD)  Boss  Carter
Arcuri  Boozman  Castle
Baca (CA)  Boyd (FL)  Castro
Bachmann (MN)  Boyda (KS)  Casados
Bachus (ID)  Brady (PA)  Chatot
Baird (TX)  Brady (TX)  Chabot
Baldwin (WI)  Bracey (LA)  Clark
Barrett (SC)  Brown (GA)  Clay
Barrow (GA)  Brown (SC)  Cleaver
Bartlett (MD)  Brown, Corrine  Clyburn
Barton (TX)  Brown-Waite  Cole
Bean (MN)  Gimrey  Coleman
Beccerra (CA)  Buchanan  Cole (OK)
Berkley (CA)  Burgess  Connaway
Bernie (IN)  Burton (NY)  Costa
Berry (AR)  Butterfield  Cooper
Biggert (IL)  Boyer  Costa
Bilirakis (FL)  Calvert  Costello
Bilirakis (FL)  Camp (FL)  Courtney
Bishop (GA)  Campbell (CA)  Crapo
Bishop (NY)  Cannon  Crowley
Bishop (UT)  Canter  Cubin

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—20

Boehner (OH)  Gilbride  Gohmert
Boehm (CO)  Crenshaw  Gohmert
Boswell (TX)  Hulshof  Goyer
Boyce (PA)  Doggett  Grijalva

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, today is Memorial Day. I rise in recognition and in advancing equal rights for women.

The motion to reconsider the vote was laid on the table.

NATIONAL POLICE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, today is National Police Officers Memorial Day, May 15. Last year, 181 police officers in the United States were killed in the line of duty. Over 18,000 have been killed in the line of duty serving this country. At this very hour on the west front of the Capitol, thousands of police officers and families of those who have been killed in the line of duty are assembling to pay tribute to these wonderful men and women who represent the United States.

Just 10 years ago, two Capitol Police officers, John Gibson and Jacob Chestnut, were killed in the line of duty defending this Capitol and literally gave their lives for Members of Congress.

I would ask that the House observe a moment of silence in honor of these peace officers and their wonderful families.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5872, 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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 403, nays 8, not voting 22, as follows:

YEA—403

Abercrumbie  Carson  Ferguson
Acker  Carter  Filer
Adler  Ackerman  Flake
Akin  Cantor  Forbes
Alexander  Casey  Forstenburg
Allen  Chabot  Foxx
Altman  Chandler  Foster
Andrews  Clarke  Furse
Arcuri  Clay  Franks (AZ)
Baca  Cleaver  Frelinghuysen
Bachmann  Clyburn  Gallegly
Bachus  collaborative  Giffords
Baird  Coble  Gohmert
Barrett (SC)  Cole (OK)  Gohmert
Barrow  Connolly  Goss
Bartlett (MD)  Cooper  Gonzalez
Barton (TX)  Costello  Graham
Bean  Costa  Green 
Becerra  Courtney  Granger
Belio  Cramer  Granger
Beneduce  Crowley  Graves
Berry  Biggert  Green (CA)
Bilirakis  Bilirakis  Green, Gene
Bilirakis  Bilirakis  Grifﬁths
Binkley  Bono  Gregory
Blackburn  Bono  Hall (NY)
Blumenerau  Blackburn  Hall (TX)
Blunt  Bono  Hallman
Bonner  Boozman  Hansen
Boren  DeFazio  Heritage
Bowser  DeLauro  Hershel Sandlin
Boucher  Boyce  Higginson
Boustany  Boyd (FL)  Hilbert
Boyd (Ky)  Diaz-Balart, L.  Hincher
Boyd (KY)  Diaz-Balart, L.  Hincher
Brady (PA)  Dicks  Hiroko
Brady (TX)  Doggett  Hoekstra
Brown (GA)  Doggett  Holden
Brown (SC)  Doggett  Holden
Brown, Corrine  Donnelly  Holden
Brown-Waite  Donnelly  Holden
Bucshanski  Duncan  Hooley
Burgess  Burton (IN)  Hoyer
Burke  Bush  Hunter
Butterfﬁeld  Butterfﬁeld  Inglis (SC)
Buyer  Calvert  Issa
Camp (MD)  Emerson  Issa
Campbell (CA)  Engel  Jackson (IL)
Cannon  English (PA)  Jackson-Lee (TX)
Cantor  Eshoo  Jefferson
Capito  Etheridge  Johnson (GA)
Capuano  Fallin  Johnson (GA)
Carbajal  Farr  Johnson (R, NY)
Carnahan  Fattah  Johnson, Sam
Carney  Feeney  Jones (NC)

NAY—8

Baldwin  Frank  Kucinich
Barrett  Furtwengler  Lee

NOT VOTING—22

Boehner  Bono Mack  Gohmert
Braley (IA)  Brown (SC)  Gohmert
Crenshaw  Cummings  Goodlatte
DeGette  Dingell  Goodwin
Delaney  Domaine  Gohmert
Delauro  Donnelly  Gohmert
Dingell  Doggett  Gohmert

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). The Clerk will designate the House.

Supplemental Appropriations ACT, 2008

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Speaker's request, I call from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2642) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

House Resolution 1197, I call from the Speaker's table 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, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, the

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

It was decided to reconsider the bill on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I could not be present today. Thursday, May 15, 2008, to vote on rollcall votes nos. 323 through 327 due to a funeral.

If I were present, I would have voted:

The "Yea" on rollcall no. 323 on agreeing to the motion ordering the previous question on H. Res. 1197, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008;

The "Yea" on rollcall no. 326 on agreeing to the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5872, the Boy Scouts of America Centennial Congressional Gold Medal Act;

The "Yea" on rollcall no. 327 on agreeing to the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 406, Alice Paul Women's Suffrage Congressional Gold Medal Act;

The "Yea" on rollcall no. 327 on agreeing to the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5872, the Boy Scouts of America Centennial Commemorative Coin Act.
and for construction of facilities to support the functions of the Commander in Chief, $3,928,149,000, to remain available until September 30, 2012: Provided, That of this amount, not to exceed $17,149,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and construction of facilities that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $228,955,000, to remain available until September 30, 2012.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY RESERVE
For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $59,150,000, to remain available until September 30, 2012.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE (INCLUDING RECESSION OF FUNDS)
For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $93,100,000 are hereby rescinded.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM
For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program, and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized by section 2006 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $201,400,000, to remain available until expended.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, ARMY
For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, $48,848,000, to remain available until September 30, 2012.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY
For expenses of family housing for the Army for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, $742,920,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS
For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, $288,329,000, to remain available until September 30, 2012.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS
For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, $771,404,000.

SEC. 104. Funds made available in this title for construction shall be available for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, $362,747,000, to remain available until September 30, 2012.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE
For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, insurance premiums, as authorized by law, $686,335,000.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE
For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military department(s) for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, $48,848,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND
For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, $500,000, to remain available until expended, for family housing initiatives undertaken pursuant to section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, providing alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities.

CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE
For expenses of construction not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with section 1412 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), $320,689,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 1990
For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990, established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), $8,174,315,000, to remain available until expended. Provided, That funds made available under this heading for the Base Closure Account 1990 are subject to the notification and reprogramming requirements applicable to military construction projects under section 2533 of title 10, United States Code, and section 7053 of the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation of December 1996, including the requirement to obtain the approval of the congressional defense committees prior to executing certain reprogramming actions.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS
SEC. 101. None of the funds made available in this title shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for construction, where cost estimates exceed $25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense for reasons therefor.

SEC. 102. Funds made available in this title for construction shall be available for the operation and maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, $362,747,000, to remain available until September 30, 2012.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE
For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, insurance premiums, as authorized by law, $686,335,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND
For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, $500,000, to remain available until expended, for family housing initiatives undertaken pursuant to section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, providing alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities.

CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE
For expenses of construction not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with section 1412 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), $320,689,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 2005
For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005, established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), $8,174,315,000, to remain available until expended. Provided, That funds made available under this heading for the Base Closure Account 2005 are subject to the notification and reprogramming requirements applicable to military construction projects under section 2533 of title 10, United States Code, and section 7053 of the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation of December 1996, including the requirement to obtain the approval of the congressional defense committees prior to executing certain reprogramming actions.

SEC. 101. None of the funds made available in this title shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for construction, where cost estimates exceed $25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense for reasons therefor.

SEC. 102. Funds made available in this title for construction shall be available for the operation and maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, $362,747,000, to remain available until September 30, 2012.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE
For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, insurance premiums, as authorized by law, $686,335,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND
For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, $500,000, to remain available until expended, for family housing initiatives undertaken pursuant to section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, providing alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities.

CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE
For expenses of construction not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with section 1412 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), $320,689,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 2005
For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005, established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), $8,174,315,000, to remain available until expended. Provided, That funds made available under this heading for the Base Closure Account 2005 are subject to the notification and reprogramming requirements applicable to military construction projects under section 2533 of title 10, United States Code, and section 7053 of the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation of December 1996, including the requirement to obtain the approval of the congressional defense committees prior to executing certain reprogramming actions.

SEC. 101. None of the funds made available in this title shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for construction, where cost estimates exceed $25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense for reasons therefor.

SEC. 102. Funds made available in this title for construction shall be available for the operation and maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, $362,747,000, to remain available until September 30, 2012.
therein are certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 104. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to begin construction of new buildings of the United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used for the purchase of land or land development on the 100 percent of the value as determined by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, except: (1) where there is a determination of a conflicting project; (2) purchase authorized by the Attorney General or the designee of the Attorney General; (3) where the estimated value is less than $25,000; or (4) as otherwise determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the public interest.

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used to: (1) acquire land; (2) provide for site preparation; or (3) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been made available in annual Acts making appropriations for military construction.

SEC. 107. None of the funds made available in this title for minor construction may be used to transfer an activity from one base or installation to another, without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 108. None of the funds made available in this title may be used for the procurement of steel for any construction project or activity for which American steel producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been denied the opportunity to compete for such steel procurement.

SEC. 109. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction or family housing during the current fiscal year may be used to pay real property taxes in any foreign nation.

SEC. 110. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to initiate a new installation overseas without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 111. None of the funds made available in this title may be obligated for architect and engineer contracts estimated by the Government to exceed $50,000 for projects to be accomplished in Japan, in any North Atlantic Treaty Organization member country, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea if that country has not increasing its expenditures by at least 10 percent in calendar year 2005, unless such contracts are awarded to United States firms or United States firms in joint venture with host nation firms.

SEC. 112. None of the funds made available in this title for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kauai Island, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea, may be used to award any contract estimated by the Government to exceed $50,000 to a foreign contractor: Provided, That this section shall not be applicable to contracts for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a United States contractor is not lower than the lowest responsive and responsible bid submitted by a Marshallian contractor.

SEC. 113. The Secretary of Defense is to inform the appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress, including the Committees on Appropriations, of the plans and scope of any proposed military exercise involving United States personnel. Prior to its occurrence, amounts expended for construction, either temporary or permanent, are anticipated to exceed $750,000.

SEC. 114. Not more than 20 percent of the funds made available in this title which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last two months of the fiscal year.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 115. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be transferred for each such military department by the authorizations enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 116. For military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, the Secretary may use such funds to pay the cost of associated supervision, inspection, overhead, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

SEC. 117. (a) Any military or other provisions of law, any funds made available to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which funds for such project were made available, if the funds obligated for such project: (1) are obligated from funds available for military construction projects; and (2) do not exceed the amount appropriated plus any amount by which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

 SEC. 118. (a) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, by February 15 of each year, an annual report on actions taken by the Department of Defense and by the Department of State during the previous fiscal year to encourage host countries to assume a greater share of the common defense burden of such countries and the United States.

(b) The report under subsection (a) shall include a description of:

(1) attempts to secure cash and in-kind contributions from host countries for military construction projects;

(2) attempts to achieve economic incentives offered by host countries to encourage private investment for the benefit of the United States Armed Forces;

(3) attempts to recover funds due to be paid to the United States by host countries for assets deemed or otherwise imparted to host countries upon the cessation of United States operations at military installations;

(4) the amount spent by host countries on defense, in dollars and in terms of the percent of gross domestic product (GDP) of the host country; and

(5) for host countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the amount contributed to NATO by host countries, in dollars and in terms of the percent of the total NATO budget.

(c) In this section, the term “host country” means other member countries of NATO, Japan, South Korea, and United States allies bordering the Arabian Sea.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 119. In addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, amounts may be transferred from the accounts established by sections 2906(a)(1) and 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, and of the alignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2906A(a)(1)), to the Fund established by section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 2380a) to pay for expenses associated with the Homeownership Assistance Program. Any amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the fund to which transferred.

SEC. 120. Subject to 30 days prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, such additional amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to: (1) the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund from amounts appropriated for construction in “Family Housing” accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund; or (2) the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund from amounts appropriated for construction of military unaccompanied housing in “Military Construction” accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund: Provided, That appropriations made available to the Funds shall be available to cover the costs, and to be merged with, the Fund for the purposes and for the same time period as any amounts appropriated directly to the Fund:

SEC. 121. (a) Not later than 60 days before issuing any solicitation for a contract with the private sector for military family housing the Secretary of the military department concerned shall notify the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress the notice described in subsection (b).

(b)(1) A notice referred to in subsection (a) is a notice of any guarantee (including the making or renewal of a guarantee) to be made by the Secretary to the private party under the contract involved in the event of

(A) the closure or realignment of the installation for which housing is provided under the contract;

(B) a reduction in force of units stationed at such installation; or

(C) the extended deployment overseas of units stationed at such installation.

(2) Each notice under this subsection shall specify the nature of the guarantee involved and assess the extent and likelihood, if any, of the liability of the Federal Government with respect to the guarantee.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 122. In addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, amounts may be transferred from the accounts established by sections 2906(a)(1) and 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, and of the alignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2906A(a)(1)), to the Fund established by section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 2380a) to pay for expenses associated with the Homeownership Assistance Program. Any amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the fund to which transferred.

SEC. 123. Notwithstanding this or any other provision of law, funds made available in this title for operation and maintenance of family housing shall be the exclusive source of funds for repair and maintenance of all family housing units, including general or flag officer quarters: Provided, That not more than $35,000 per unit may be spent annually for the maintenance and repair of any general or flag officer quarters without 30 days prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, except that an after-the-fact notification shall be submitted if the limitation is exceeded solely due to costs associated with environmental remediation that could not be reasonably anticipated at the time of the budget submission: Provided further, That the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) is to report annually to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, and to the Appropriations Committees of Congress, expenditures for each individual general or flag officer quarters for the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 124. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, and in the case of an obligation incurred on or after the effective date of this Act, amounts made available to the Secretary of Defense for the construction of family housing projects shall be obligated directly to the Fund: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may, after consultation with the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, use funds made available to the Secretary for the construction of family housing projects for any purpose authorized in this title, for any purpose authorized in any other Act, or for any purpose otherwise authorized by law, and may transfer such amounts to the Fund directly: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may use such amounts for the purposes authorized by section 117 of this Act.

(b) A notice referred to in paragraph (a) is a notice of any guarantee (including the making or renewal of a guarantee) to be made by the Secretary to the private party under the contract involved in the event of

(A) transfer or relocation of an installation, or

(B) the closure of an installation.

(2) Each notice under this subsection shall specify the nature of the guarantee involved and assess the extent and likelihood, if any, of the liability of the Federal Government with respect to the guarantee.
year: Provided further, That nothing in this section precludes the Secretary of a military department, after notifying the congressional defense committees and waiting 21 days, from using such funds to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan program authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, chapters 11, 13, 18, 51, 53, 55, and 61); pension benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 15, 51, 53, and 55); and 62 Stat. 2508); and burial benefits, the Reinstated Entitlement Program for Survivors, emergency and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits and certificates, and all other payments that are provided for under section 2601, an annual report by February 15 to the congressional defense committees within 45 calendar days of the date on which such project is certified by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and by the Secretary of Defense that the project is ready for occupancy in accordance with law (38 U.S.C. section (a)(1), (2), (5), and (11) of that section, shall be reimbursed to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for purposes of the military service academy under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense. Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall give priority to funding of the provisions of chapters 51, 53, 55 of title 38, United States Code, the funding source for which is specifically provided for as the "Compensation and pensions."

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, service-disabled veteran insurance, and veterans mortgage life insurance as authorized by title 38, United States Code, chapter 19; 72 Stat. 487; 72 Stat. 487; 41,298,000, to remain available until expended.

For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 21, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 39, 51, 53, 55, and 61), $3,100,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such funds shall be used to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan program authorized by section 3104(a) of title 38, United States Code, other than under subsection (a)(1), (2), (5), and (11) of that section, shall be charged to the account.

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, service-disabled veteran insurance, and veterans mortgage life insurance as authorized by title 38, United States Code, chapter 19; 72 Stat. 487; 72 Stat. 487; 41,298,000, to remain available until expended.

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan program authorized by section 3104(a) of title 38, United States Code, chapter 19; 72 Stat. 487; 72 Stat. 487; 41,298,000, to remain available until expended.

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and medical centers, and for the care and treatment of patients and beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs, $628,000.

For necessary expenses in the administration of the medical, hospital, nursing home, domiciliary, construction, supply, and research activities, as authorized by law; administrative expenses in support of capital policy activities; administrative expenses in support of the Department for collecting and recovering amounts owed the Department as authorized under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, and Federal Medical Care program (42 U.S.C. 2651 et seq.): $4,362,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and medical centers, and for the care and treatment of patients and beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs, $628,000.
Of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, and 8112 of title 38, United States Code, including planning, architectural and engineering services, construction contracts, design, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility costs, and other appropriate administrative costs, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is more than the amount set forth in section 310A(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code, on which such project work or service was made available in a previous major project appropriation, $272,400,000, to remain available until expended, to be made to reimbursements as provided in section 13 of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 612) for claims paid for contract disputes: Provided, That except for advance planning, design and construction planning activities, including needs assessments which may or may not lead to capital investments, and other capital asset management related activities, such as portfolio development and management activities, and investment strategy studies funded through the advance planning fund and the planning and design activities funded through the design fund, none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used for any project which has not been approved by the Congress in the budgetary process: Provided further, That funds provided in this appropriation for the awarding of a construction contract by September 30, 2009; and (2) by the awarding of a construction contract by September 30, 2009: Provided further, That the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall promptly report in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress any approved major construction project in which obligations are not incurred within the time limitations established above.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities including parking projects under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including planning and assessments of needs which may lead to capital investments, architectural and engineering services or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility costs, and other appropriate administrative costs, and site acquisition, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, and 8112 of title 38, United States Code, where the estimated cost of a project is equal to or less than the amount set forth in section 810A(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code, the funds made available in such appropriation shall be available until expended, along with unobligated balances of previous “Construction, minor projects” appropriations which are hereby made available for any project whose estimated cost is equal to or less than the amount set forth in such section for: (1) repairs to any of the nonmedical facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department which are necessary because of loss or damage caused by any natural disaster or catastrophe; and (2) temporary measures necessary to prevent or to minimize further loss by such causes.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

For grants to aid States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veterans cemeteries, as authorized by section 305 of title 38, United States Code, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS

For necessary expenses for information technology systems and telecommunications, including developmental information systems and operational information systems; including pay and associated cost for operations and management services associated with capital asset acquisition of information technology systems, including management and related contractual costs of said acquisitions, including costs associated with fund transfers authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, $1,888,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: Provided, That none of these funds may be obligated until the Department of Veterans Affairs submits to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, and such Committees approve, a plan for expenditure that: (1) meets the capital planning and investment control review requirements established by the Office of Management and Budget; (2) complies with the Department of Veterans Affairs enterprise architecture, established with an established enterprise life cycle methodology; and (4) complies with the acquisition rules, requirements, guidelines, and systems acquisition management practices of the Federal Government.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 283. No appropriation available in this title for fiscal year 2008, in this Act or any other Act, for “Compensation and pensions”, “Readjustment benefits”, and “Veterans insurance and indemnities” may be transferred as necessary to any other of the mentioned appropriations: Provided, That before a transfer may take place, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall request from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued, or absent a response, a period of 30 days has elapsed.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 284. Among the funds available in this title for fiscal year 2008, in this Act or any other Act, under the “Medical services”, “Medical Administration”, and “Medical facilities” accounts may be transferred between the accounts to the extent necessary to implement the restructuring of the Veterans Health Administration accounts: Provided, That before a transfer may take place, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall request from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued.

SEC. 285. Appropriations available in this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, hire of passenger motor vehicles, rental of a facility or land or premises, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901–5902 of title 5, United States Code.
under sections 7992–7994 of title 5, United States Code or the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), unless reimbursement of cost is made to the “grantee” at such rates as are fixed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 206. Appropriations available in this title for “compensation and pensions”, “Readjustment benefits”, and “Veterans insurance and indemnities” shall be available for payment of prior year accrued obligations required to be recorded against the prior year accounts within the last quarter of fiscal year 2007.

SEC. 207. Appropriations available in this title shall be available to pay prior year obligations of corresponding prior year appropriations accounts resulting from sections 3228(a), 3334, and 3712(a) of title 31, United States Code, except that if such obligations are from trust fund accounts they shall be payable from “Compensation and pensions”.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 208. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during fiscal year 2008, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, from the National Service Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1920), the Veterans Health Insurance and Indemnity Compensation Fund (38 U.S.C. 1923), and the United States Government Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1955), reimburse the “General operating expenses” account for the cost of services rendered to non-veterans in the insurance programs financed through those accounts: Provided, That reimbursement shall be made only from the surplus earnings accumulated in an insurance program in fiscal year 2008 that are available for dividends in that program after claims have been paid and actuarially determined reserves have been set aside: Provided further, That the Secretary of administration of an insurance program exceeds the amount of surplus earnings accumulated in that program, reimbursement shall be made only to the extent of such surplus earnings: Provided further, That the Secretary shall determine the amount of surplus earnings available until expended for the purposes of this account.

SEC. 210. Funds available in this title or funds for salaries and other administrative expenses shall be used to reimburse the Office of Resolution Management and the Office of Employment Discrimination Complaint Adjudication for all services provided at rates which will recover actual costs but not exceed $32,000,000 for the Office of Resolution Management and $3,148,000 for the Office of Employment and Discrimination Complaint Adjudication: Provided, That the rates made in this section for services to be furnished based on estimated costs: Provided further, That amounts received shall be credited to “General operating expenses” for use by the office that provided the service.

SEC. 211. Appropriations in this title shall be available to enter into any new lease of real property for the establishment of the “readjustment centers” as are required to be established by section 1729(a)(2) of such title, unless that person has disclosed to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in such form as the Secretary may require, current, accurate third-party estimates of the medical care costs of that person before the date described in section 1729 of such title: Provided, That the Secretary may recover, in the same manner as any other debt due the United States, the reasonable charges from any person who does not make such disclosure as required: Provided further, That any amounts so recovered for care or services provided in a prior fiscal year may be obligated in the fiscal year in which amounts are received.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 212. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, at the discretion of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, proceeds or revenues derived from enhanced-use leasing activities (including divestiture) may be deposited into the “Construction, major projects” and “Construction, minor projects” accounts and be used for construction of hospital facilities or for the use of the Indian Health Service or tribal organizations: Provided, That such revenues shall be used to the extent of such proceeds: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Treasury may require, current, accurate third-party estimates and shall require participating veterans and facilities to comply with all appropriate rules and regulations, as established by the Secretary: Provided further, That the Secretary may declare as surplus earnings accumulated in an insurance program, any amounts that have been deposited in an insurance program, any amount that has been declared surplus earnings in an insurance program, any amount that has been declared surplus earnings in an insurance program:

SEC. 213. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during fiscal year 2008, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may require, current, accurate third-party estimates and shall require participating veterans and facilities to comply with all appropriate rules and regulations, as established by the Secretary: Provided, That the Secretary of the Treasury may require, current, accurate third-party estimates and shall require participating veterans and facilities to comply with all appropriate rules and regulations, as established by the Secretary:

SEC. 214. Amounts made available under “Medical services and supplies”:

SEC. 215. Such sums as may be deposited to the Medical Care Collections Fund pursuant to section 1729A of title 38, United States Code, may be transferred to the “Construction, major projects” and the “Construction, minor projects” accounts: Provided, That such amounts shall be made available under “Medical services and supplies”:

SEC. 216. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall allow veterans eligible under existing Department of Veterans Affairs medical care requirements and who reside in Alaska, to obtain medical care services from medical facilities supported by the Indian Health Service or tribal organizations: The Secretary shall: (1) limit the application of this provision to rural Alaskan communities; (2) negotiate the extent of such care or services to be provided; (3) require this provision to be consistent with Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services activities; and (4) result in no additional cost to the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Indian Health Service.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 217. Such sums as may be deposited to the Department of Veterans Affairs Capital Asset Fund pursuant to section 8118 of title 38, United States Code, may be transferred to the “Construction, major projects” and “Construction, minor projects” accounts, to remain available until expended for the purposes of these accounts.

SEC. 218. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement any policy prohibiting the Directors of the Veterans Integrated Service Networks from conducting outreach or marketing to enroll new veterans within their respective Networks.

SEC. 219. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a quarterly report on the financial status of the Veterans Health Administration.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 220. Amounts made available under the “Medical services”, “Medical Administration", “Medical facilities”, “General operating expenses", and “National Cemetery Administration” accounts for fiscal year 2008, may be transferred to or from the “Information technology systems” account, funds made available for fiscal year 2008, in this or any other Act, may be transferred to or from the “National Cemetery Administration”, and “Office of Inspector General” accounts to the “Medical services” account: Provided, That before a transfer may take place, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall request from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 221. For purposes of perfecting the funding sources of the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2008, the “Information technology systems” account, funds made available for fiscal year 2008, in this or any other Act, may be transferred to the “Compensation and pensions”, “National Cemetery Administration”, and “Office of Inspector General” accounts to the “Medical services” account: Provided, That before a transfer may take place, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall request from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 222. Amounts made available for the “Information technology systems” account may be transferred between projects: Provided, That no project may be increased by more than $1,000,000 of cost prior to submitting a request to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress to make the transfer and an approval is issued.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 223. None of the funds available to the Department of Veterans Affairs, in this Act, or any other Act, may be used to replace the current system by which the Veterans Integrated Services Networks select and contract for diabetes monitoring supplies and equipment.

SEC. 224. None of the funds available for fiscal year 2008, in this Act or any other Act, under the “Medical Facilities” account for non-recurring maintenance, not more than 20 percent of the funds made available for fiscal year 2008, in this Act, may be used to provide, or otherwise permit, the transfer of any amount to any entity other than the United States.

SEC. 225. PROHIBITION ON DISPOSAL OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS LANDS AND IMPROVEMENTS AT WEST LOS ANGELES MEDICAL CENTER, CALIFORNIA. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may not convey, exchange, trade, auction, transfer, or otherwise permit the disposal of any property of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or any property acquired by the Department, located at or related to the West Los Angeles Medical Center, unless that person has disclosed to the Secretary that the property has not been used for a purpose for which Federal funds were provided.

(b) SPECIAL PROVISION REGARDING LEASE WITH REPRESENTATIVE OF THE HOMELESS.—Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, section 421(b)(2) of the Veterans Benefits and Services Act of 1988 (38 U.S.C. 17203(b)(2)), as amended, is amended—

(1) by inserting “or section 225(a) of the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008,” after “section 421(b)(2) of the Veterans’ Benefits and Services Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–322; 102 Stat. 533)”, and

(2) by striking “such section” and inserting “such sections”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section, including the amendment made by this section, shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2008 and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 226. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a quarterly report on the financial status of the Veterans Health Administration.

SEC. 227. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement any policy prohibiting the Directors of the Veterans Integrated Service Networks from conducting outreach or marketing to enroll new veterans within their respective Networks.

SEC. 228. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement any policy prohibiting the Directors of the Veterans Integrated Service Networks from conducting outreach or marketing to enroll new veterans within their respective Networks.

SEC. 229. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a quarterly report on the financial status of the Veterans Health Administration.

SEC. 230. Amounts made available under the “Medical services”, “Medical Administration", “Medical facilities”, “General operating expenses", and “National Cemetery Administration” accounts for fiscal year 2008, may be transferred to or from the “Information technology systems” account, funds made available for fiscal year 2008, in this or any other Act, may be transferred to the “Compensation and pensions”, “National Cemetery Administration”, and “Office of Inspector General” accounts to the “Medical services” account: Provided, That before a transfer may take place, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall request from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued.
Title III

Related Agencies

American Battle Monuments Commission

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for the payment of expenses of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one-for-one replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $7,500 for official reception and representation expenses; and insurance of official motor vehicles and foreign countries, when required by law of such countries, $45,600,000, to remain available until expended.

Foreign Currency Fluctuations

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for the payment of necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for the operation of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, $11,000,000, to remain available until expended, for purposes authorized by section 2209 of title 36, United States Code.

United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers’ and Airmen’s Home National Cemeteries, including the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $21,865,000, to remain available until expended. In addition, such sums as may be necessary for parking maintenance, repairs and replacement, to be derived from the Lease of Department of Interior, Departmental Real Property to Defense Agencies account.

Parks appropriated under this Act may be provided to Arlington County, Virginia, for the additional use of the federal burial grounds at Arlington National Cemetery making additional land available for ground burials.

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

Trust Fund

For expenses necessary at the Armed Forces Retirement Home to operate and maintain the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Washington, District of Columbia and the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Toledo, to be paid from funds available in the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund, $55,724,000.

General Fund Payment, Armed Forces Retirement Home

For payment of the “The Armed Forces Retirement Home”, $5,900,000, to remain available until expended.
ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 301. None of the funds in this title under the heading ‘‘American Battle Monuments Commission’’ shall be available for the Capital Security Costs Sharing program.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly provided therein.

SEC. 402. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2008 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 403. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any program, project, or activity made known to the appropriate Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that the program, project, or activity is not in compliance with any Federal law relating to risk assessment, the protection of private property rights, or unfunded mandates.

SEC. 404. No part of any funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the executive branch, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, and for the preparation or use of any kind of filament, booklet, publication, radio, television or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress, except in presentations made by Congress itself.

SEC. 405. All departments and agencies funded under this Act are encouraged, within the limits of the existing statutory authorities and funding levels, to expand their use of ‘‘E-Commerce’’ technologies and procedures in the conduct of their business practices and public service activities.

SEC. 406. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government except pursuant to a transfer made by, or at the direction of, the President under this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 407. Unless stated otherwise, all reports and notifications required by this Act shall be submitted to the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 408. (a) ASSIGNMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH CARE SERVICES FOR FEMALE SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an assessment of the adequacy of the mental health care services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense to female members of the Armed Forces and female veterans to meet the mental health care needs of such members and veterans.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than September 1, 2008, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committees referred to in subsection (a) a report on the assessment required by subsection (a).

SEC. 409. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to enter into a contract in an amount greater than $5,000,000 or to award a grant in excess of such amount unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that the contractor or grantee has filed all Federal tax returns required during the three years preceding the certification, and has not been convicted of a criminal offense under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and has not been notified of any unpaid Federal tax assessment for which the liability has not been satisfied unless the assessment is the subject of an installment agreement or offer in compromise that has been approved by the Internal Revenue Service and is not in default. If a contract is the subject of a non-frivolous administrative or judicial appeal.

SEC. 410. (a) In this section:

(1) the term ‘‘City’’ means the City of Aurora, Colorado;

(2) the term ‘‘deed’’ means the quitclaim deed—

(A) conveyed by the Secretary to the City; and

(B) dated May 24, 1999;

(3) the term ‘‘Federal land’’ means—

(A) parcel 1 of the Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado; and

(B) the parcel of land described in the deed.

(4) the term ‘‘Secretary’’ means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b)(1) In accordance with paragraph (2), and subject to each term and condition required by paragraph (3) the Secretary may convey to the United States the non-Federal land to be used by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for the construction of a veterans medical facility, the Secretary may execute such instruments as determined by the Secretary to be necessary to modify or release any condition under which the non-Federal land would revert to the United States.

(2) In carrying out paragraph (1), with respect to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall alter—

(A) each provision of the deed relating to a reversionary interest of the United States; and

(B) any other reversionary interest of the United States.

To authorize the use of the property to include use as a veteran’s facility in addition to use for recreational purposes.

(3) The Secretary shall carry out paragraph (1) subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 411. For an additional amount $100,000,000, with $50,000,000 each to the Cities of Denver, Colorado, and St. Paul, Minnesota, shall be available to the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice for law enforcement entities for security and related costs, including overtime, associated with the Democratic National Convention and Republican National Convention in 2008. The Department of Homeland Security shall provide for an audit of all amounts made available under this section, including expenditures by State and local law enforcement entities. Amounts provided by this section are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 204 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

SEC. 412. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for any action that is related to or proceeds from the expansion of or purchase of the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site, Colorado. This Act may be cited as the ‘‘Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008.’’

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. OBAMA

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. Speaker, I offer the motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The motion is as follows: Motion offered by Mr. OBERY.

Mr. Obama moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment with three House amendments.

The text of House amendment No. 1 to the Senate amendment is as follows:

The non-privileged engrossed amendment, strike lines 1 through 3 and insert the following:

TITLE IX—DEFENSE MATTERS

CHAPTER 1—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ‘‘Military Personnel, Navy’’, $11,807,655,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ‘‘Military Personnel, Navy’’, $866,753,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ‘‘Military Personnel, Marine Corps’’, $1,820,571,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ‘‘Reserve Personnel, Air Force’’, $304,200,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ‘‘Reserve Personnel, Air Force’’, $372,500,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ‘‘Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps’’, $15,720,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ‘‘Reserve Personnel, Air Force’’, $5,000,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ‘‘National Guard Personnel, Army’’, $2,432,512,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ‘‘National Guard Personnel, Air Force’’, $4,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ‘‘Operation and Maintenance, Army’’, $15,343,512,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ‘‘Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide’’, $3,387,562,000, of which—

(1) not to exceed $800,000,000, to remain available until expended, may be used for payments to reimburse key cooperating nations, for logistical, military, and other support provided to United States military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan; Provided further, That these funds may be used for the purpose of providing specialized equipment and support for United States military missions and special equipment and providing such supplies and loaning such equipment on a non-reimbursable basis to coalition forces supporting United States military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan; Provided further, That such payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretaries of State and the Treasury, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, in his discretion, based on documentation determined by the Secretary of Defense to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Secretary of State, and in con- formity to the appropriate congressional committees; Provided further, That the Secretary
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of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph: Provided further, That of the amount available under this heading for the Defense Contract Management Agency, $52,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2009.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY Reserve

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve”, $164,839,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY Reserve

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve”, $198,976,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS Reserve

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve”, $70,256,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE Reserve

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve”, $185,994,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY Reserve

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve”, $1,085,644,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard”, $287,369,000.

IRAQ FREEDOM FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Iraq Freedom Fund”, $56,000,000, to remain available for transfer until September 30, 2009, notwithstanding any other provision of law, only for the development of the Iraqi industrial sector by identifying, and providing assistance to, factories and other industrial facilities that are best situated to resume operations quickly and reemploy the Iraqi workforce: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees summarizing the details of the transfer of funds from this appropriation.

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Aircraft Procurement, Army”, $304,945,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2010.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Missile Procurement, Army”, $1,060,167,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2010.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army”, $5,393,471,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2010.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Army”, $394,111,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2010.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Navy”, $66,943,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2010.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Marine Corps”, $750,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2010.

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For an additional amount for “Defense Working Capital Funds”, $1,837,450,000, to remain available for obligation until expended.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE


DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for “Defense Health Program”, $1,363,864,000, of which...
$907,064,000 shall be for operation and maintenance; of which $91,900,000 is for procurement to remain available until September 30, 2010; of which $849,000,000 shall be for research, development, test and evaluation; $65,171,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009; Provided, That in addition to amounts otherwise contained in this paragraph, $75,000,000 is hereby authorized for the Department of Defense to transfer to the "Defense Health Program" for operation and maintenance for psychological health and traumatic brain injury, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9101. Appropriations provided in this chapter shall be available for obligation until September 30, 2009, unless otherwise provided in this chapter.

SEC. 9102. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts made available under this chapter are in addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2008.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 9105. During fiscal year 2008, the Secretary of Defense may transfer not to exceed $1,026,841,000 may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for operation and maintenance in this chapter for support under any other provision of law.

SEC. 9107. Amounts provided in this chapter for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan may be used by the Department of Defense for the purchase of up to 20 heavy and lightly armored vehicles for force protection purposes, notwithstanding price or other limitations specified elsewhere in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-161), or any other provision of law: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, $200,000,000, to remain available until expended, may be used for the purchase of 21 vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $250,000 per vehicle: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall report to the Congress all transfers made pursuant to this authority.

SEC. 9108. Section 562(c) of Public Law 110-161 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(4) Upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred under paragraph (1) are not necessary to accomplish the purposes specified in such paragraph, such amounts may be transferred back to the "Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund":"

SEC. 9109. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $150,000,000 of the funds made available in this chapter may be obligated to conduct or support a program to build the capacity of a foreign country's national military forces in order for that country to conduct counterterrorism operations or participate in or support military and stability operations in which the U.S. Armed Forces are a participant: Provided, That funds available pursuant to the authority in this section shall be subject to the same restrictions, limitations, and reporting requirements as required by section 1206 of Public Law 109-183 as amended.

CHAPTER 2—BRIDGE FUND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 9105. During fiscal year 2008, the Secretary of Defense may transfer not to exceed $6,500,000 of the amounts in or credited to the Defense Cooperation Account, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2008, to such appropriations or funds of the Department of Defense as the Secretary shall determine for use consistent with the purposes for which such funds were contributed and accepted: Provided, That such amounts shall be available for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the Secretary shall determine for use consistent with the purposes for which such funds were contributed and accepted: Provided, That such amounts shall be available for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 9106. Of the amount appropriated by this chapter under the heading "Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense," not to exceed $20,000,000 may be used for the provision of support for counter-drug activities of the Governments of Afghanistan, Pakistan, Tajikistan, and Turkmenistan, as specified in section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85), as amended by Public Laws 106-398, 107-136, 107-186, and 110-181: Provided, That such support shall be in addition to support provided under any other provision of law.

SEC. 9107. Amounts provided in this chapter for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan may be used by the Department of Defense for the purchase of up to 20 heavy and lightly armored vehicles for force protection purposes, notwithstanding price or other limitations specified elsewhere in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-161), or any other provision of law: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, $200,000,000, to remain available until expended, may be used for the purchase of 21 vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $250,000 per vehicle: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph.

That these funds may be used for the purpose of providing specialized training and procuring supplies and specialized equipment and providing such supplies and loaning such equipment on a nonreimbursable basis to countries supporting United States military operations, notwithstanding any other provision of law: Provided, That these funds may be used for the purpose of providing specialized training and procuring supplies and specialized equipment and providing such supplies and loaning such equipment on a nonreimbursable basis to countries supporting United States military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan: Provided further, That such payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, in his discretion, based on documentation determined by the Secretary of Defense to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the concurrence of the Secretaries of the three military departments and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and 30 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees.

That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMED FORCES

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve", $79,291,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY Reserve

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve", $14,490,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS Reserve

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve", $47,076,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE Reserve

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve", $12,376,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY Reserve

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve", $79,291,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY Reserve

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve", $47,076,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS Reserve

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve", $47,076,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE Reserve

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve", $12,376,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY Reserve

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve", $79,291,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY Reserve

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve", $14,490,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS Reserve

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve", $47,076,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE Reserve

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve", $12,376,000.
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard”, $52,667,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND
For an additional amount for “Afghanistan Security Forces Fund”, $2,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

IRAQ SECURITY FORCES FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)
For an additional amount for “Iraqi Security Forces Fund”, $1,009,050,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard”, $1,009,050,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2011.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Navy”, $27,948,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2011.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS
For an additional amount for “Procurement, Marine Corps”, $656,425,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2011.

PROCUREMENT, AIRCRAFT
For an additional amount for “Aircraft Procurement, Air Force”, $201,842,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2011.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE
For an additional amount for “Procurement, Defense-Wide”, $177,237,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2011.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION
For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy”, $113,228,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE
For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force”, $72,041,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE
For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide”, $202,559,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM
For an additional amount for “Defense Health Program”, $1,100,000,000 for operation and maintenance.

DRUG INTERDICT AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)
For an additional amount for “Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense”, $188,000,000.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFRAULT FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)
For an additional amount for “Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund”, $2,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE
For an additional amount for “Aircraft Procurement, Air Force”, $201,842,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2011.

PROCUREMENT, AIRCRAFT
For an additional amount for “Aircraft Procurement, Air Force”, $201,842,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2011.
(D) A description of all militias operating in Iraq, including the number, size, equipment strength, military effectiveness, sources of support, legal status, and efforts to disintegrate such militias.

(E) Key indicators of economic activity that should be considered the most important for determining the prospects of stability in Iraq, including:
(i) unemployment levels;
(ii) electricity, water, and oil production rates;
(iii) hunger and poverty levels.

(F) The most recent annual budget for the Government of Iraq, including a description of the composition of government revenues and expenditures, including revenue from oil; the structure of the budget by ministry, sector, and project basis; and the success rates of such instructions.

(G) The number of Iraqi police who have received field training by international police trainers and the duration of such instruction;

(H) The effectiveness of the Iraqi military and police trainer cadre and chain of command.

(I) The number of United States and coalition advisors needed to support the Iraqi security forces and associated ministries.

(J) An assessment, in a classified annex if necessary, of the military effectiveness of other Ministry of Defense forces and the extent to which in-country equipment is being used by such forces.

(K) The effectiveness of the Iraqi military and police and other Ministry of Interior Forces in provinces where the United States has formally transferred responsibility for security of the province to the Iraqi Security Forces under the Provincial Iraqi Control (PIC) process.

(L) The level and effectiveness of the Iraqi Security Forces under the PIC process.

(M) The rates of absenteeism in the Iraqi security forces, including planned force rotations, and the milestones and nontactical time table for achieving these goals.

(N) The readiness status of the Iraqi military forces, including the type, number, size, and organizational structure of Iraqi battalions that are:
(i) capable of conducting counterinsurgency operations independently without any support from Coalition Forces;
(ii) capable of conducting counterinsurgency operations with the support of United States or coalition forces; or
(iii) not ready to conduct counterinsurgency operations.

(O) The number of Iraqi battalions in the Iraq Army currently conducting operations and the type of operations being conducted.

(P) The rates of absenteeism in the Iraqi military forces, including the type, number, size, and organizational structure of battalions in which insurgents have infiltrated such forces.

(Q) The training provided Iraqi police and other Ministry of Interior forces and the equipment used by such forces.

(R) The level and effectiveness of the Iraq Security Forces under the Ministry of Defense in provinces where the United States has formally transferred responsibility for the security of the province to the Iraqi Security Forces under the Provincial Iraqi Control (PIC) process.

(S) Key indicators of economic activity that should be considered the most important for determining the prospects of stability in Iraq, including:
(i) unemployment levels;
(ii) electricity, water, and oil production rates;
(iii) hunger and poverty levels.

(T) The most recent annual budget for the Government of Iraq, including a description of the composition of government revenues and expenditures, including revenue from oil; the structure of the budget by ministry, sector, and project basis; and the success rates of such instructions.

(U) The number of Iraqi police who have received field training by international police trainers and the duration of such instruction;

(V) The effectiveness of the Iraqi military and police trainer cadre and chain of command.

(W) The number of United States and coalition advisors needed to support the Iraqi security forces and associated ministries.

(X) An assessment, in a classified annex if necessary, of the military effectiveness of other Ministry of Defense forces and the extent to which in-country equipment is being used by such forces.

(Y) The effectiveness of the Iraqi military and police and other Ministry of Interior Forces in provinces where the United States has formally transferred responsibility for security of the province to the Iraqi Security Forces under the Provincial Iraqi Control (PIC) process.

(Z) The level and effectiveness of the Iraqi Security Forces under the PIC process.

(AB) The rates of absenteeism in the Iraqi security forces, including planned force rotations, and the milestones and nontactical time table for achieving these goals.

(BC) The readiness status of the Iraqi military forces, including the type, number, size, and organizational structure of Iraqi battalions that are:
(i) capable of conducting counterinsurgency operations independently without any support from Coalition Forces;
(ii) capable of conducting counterinsurgency operations with the support of United States or coalition forces; or
(iii) not ready to conduct counterinsurgency operations.

(DD) The number of Iraqi battalions in the Iraq Army currently conducting operations and the type of operations being conducted.

(EF) The rates of absenteeism in the Iraqi military forces, including the type, number, size, and organizational structure of battalions in which insurgents have infiltrated such forces.

(GG) The training provided Iraqi police and other Ministry of Interior forces and the equipment used by such forces.

(HH) The level and effectiveness of the Iraq Security Forces under the Ministry of Defense in provinces where the United States has formally transferred responsibility for the security of the province to the Iraqi Security Forces under the Provincial Iraqi Control (PIC) process.

(III) Key indicators of economic activity that should be considered the most important for determining the prospects of stability in Iraq, including:
(i) unemployment levels;
(ii) electricity, water, and oil production rates;
(iii) hunger and poverty levels.

(JJ) The most recent annual budget for the Government of Iraq, including a description of the composition of government revenues and expenditures, including revenue from oil; the structure of the budget by ministry, sector, and project basis; and the success rates of such instructions.

(KK) The number of Iraqi police who have received field training by international police trainers and the duration of such instruction;

(LL) The effectiveness of the Iraqi military and police trainer cadre and chain of command.

(MM) The number of United States and coalition advisors needed to support the Iraqi security forces and associated ministries.

(PP) An assessment, in a classified annex if necessary, of the military effectiveness of other Ministry of Defense forces and the extent to which in-country equipment is being used by such forces.

(QQ) The effectiveness of the Iraqi military and police and other Ministry of Interior Forces in provinces where the United States has formally transferred responsibility for security of the province to the Iraqi Security Forces under the Provincial Iraqi Control (PIC) process.

(RR) The level and effectiveness of the Iraqi Security Forces under the PIC process.

(SS) The rates of absenteeism in the Iraqi security forces, including planned force rotations, and the milestones and nontactical time table for achieving these goals.

(TT) The readiness status of the Iraqi military forces, including the type, number, size, and organizational structure of Iraqi battalions that are:
(i) capable of conducting counterinsurgency operations independently without any support from Coalition Forces;
(ii) capable of conducting counterinsurgency operations with the support of United States or coalition forces; or
(iii) not ready to conduct counterinsurgency operations.

(UU) The number of Iraqi battalions in the Iraq Army currently conducting operations and the type of operations being conducted.

(VV) The rates of absenteeism in the Iraqi military forces, including the type, number, size, and organizational structure of battalions in which insurgents have infiltrated such forces.

(WW) The training provided Iraqi police and other Ministry of Interior forces and the equipment used by such forces.

(XX) The level and effectiveness of the Iraq Security Forces under the Ministry of Defense in provinces where the United States has formally transferred responsibility for the security of the province to the Iraqi Security Forces under the Provincial Iraqi Control (PIC) process.
deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414(a)(1)).

SEC. 9303. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the following laws enacted or regulations promulgated to implement the United Nations Convention Against Torture, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (done at New York on December 10, 1984):

(1) Section 2340A of title 18, United States Code.


(3) Sections 1002 and 1003 of the Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–148).

SEC. 9304. (a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Director of National Intelligence, shall jointly submit to Congress a report setting forth the global threat posed by al Qaeda and its affiliates, including an assessment of the threat posed in particular regions or countries.

(b) ELEMENTS OF STRATEGY.—The strategy set forth in the report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) An analysis of the global threat posed by al Qaeda and its affiliates, including an assessment of the threat posed in particular regions or countries.

(2) Recommendations regarding the distribution and deployment of United States military personnel and equipment to meet the threat and identified and described in paragraph (1) and:

(A) does not undermine the military readiness or homeland security of the United States;

(B) ensures adequate time between military deployments for rest and training; and

(C) does not require further extensions of military deployments to the extent practicable.

(c) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but shall include a classified annex.

SEC. 9305. None of the funds provided in this title may be used to finance programs or activities that increase in fiscal years 2007 or 2008 appropriations to the Department of Defense or to initiate a procurement or research, development, test and evaluation program without prior written notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 9306. Section 1002(c)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) is amended by striking "$362,159,000" and inserting "$435,259,000".

SEC. 9307. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this title may be obligated or expended to provide award fees to any defense contractor contrary to the provisions of section 814 of the National Defense Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 9308. (a) Of the funds made available for “Defense Health Program” in Public Law 110–28, $75,000,000 is rescinded.

(b) Of the funds available for “Joint Improved Explosive Device Defeat Fund” in Division L of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–161), $7,151,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 9309. Of the funds appropriated in the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans’ Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 110–28), which remain available for obligation under the “Iraq Freedom Fund”, $150,000,000 is only for the Joint Rapid Acquisition Cell, and $10,000,000 is only for the transportation of fallen service members.

SEC. 9310. Funds available in this title which are available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment unit cost of not more than $250,000: Provided. That upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that an investment unit cost of not more than $500,000 is only for the Joint Rapid Acquisition Cell, and $10,000,000 is only for the transportation of fallen service members.

The text of House amendment No. 2 to the Senate amendment is as follows:

Page 60 of the Senate engrossed amendment, after line 3, insert the following:

TITLE X—POLICY REGARDING OPERATIONS IN IRAQ

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING UNITED STATES DEPLOYMENT TO IRAQ

SEC. 10001. It is the sense of the Congress that the performance of United States military personnel should be commended, their courage and sacrifice have been exceptional, and when a United States service member's service should be recognized appropriately.

UNITS DEPLOYED FOR COMBAT TO BE FULLY MISSION CAPABLE

SEC. 10002. (a) The Congress finds that it is the policy of the Department of Defense that units should not be deployed for combat unless they are rated “fully mission capable”. (b) None of the funds made available in this title shall be used to deploy any unit of the Armed Forces to Iraq unless the President has certified to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate that the extension of a unit beyond 210 days within the previous 365 consecutive days and that a Marine Corps Reserve unit should not be deployed for combat if the unit has been deployed within the previous 210 days.

(c) Of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be obligated or expended to initiate the development of, or continue the development of, or execute any order that has the effect of deploying for Operation Iraqi Freedom of any unit of the Army, Army Reserve, or Marine National Guard if such unit has been deployed within the previous 365 consecutive days.

(d) Of the funds made available in this title shall not be used to deploy any unit of the Army, Army Reserve, or Marine National Guard beyond 365 days.

EQUIPMENT LIMITATION ON COMBAT DEPLOYMENTS

SEC. 10003. (a) The Congress finds that the equipment policy of the Department of Defense that Army, Army Reserve, and National Guard units should not be deployed for combat beyond 365 days and that Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve units should be deployed for combat beyond 210 days.

(b) Of the funds made available in this title shall not be used to deploy any unit of the Army, Army Reserve, or Marine National Guard beyond 365 days.

(c) The limitation prescribed in subsection (b) shall not be construed to require force levels in Iraq to be decreased below the total United States force levels in Iraq as of January 9, 2007.

(d) The President may waive the limitations prescribed in subsection (b) on a unit-by-unit basis in which the President in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate certifies that the extension of a unit beyond the effective control of an element of the United States force levels in Iraq by the period applicable to the unit under such subsection is required for reasons of national security.

TWILIGHT TIME BETWEEN COMBAT DEPLOYMENTS

SEC. 10004. (a) The Congress finds that it is the policy of the Department of Defense that an Army, Army Reserve, or National Guard unit's early redeployment is necessary.

(b) None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be obligated or expended to deploy any unit of the Army, Army Reserve, or Marine Corps Reserve unit beyond 210 days.

(c) The limitation prescribed in subsection (b) shall not be construed to require force levels in Iraq to be decreased below the total United States force levels in Iraq as of January 9, 2007.

(d) The President may waive the limitations prescribed in subsection (b) on a unit-by-unit basis in which the President in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate certifies that the extension of a unit to Iraq in violation of the expiration of the period applicable to the unit under such subsection is required for reasons of national security.

LIMITATION ON INTERROGATION TECHNIQUES

SEC. 10005. (a) No individual in the custody or control of the Department of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps Reserve of the intelligence community or instrumentality thereof, regardless of nationality or
physical location, shall be subject to any treatment or technique of interrogation not authorized by the United States Army Field Manual on Human Intelligence Collector Operative Techniques.

(b) In this section, the term ‘instrumentality’, with respect to an element of the intelligence community, means a contractor or subcontractor at any tier of the element of the intelligence community.

REGISTRATION WITH THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

SEC. 10006. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to detain any individual who is in the custody or under the effective control of an element of the intelligence community or an instrumentality thereof unless the International Committee of the Red Cross is provided notification of the detention of and access to such person in a timely manner and consistent with the practices of the Armed Forces of the United States.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term ‘instrumentality’, with respect to an element of the intelligence community, means a contractor or subcontractor at any tier of the element of the intelligence community, or any other Act may be used to detain any individual who is in the custody or under the effective control of an element of the intelligence community or an instrumentality thereof unless the United States or any other government or faction in Iraq, or of any government or faction in Iraq, shall be considered to include security personnel at any tier of the element of the intelligence community.

PROHIBITION OF PERMANENT BASES IN IRAQ

SEC. 10007. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to plan or execute a safe and orderly redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq.

LIMITATION ON DEFENSE AGREEMENTS WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAQ

SEC. 10008. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act or any other Act may be obligated or expended by the United States Government for a purpose as follows:

(1) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq.

(2) To exercise United States control over any or all resource of Iraq.

(3) A description of any budget surplus or deficit, if applicable.

(a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to negotiate, enter into, implement any agreement with the Government of Iraq that includes security assurances for mutual defense, unless the agreement:

(1) Is in the form of a treaty requiring the advice and consent of the Senate (or is in force at the time of enactment of this Act, the President shall certify to the Committees on Appropriations on the details and terms of the agreement described in subsection (b)(1)); or

(2) Is specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) For purposes of this section, an agreement shall be considered to include security assurances for mutual defense if it includes provisions addressing any of the following:

(1) Commitments or obligations which may commit United States Armed Forces in defense of Iraq, or of any government or faction in Iraq, against any foreign or domestic threat.

(2) The number of United States Armed Forces personnel to be deployed to, or stationed in, Iraq.

(3) The mission of United States Armed Forces deployed to Iraq.

(4) The duration of the presence of United States Armed Forces in Iraq.

PROHIBITION ON AGREEMENTS SUBJECTING ARMED FORCES TO IRAQI CRIMINAL JURISDICTION

SEC. 10009. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to negotiate, enter into, or implement an agreement with the Government of Iraq that would subject members of the Armed Forces of the United States to the jurisdiction of any criminal courts or punishment under Iraqi law.

REQUIREMENT FOR MATCHING FUNDS FROM GOVERNMENT OF IRAQ

SEC. 10101. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act or any other Act for assistance for Iraq, including training, capacity building, and construction or mitigation or operations or defense activities; or

(b) Not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the President shall:

(1) complete an agreement with the Government of Iraq to subsidize fuel costs for United States Armed Forces operating in Iraq, the price of those fuel costs being equal to the discounted price per gallon at which the Government of Iraq is providing fuel for domestic Iraqi consumption; and

(2) transmit a report to the Committees on Appropriations on the details and terms of that agreement.

(c) No funds received from the Government of Iraq under an agreement described in subsection (b)(1) shall be credited to the appropriations or funds that incurred obligations for fuel costs being paid as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

TIMELINE FOR REDEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES FORCES FROM IRAQ

SEC. 10012. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to plan and execute a safe and orderly redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq.

(b) Within 30 days after enactment of this Act, the President shall commence an immediate and orderly redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq, with a goal of completing such redeployment within 18 months. The President shall ensure that such redeployment is conducted to begin such redeployment with units of the Armed Forces that have been deployed in excess of 180 days, except to the extent those units are needed to provide for the safe withdrawal of other units of the Armed Forces or to protect United States and coalition personnel and infrastructure.

(c) No funds obligated or expended until the agreement described in subsection (b)(1) shall be credited to the appropriations or funds that incurred obligations for assistance for refugees, internally displaced persons, and civilian victims of military operations.

(d) Assistance for refugees, internally displaced persons, and civilian victims of military operations; intelligence or intelligence-related activities; or

(e) Grants and cooperative agreements for programs to promote democracy and human rights; the Community Action Program and other direct assistance to non-governmental organizations; humanitarian demining; assistance for refugees, internally displaced persons, and civilian victims of military operations;

(f) The Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury shall certify to the Committees on Appropriations on the details and terms of the agreement described in subsection (b)(1), including:

(1) A description of the nature of the assistance provided by the Government of Iraq.

(2) The Community Action Program.

(3) A description of any budget surplus or deficit, if applicable.

(4) Assistance for refugees, internally displaced persons, and civilian victims of military operations;

(5) Intelligence or intelligence-related activities; or

(6) Projects with an estimated cost of less than $750,000 undertaken through the Community Action Program.

(e) Within 30 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations detailing the amount of funds provided by the Government of Iraq for assistance for Iraq, including training, capacity building, and construction or mitigation or operations or defense activities.

(f) Within 30 days after enactment of this Act, the President shall:

(1) Submit a report to the congressional defense committees concerning the reduction of United States Armed Forces from Iraq, with a goal of completing such reduction within 18 months. The President shall ensure that such reduction is conducted to begin such reduction with units of the Armed Forces that have been deployed in excess of 180 days, except to the extent those units are needed to provide for the safe withdrawal of other units of the Armed Forces or to protect United States and coalition personnel and infrastructure.

(2) Transmit a report to the Committees on Appropriations on the details and terms of the agreement described in subsection (b)(1) shall be credited to the appropriations or funds that incurred obligations for assistance for refugees, internally displaced persons, and civilian victims of military operations.

(3) Assistance for refugees, internally displaced persons, and civilian victims of military operations;

(4) Intelligence or intelligence-related activities; or

(5) Projects with an estimated cost of less than $750,000 undertaken through the Community Action Program.

(g) Within 30 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(1) The current plan for and the status of the reduction of United States Armed Forces in Iraq and the transition of the Armed Forces in Iraq to a limited presence whose missions do not exceed the missions specified in subsection (c), including the associated force reductions and adjustments and expectations with respect to time, and the force levels anticipated to perform those missions.

(2) A comprehensive current description of efforts to prepare for and implement the transition of United States Armed Forces in Iraq in accordance with this section and to limit

Washington Headquarters Services may be obligated or expended until the agreement described in subsection (b)(1) is complete and the report required by subsection (b)(2) has been submitted to the Committees on Appropriations on the details and terms of the agreement described in subsection (b)(1), including:

(1) A description of the reduction of United States Armed Forces in Iraq that is planned, including reports on year-to-year reductions of United States Armed Forces in Iraq that are to be equal to the reduction of United States Armed Forces in Iraq matches such assistance on a dollar-for-dollar basis with United States contributions on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

(2) An agreement with the Government of Iraq that will impact the training, equipping and other assistance provided for the Armed Forces of the United States to the jurisdiction of Iraq criminal law.

(3) A description of any budget surplus or deficit, if applicable.

(4) Assistance for refugees, internally displaced persons, and civilian victims of military operations;

(5) Intelligence or intelligence-related activities; or

(6) Projects with an estimated cost of less than $750,000 undertaken through the Community Action Program.

(h) Within 30 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(1) A description of the reduction of United States Armed Forces in Iraq and the transition of the Armed Forces in Iraq to a limited presence whose missions do not exceed the missions specified in subsection (c), including the associated force reductions and adjustments and expectations with respect to time, and the force levels anticipated to perform those missions.

(2) A comprehensive current description of efforts to prepare for and implement the transition of United States Armed Forces in Iraq in accordance with this section and to limit
any destabilizing consequences of such re-
duction and transition, including a descrip-
tion of efforts to work with the United Na-
tions and countries in the region toward that
objective.
(e) Not later than 45 days after enactment of
this Act, the Secretary of State shall pro-
vide to the Committees on Appropriations of
the House of Representatives and the Senate
a strategy for civilian-led post-conflict sta-
bilization and reconstruction assistance for
Iraq. The strategy (which may be provided in
classifiable form, if necessary) shall include—
(1) the plans and timetable for transfer of
all responsibility for United States post-con-
flict stabilization and reconstruction assistance
for the Department of Defense to the
Department of State and the United States
Agency for International Development; and
(2) the staff, security and resource require-
ments for United States diplomatic efforts
and assistance programs.
TITLE XI—REFORMS RELATED TO WAR
PROFITEERING AND CONTRACTORS
CHAPTER 1—ADJUSTMENT OF WARTIME
STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS
ADJUSTMENT OF WARTIME STATUTE OF
LIMITATIONS
SEC. 1101. Section 3237 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—
(1) by inserting ‘‘or Congress has enacted
a specific authorization for the use of the Armed
Forces, as described in section 5(b) of the
War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(b)) as
‘‘at war’’; and
(2) by inserting ‘‘or directly connected
with or related to the authorized use of the
Armed Forces’’ after ‘‘prosecution of the
war’’;
(3) by striking ‘‘three years’’ and inserting
‘‘5 years’’;
(4) by striking ‘‘proclaimed by the Presi-
dent’’ and inserting ‘‘proclaimed by a Presi-
dential proclamation, with notice to Con-
gress’’; and
(5) by adding at the end the following: ‘‘For
purposes of applying such definitions in this
section, the term ‘war’ includes a specific au-
thorization for the use of the Armed Forces,
as described in section 5(b) of the War Pow-
ers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(b)) as ‘‘at war’’.’’
CHAPTER 2—WAR PROFITEERING AND
FRAUD
WAR PROFITEERING AND FRAUD
SEC. 1201. (a) PROHIBITION ON WAR PROFIT-
TERING.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 47 of title 18,
United States Code, is amended by adding at
the end the following:
‘‘§ 1041. War profiteering and fraud
“(a) PROHIBITION.—Whoever, in any matter
involving a contract with, or the provision of
goods or services to, the United States or a
provisional authority, in connection with a
mission of the United States Government
overseas, knowingly—
“(1)(A) executes or attempts to execute a
scheme or artifice to defraud the United States
or that authority; or
“(B) materially and adversely overvalues
any good or service with the intent to defraud
the United States or that authority;
shall be fined not more than $1,000,000 or im-
prisoned not more than 10 years, or both.
“(b) EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION.—
There is extraterritorial Federal jurisdiction
over an offense under this section.
“(c) VENUE.—A prosecution for an offense
under this section may be brought—
“(1) as authorized by chapter 211 of this
title;
“(2) in any district where any act in fur-
therance of the offense took place; or
“(3) in any district where any party to the
contract or provider of goods or services is
located.
“(d) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sec-
tions for chapter 47 of this title is amended by
adding the following new section:
“1041. War profiteering and fraud.”
“(b) CRIMINAL FORFEITURE.—Section
982(a)(2)(B) of title 18, United States Code,
is amended by striking “or 1098” and inserting
“1098, or 1041”.
“(c) MONEY LAUNDERING.—Section
1966(c)(7)(D) of title 18, United States Code,
is amended by inserting “section 1041 (relating
to war profiteering and fraud)” after “liquid-
ating agent of financial institution”.
“(d) RICO.—Section 1961(3) of title 18,
United States Code, is amended by striking
“section 1041 (relating to war profiteering
and fraud)” and inserting “with connection
with access devices”.
CHAPTER 3—MILITARY
EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION
SHORT TITLE
SEC. 1301. This chapter may be cited as the
‘‘MEJA Expansion and Enforcement Act of
2008’’.
LEGAL STATUS OF CONTRACT PERSONNEL
SEC. 1302. (a) CLASSIFICATION OF MILITARY
EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION ACT.—
INCLUSION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND
CONTRACTORS.—Section 3261(a) of title 18,
United States Code, is amended by inserting
“(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “or” at
the end;
“(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the comma
at the end and inserting a semicolon;
and
“(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the fol-
lowing new paragraphs:
“(3) while employed by any Department or
agency of the United States other than the
Armed Forces in a foreign country in which
the Armed Forces are conducting a qualifi-
cy military operation; or
“(4) while employed as a security officer or
security contractor by any Department or
agency of the United States other than the
Armed Forces.”
DEFINITIONS.—Section 3267 of title 18,
United States Code, is amended—
(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subpara-
graph (A) and inserting the following new
subparagraph:
“(A) employed by or performing services
under a contract with or grant from the De-
partment of Defense, a non-appropriated fund
instrumentality of the Department” as—
“(i) a civilian employee (including an
employee from any other Executive agency
on temporary assignment to the Department of
Defense);
“(ii) a contractor (including a subcon-
tractor at any tier); or
“(iii) an employee of a contractor (includ-
ing a subcontractor at any tier);” and
(B) by adding at the end the following new
paragraphs:
“(5) The term ‘employed by any Depart-
ment or agency of the United States other
than the Armed Forces’ means—
“(A) employed by or performing services
under a contract with or grant from any De-
partment or agency of the United States, or
any provisional authority funded in whole or
substantial part or created by the United States
Government, other than the Department
of Defense as—
“(i) a civilian employee;
“(ii) a contractor (including a subcon-
tractor at any tier); or
“(iii) an employee of a contractor (includ-
ing a subcontractor at any tier); and
“(B) present or residing outside the United
States in connection with such employment;
and
“(C) not a national of or ordinarily a resi-
dent in the host nation.
“(6) The term ‘employed as a security of-
ficer or security contractor’ by any Depart-
ment or agency of the United States other
than the Armed Forces’ means—
“(A) employed by or performing services
under a contract with or grant from any De-
partment or agency of the United States, or
any provisional authority funded in whole or
substantial part or created by the United States
Government, other than the Department
of Defense as—
“(i) a civilian employee;
“(ii) a contractor (including a subcon-
tractor at any tier); or
“(iii) an employee of a contractor (includ-
ing a subcontractor at any tier);
“(B) authorized in the course of such em-
ployment—
“(i) to provide physical protection to or se-
curity for persons, places, buildings, facili-
ties, supplies, or means of transportation;
(ii) to carry or possess a firearm or dan-
gerous weapon, as defined by section 933(c)(2)
of this chapter;
“(iii) to use force against another; or
“(iv) to supervise individuals performing
the activities described in clause (1), (ii), or (iii);
“(C) present or residing outside the United
States in connection with such employment;
and
“(D) not a national of or ordinarily resi-
dent in the host nation.
“(7) The term ‘qualifying military oper-
ation’ means—
“(A) a military operation covered by a de-
claration of war or an authorization of the use
of military force by Congress;
“(B) a contingency operation (as defined in
section 101 of title 10);
“(C) any other military operation outside
of the United States, including a humani-
tarian assistance or peace keeping operation,
provided such operation is conducted pursu-
ance to an order from or approved by the Sec-
detary of Defense.”
(b) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE INSPECTOR
GENERAL REPORT.—
(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180
days after the date of the enactment of this
Act, the Inspector General of the Depart-
ment of Justice, in consultation with the In-
spectors General of the Department of De-
fense, the Department of State, the United
States Agency for International Develop-
ment, the Department of Agriculture, the
Department of Energy, and other appro-
priate Federal departments and agencies,
shall submit to Congress a report in accord-
ance with this subsection.
(2) CONTENT OF REPORT.—The report under
paragraph (1) shall include, for the period be-
ing on October 1, 2001, and ending on the
date of the report—
(A) unless the description pertains to non-
public information that relates to an ongo-
ing investigation or criminal or civil pro-
secution; a description of any al-
leged violations of section 3261 of title 18,
United States Code, reported to the Inspec-
tor Generals identified in paragraph (1) or
the Department of Justice—
(i) the date of the complaint and the type of
offense alleged;
(i) whether any investigation was opened or declined based on the complaint;  
(ii) whether the investigation was closed, and if so, when it was closed;  
(iii) the formal or civil case was filed as a result of the investigation, and if so, when it was filed; and  
(iv) any charges or complaints filed in those cases.

(b) Unless the description pertains to nonpublic information that relates to an ongoing investigation or criminal or civil proceeding conducted with appropriate safeguards for the protection of national security information, a description of any shooting or escalation of force incidents in Iraq or Afghanistan involving alleged conduct by persons employed as a security officer or security contractor by any Department or agency of the United States, and any official action taken against such persons.

(c) Form of Report.—The report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified or nonpublic form as appropriate.

INVESTIGATIVE UNITS FOR CONTRACTOR OVERSIGHT

SEC. 11303. (a) ESTABLISHMENT OF INVESTIGATIVE UNITS FOR CONTRACTOR OVERSIGHT—  

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the heads of any other Federal departments or agencies responsible for employing private security contractors or contractors at any tier in a foreign country where the Armed Forces are conducting a qualifying military operation—  

(A) shall assign adequate personnel and resources through the creation of Investigative Units for Contractor Oversight to investigate allegations of criminal violations under paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 3261(a) of title 18, United States Code (as amended by section 11302(a) of this chapter); and  

(B) may authorize the overseeing deployment of law enforcement agents and other Department of Justice personnel for that purpose.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit or extinguish any Federal law or otherwise available to the proper authorities.

(b) Provisions.—Upon conclusion of an investigation of an alleged violation of sections 3261(a)(3) and 3261(a)(4) of title 18, United States Code, an Investigative Unit for Contractor Oversight may refer such matter to the Attorney General for further action, as appropriate in the discretion of the Attorney General.

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL—  

(1) INVESTIGATION.—The Attorney General shall have the principal authority for the enforcement of sections 3261(a)(3) and 3261(a)(4) of title 18, United States Code, and shall have the authority to initiate, conduct, and supervise investigations of any violations of such sections 3261(a)(3) and 3261(a)(4).

(2) ASSISTANCE ON REQUEST OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any statute, rule, or regulation to the contrary, the Attorney General may request assistance from the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, or the head of any other Executive agency to enforce this chapter. This request may include the assignment of additional personnel and resources to an Investigative Unit for Contractor Oversight established by the Attorney General under section (a)(1).

(3) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, shall submit to Congress a report containing—  

(A) the number and location of Investigative Units for Contractor Oversight deployed to investigate violations of such sections 3261(a)(3) and 3261(a)(4) of title 18, United States Code, received, investigated, and referred for prosecution by Federal law enforcement authorities during the previous year;  

(B) the number and location of Investigative Units for Contractor Oversight deployed to investigate violations of such sections 3261(a)(3) and 3261(a)(4) during the previous year; and  

(C) any recommended changes to Federal law that the Attorney General considers necessary to enforce this chapter and the amendments made by this chapter and chapter 212 of title 18, United States Code.

REMOVAL PROCEDURES FOR NON-DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EMPLOYEES AND CONTRACTORS

SEC. 11304. (a) ATTORNEY GENERAL REGULATIONS.—Section 3269 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) The Attorney General, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of National Intelligence, may prescribe regulations governing the investigation, apprehension, detainment, delivery, and removal of persons described in section 3261(a)(3) and 3261(a)(4) and describing the notice due, if any, to any foreign nationals potentially subject to the criminal jurisdiction of the United States under those sections.

(b) CLARIFYING AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 212 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—  

(A) in section 3261(a)—  

(i) by inserting "against the United States" after "offense" the first time it appears; and  

(ii) by inserting "within the United States" after "had been engaged in";  

(B) in section 3262—  

(i) in subsection (a), by striking "section 3261(a)" the first place it appears and inserting "section 3261(a)(1) or 3261(a)(2)";  

(ii) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and  

(iii) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (b):  

"(b) The Attorney General may designate and authorize any person serving in a law enforcement position in the Department of Justice, the Department of Defense, the Department of State, or any other Executive agency to arrest, in accordance with applicable international agreements, outside the United States any person described in section 3261(a) if there is probable cause to believe that such person violated section 3261(a)."

(C) in section 3263(a), by striking "section 3261(a)" the first place it appears and inserting "section 3261(a)(1) or 3261(a)(2)";  

(D) in section 3264(a), by inserting "section 3261(a)(3) and 3261(a)(4)" after "section 3261(a)";  

(E) in section 3265(a)(1) by inserting "section 3261(a)(1) or 3261(a)(2)" after "section 3261(a)"; and  

(F) in section 3265(a)(2) by inserting "section 3261(a)(1) or 3261(a)(2)" after "section 3261(a)".

(2) ADDITIONAL AMENDMENT.—Section 709 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "section 3261(a)" and inserting "section 3261(a)(1) or 3261(a)(2)".

RULES OF CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 11305. (a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this chapter shall apply to authorized and otherwise lawful intelligence activities carried out by or at the direction of the United States.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or extinguish any defense or protection otherwise available to any person or entity from suit, civil or criminal liability, or damages, or to provide immunity from prosecution for any criminal offense by the proper authorities.

(c) EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION.—Nothing in this chapter or the amendments made by this chapter shall be construed to limit or affect the extraterritorial jurisdiction related to any Federal statute not amended by this chapter.

DEFINITION

SEC. 11306. For purposes of this chapter and the amendments made by this chapter, the term "Executive agency" has the meaning given in section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11307. (a) IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVENESS.—The provisions of this chapter shall enter into effect immediately upon the enactment of this Act.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Attorney General and the head of any other Federal department or agency to which this chapter applies shall have the authority to prescribe regulations giving effect to the provisions of this Act to ensure compliance with the provisions of this chapter.

The text of House amendment No. 3 to the Senate amendment is as follows:

Page 1 of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike line 1 and all that follows through the end of line 21 on page 59, and insert the following:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, AND OTHER SECURITY-RELATED MATTERS

CHAPTER 1—AGRICULTURE

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE II GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Public Law 480 Title II Grants", $850,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

For an additional amount for "Public Law 480 "Title II Grants", $350,000,000, to become available on October 1, 2008, and to remain available until September 30, 2009.

CHAPTER 2—COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Office of Inspector General", $1,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "SALARIES AND EXPENSES, General Legal Activities", $1,668,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For an additional amount for "SALARIES AND EXPENSES, United States Attorneys", $5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "SALARIES AND EXPENSES", $18,621,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.
For an additional amount for "Military Construction, Army", $1,432,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, \(\text{10 U.S.C. 2687 note}\), $1,354,634,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated and expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law: Provided further, That of the funds provided, \$982,000,000 shall be for medical treatment facilities construction (including planning and design) and shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

For an additional amount for "Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps", \$1,769,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated and expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 2005

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2901-2908), \$354,634,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated and expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

For an additional amount for "General Operating Expenses", \$20,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS

For an additional amount for "Information Technology Systems", \$20,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

GENERAL PROVISION, THIS CHAPTER Sec. 1301. None of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to terminate, reorganize, or relocate the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology until the President has established, as required by section 722 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181, 122 Stat. 199; 10 U.S.C. 176 note), a joint Pathology Center.

CHAPTER 4—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND FOREIGN OPERATIONS

SUBCHAPTER A—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Diplomatic and Consular Programs", \$1,606,808,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, of which not more than \$440,000,000 may be made available for assistance for Jordan to meet the needs of Iraqi refugees, and up to \$50,000,000 may be available for energy-related assistance for North Korea, notwithstanding any other provision of law: Provided, That of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for assistance for the West Bank and none of such funds shall be for cash transfer assistance: Provided further, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for assistance to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction for reconstruction oversight.

EMBASSY SECURITY, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE

For an additional amount for "Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance", \$76,700,000, to remain available until expended, for facilities in Afghanistan.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For an additional amount for "Contributions to International Organizations", \$200,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

For an additional amount for "Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development", \$1,606,808,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, \(\text{P.L.} 105–277\), $200,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

For an additional amount for "Economic Support Fund", \$1,747,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, of which not more than \$440,000,000 may be made available for assistance for Jordan to meet the needs of Iraqi refugees, and up to \$50,000,000 may be available for energy-related assistance for North Korea, notwithstanding any other provision of law: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for assistance for the West Bank and none of such funds shall be for cash transfer assistance: Provided further, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall not be available for assistance for the President has established, as required by section 421 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181, 122 Stat. 199; 10 U.S.C. 176 note), a joint Pathology Center.

CHAPTER 4—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND FOREIGN OPERATIONS

SUBCHAPTER A—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Diplomatic and Consular Programs", \$1,606,808,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, of which not more than \$440,000,000 may be made available for assistance for Jordan to meet the needs of Iraqi refugees, and up to \$50,000,000 may be available for energy-related assistance for North Korea, notwithstanding any other provision of law: Provided, That of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for assistance for the West Bank and none of such funds shall be for cash transfer assistance: Provided further, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall not be available for assistance for the
North Korea may be made available to support the goals of the Six Party Talks Agreements after the Secretary of State determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that North Korea is continuing to fulfill its commitments under such agreements.

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

**DEMOCRACY FUND**

For an additional amount for ‘‘Democracy Fund’’, $200,000,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2009, for democracy programs in Iraq.

**INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT**

For an additional amount for ‘‘International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement’’, $199,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: Provided, That not more than $29,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this subchapter shall be made available for security assistance for the West Bank.

**MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE**

For an additional amount for ‘‘Migration and Refugee Assistance’’, $300,000,000, to remain available until expended.

**UNITED STATES EMERGENCY REFUGEE AND MIGRATION ASSISTANCE FUND**

For an additional amount for ‘‘United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund’’, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

**NONPROLIFERATION, ANTI-TELECOM, DEMINCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS**

For an additional amount for ‘‘Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs’’, $11,200,000, to remain available until expended.

**MILITARY ASSISTANCE**

**FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAMS**

For an additional amount for ‘‘Foreign Military Financing Program’’, $72,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, of which up to $66,500,000 shall be made available for assistance for Mexico.

**SUBCHAPTER B—BRIDGE FUND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009**

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

**ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS**

For an additional amount for ‘‘Diplomatic and Consular Programs’’, $737,900,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2008 and remain available through September 30, 2009: Provided, That funds become available under this heading, $76,400,000 is for worldwide security protection and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That not more than $81,500,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for diplomatic operations in Iraq.

**OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

**(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)**

For an additional amount for ‘‘Office of Inspector General’’, $37,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2008 and remain available through September 30, 2009: Provided, That $46,500,000 shall be transferred to the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction for reconstruction oversight and up to $3,000,000 shall be transferred to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction for reconstruction oversight.

**EMBASSY SECURITY, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE**

For an additional amount for ‘‘Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance’’, $41,300,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2008 and remain available until expended, for facilities in Afghanistan.

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

**CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

For an additional amount for ‘‘Contributions to International Organizations’’, $75,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2008 and remain available through September 30, 2009.

**CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES**

For an additional amount for ‘‘Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities’’, $150,500,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2008 and remain available through September 30, 2009.

**BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

**INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS**

For an additional amount for ‘‘International Broadcasting Operations’’, $8,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2008 and remain available through September 30, 2009.

**BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE**

**FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES**

For an additional amount for ‘‘Development Assistance’’, $200,000,000, for assistance for developing countries to address the international food crisis notwithstanding any other provision of law, which shall become available on October 1, 2008 and remain available through September 30, 2010: Provided, That such assistance should be carried out consistent with the purposes of section 103(a)(1) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1961: Provided further, That not more than $50,000,000 should be made available for local or regional purchase and distribution of food: Provided further, That the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations not later than 45 days after enactment of this Act, a report including a list of those countries facing significant food shortages.

**INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE**

For an additional amount for ‘‘International Disaster Assistance’’, $280,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2008 and remain available until expended.

**OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY TO THE UNITED NATIONS**

For an additional amount for ‘‘Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development’’, $95,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2008 and remain available through September 30, 2009.

**OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY TO THE UNITED NATIONS**

For an additional amount for ‘‘Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development’’, $95,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2008 and remain available through September 30, 2009.

**INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT**

For an additional amount for ‘‘International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement’’, $294,500,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2008 and remain available through September 30, 2009: Provided, That not more than $50,000,000 of the funds made available by this subchapter shall be made available for assistance for North Korea, notwithstanding any other provision of law: Provided, That not more than $10,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading in this subchapter shall be made available for assistance for the West Bank.

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

**INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT**

For an additional amount for ‘‘International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement’’, $294,500,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2008 and remain available until expended.

**NONPROLIFERATION, ANTI-TELECOM, DEMINCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS**

For an additional amount for ‘‘Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs’’, $4,500,000, for humanitarian demining assistance for Iraq, which shall become available on October 1, 2008 and remain available through September 30, 2009.

**MILITARY ASSISTANCE**

**FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAMS**

For an additional amount for ‘‘Foreign Military Financing Program’’, $170,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2008 and remain available through September 30, 2009, of which $100,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for Jordan and up to $50,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for Mexico: Provided, That section 382(c) of title III, chapter 8 of Public Law 110-28 shall apply to funds made available under this heading for assistance for Lebanon.

**PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS**

For an additional amount for ‘‘Peacekeeping Operations’’, $85,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2008 and remain available through September 30, 2009.

**SUBCHAPTER C—GENERAL PROVISIONS, THIS CHAPTER**

**EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES**


**AFGHANISTAN**

Sec. 1402 (a) ASSISTANCE FOR WOMEN AND GIRLS—Funds appropriated by this chapter under the heading ‘‘Economic Support Fund’’ that are available for assistance for Afghanistan shall be made available, to the maximum extent practicable, through local Afghan provincial and municipal governments and Afghan civic society organizations and in a manner that emphasizes the participation of Afghan women and girls.

Sec. 1402 (b) ASSISTANCE FOR WOMEN AND GIRLS—Funds appropriated by this chapter under the heading ‘‘Economic Support Fund’’ that are available for assistance for Afghanistan shall be made available, to the maximum extent practicable, through local Afghan provincial and municipal governments and Afghan civic society organizations and in a manner that emphasizes the participation of Afghan women and girls.
b) Higher Education.—Of the funds appropriated by this chapter under the heading “Economic Support Fund” that are made available for education programs in Afghanistan, 20 percent shall be made available to support higher education and vocational training programs in law, accounting, engineering, public administration, and other disciplines necessary to build the country, in which the participation of women is emphasized.

c) Civilian Assistance.—Of the funds appropriated by this chapter under the heading “Economic Support Fund” that are available for assistance for Afghanistan, not less than $2,000,000 shall be made available to the United States contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization/International Security Assistance Force Post-Operations Humanitarian Relief Fund.

(d) Anticorruption.—Not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall:

1. submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations on actions being taken by the Government of Afghanistan to combat corruption within the national and provincial governments and the protection of freedom of expression, rule of law activities, and the protection of freedom of expression, and the ability of state and municipal police forces for eligibility to receive assistance under this section.

2. submit a list to the Committees on Appropriations that effective mechanisms are in place to ensure that assistance to national government ministries and provincial governments will be properly accounted for.

3. submit a list to the Committees on Appropriations on actions being taken by the United States for the training of Palestinian security forces, including detailed descriptions of the training, curriculum, and equipment provided; an assessment of the training and the performance of forces after training has been completed; and a description of the assistance that has been pledged and provided to Palestinian security forces by other donors: Provided, That not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall report to the Committees on Appropriations, in classified form if necessary, on the security strategy of the Palestinian Authority.

MEXICO

SEC. 1403. Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations a report, in classified form if necessary, detailing the procedures used to vet Mexican armed forces and police forces for eligibility to receive assistance under this section.

(b) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—(i) Provided further, That none of the funds made available for assistance to Mexico by this chapter shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations and section 504 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2394-1).

(ii) Provided further, That not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter until September 30, 2010, the Secretary of State shall consult with Mexican officials to ensure that the Mexican armed forces and police forces are cooperating with civilian prosecutors and judicial authorities in investigating and prosecuting officials who have committed corruption acts; and

(iii) Provided further, That not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a list to the Committees on Appropriations of a detailed spending plan for funds appropriated or otherwise made available for Mexico by this chapter, which shall include a strategy for combating drug trafficking and related violent crime, and for judicial reform, institution building, and rule of law activities, with concrete goals, actions to be taken, budget proposals, and anticipated results.

SEC. 1405. (a) Assistance for the Countries of Central America.—Of the funds appropriated in subchapter A under the headings “International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement”, “Economic Support Fund”, “Foreign Military Financing Program”, “Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining and Related Programs”, and “Economic Support Fund”, $61,500,000 shall be made available for assistance for the countries of Central America, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic only to combat drug trafficking and related violent crime, and for judicial reform, institution building, rule of law activities, and maritime security: Provided, That of the funds appropriated under the heading “Economic Support Fund”, $3,500,000 shall be available through the United States Agency for International Development for an Economic and Social Development Fund for the countries of Central America: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated under the heading “International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement”, $2,500,000 shall be made available for assistance for Haiti and $2,500,000 shall be made available for assistance for the Dominican Republic: Provided further, That none of the funds shall be used to finance not more than 30 percent of the costs of construction or operation of new prisons.

(b) Allocation of funds.—(I) Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated under the headings “International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement”, “Foreign Military Financing Program” in subchapter A of this chapter shall be used for assistance for any project unless the Secretary of State for which the funds are made available is able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Committees on Appropriations that the project is consistent with the strategy established by the Secretary of State required in paragraph (2).
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goals, actions to be taken, budget proposals, and rule of law activities, with concrete funds appropriated or otherwise made available until September 30, 2008. Any funds transferred pursuant to this paragraph may be exercised only with respect to funds appropriated under the headings “International Disaster Assistance”, “Migration and Refugee Assistance”, and “United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund”.

(c) Notification.—Funds made available in this chapter shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations and section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

TITLE II—DOMESTIC MATTERS

CHAPTER 1—COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

PERIODIC CENSUSES AND PROGRAMS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Periodic Censuses and Programs”, $210,000,000, to remain available until expended, for necessary expenses related to the 2010 Decennial Census: Provided, That not less than $3,000,000 shall be transferred to the “Office of Inspector General” at the Department of Commerce for necessary expenses associated with oversight activities of the 2010 Decennial Census: Provided further, That not less than $1,000,000 shall be used in a reimbursable agreement with the Defense Contract Management Agency to provide continuing contract management oversight of the 2010 Decennial Census.
CHAPTER 2—ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL
CONSTRUCTION
For an additional amount for “Construction,” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricane Katrina and other hurricanes of the 2005 season, $2,835,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That $597,000,000 of the funds provided herein shall be available until October 1, 2008: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to use $393,000,000 of the funds provided herein to modify the 17th Street, Orleans Avenue, and West Bank and Vicinity project, to provide the operability of the stations during hurricanes, storms, and high water events; $393,000,000 shall be used for repair and restoration of author-
ized protections and floodwalls, and $359,000,000 shall be used to complete the author-
ized protection for the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity Project and for the West Bank and Vicinity project: Provided further, That beginning not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chief of Engineers, acting through the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, shall provide monthly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds: Provided further, That any project using funds appropriated under this heading shall be initiated only after non-Federal interests have entered into binding agreements with the United States or its contractors: Provided further, That the expenditure of funds as provided above may be exercised without regard to individual amounts or purposes except that any reallocation of funds that is necessary to accomplish the established goals is author-
ized, subject to the limits of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

CHAPTER 3—LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION
STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS
For an additional amount for “State Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service Operations” for grants to the States for the administration of unemployment insurance, $110,000,000, which may be expanded from the Employment Security Administra-
tion Account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, to be used for unemployment ins-
urance workloads experienced by the States through September 30, 2008, which shall be available for Federal obligation through De-

CHAPTER 4—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
PAYMENT TO WIDOWS AND HEIRS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS
For payment to Annette Lantos, widow of Tom Lantos, late a Representative from the State of California, $189,300: Provided, That section 8002 shall not apply to this appro-
priation.

TITLE III—VETERANS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE
SHORT TITLE
SEC. 3001. This title may be cited as the “Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008”.

FINDINGS
SEC. 3002. Congress makes the following findings:
(1) On September 11, 2001, terrorists at-
tacked the United States, and the brave members of the Armed Forces of the United States were called to the defense of the Na-
tion.
(2) Service on active duty in the Armed Forces has been especially arduous for the members of the Armed Forces since Sep-
(3) The United States has a proud history of offering educational assistance to millions of veterans, as demonstrated by the many “GI Bills” enacted since World War II. Edu-
cational assistance for veterans helps reduce the costs of war, assist veterans in read-
justing to civilian life after wartime service, and boost the United States economy, and has a positive effect on recruitment for the Armed Forces.
(4) The current educational assistance pro-
gram for veterans is outdated and designed for peacetime service in the Armed Forces.
(5) The people of the United States greatly value military service and recognize the dif-
cult challenges involved in readjusting to civilian life after wartime service in the Armed Forces.
(6) It is in the national interest for the United States to provide veterans who serve on active duty in the Armed Forces after September 11, 2001, with enhanced edu-
cational assistance benefits that are worthy of such service and are commensurate with the educational assistance benefits provided by a grateful Nation to veterans of World War II.

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO SERVE AFTER SEP-
TEMBER 11, 2001
SEC. 3003. (a) EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE AU-
THORIZED.—
(1) In general.—Part III of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 23 the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 33—POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

“SUBCHAPTER I—DEFINITIONS

“Sec. 3301. Definitions.
“SUBCHAPTER II—EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE
“Sec. 3311. Educational assistance for service in the Armed Forces commencing on or after September 11, 2001; entitlement.
“Sec. 3312. Educational assistance: duration.
“Sec. 3313. Educational assistance: amount; payment.
“Sec. 3314. Tutorial assistance.
“Sec. 3315. Licensure and certification tests.
“Sec. 3316. Supplemental educational assistance: members with critical skills or specialty; members serving addi-
tional service.
“Sec. 3317. Public contribution provisions for addi-
tional educational assistance.
“SUBCHAPTER III—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS
“Sec. 3321. Time limitation for use of and eligi-
bility for entitlement.
“Sec. 3322. Bar to duplication of educational as-
sistance benefits.
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“SUBCHAPTER I—DEFINITIONS

“Sec. 3301. Definitions.
“(1) In this chapter:
“(A) The term ‘active duty’ has the mean-
ings as follows (subject to the limitations specified in sections 3002(6) and 3311(b) of this title):
“(A) In the case of members of the regular components of the Armed Forces, the mean-
ing given such term in section 101(2)(A) of this title.
“(B) In the case of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, service on active duty under a call or order to active duty under section 688, 12301(a), 12301(d), 12301(g), 12302, or 12304 of title 10.
“(B) In the case of members of the Army Reserve, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and National Guard of the States, the mean-
ing given such term in section 601(2)(A) of this title.
“(B) In the case of members of the Navy, Recruit Training (or Boot Camp) and Skill Training (or so-called ‘A’ School).
“(B) In the case of members of the Air Force, Basic Military Training and Tech-

nal
educted individuals. An individual described in this subsection is any individual as follows: 

(a) An individual who—

(A) commencing on or after September 11, 2001, serves an aggregate of at least 36 months on active duty in the Armed Forces (including service on active duty in entry level and skill training); and 

(B) after completion of service described in subparagraph (A) 

(i) continues on active duty for an aggregate of less than 12 months; or 

(ii) before completion of service on active duty of an aggregate of 12 months, is discharged or released from active duty as described in subsection (c). 

(b) An individual who—

(A) commencing on or after September 11, 2001, serves an aggregate of at least 6 months, but less than 12 months, on active duty in the Armed Forces (excluding service on active duty in entry level and skill training); and 

(B) after completion of service described in subparagraph (A) 

(i) continues on active duty for an aggregate of less than 6 months; or 

(ii) before completion of service on active duty of an aggregate of 6 months, is discharged or released from active duty as described in subsection (c). 

(c) An individual who—

(A) commencing on or after September 11, 2001, serves at least 30 continuous days on active duty in the Armed Forces; and 

(B) after completion of service described in subparagraph (A) 

(i) continues on active duty for an aggregate of less than 30 months; or 

(ii) before completion of service on active duty of an aggregate of 30 months, is discharged or released from active duty as described in subsection (c). 

(d) An individual who—

(A) commencing on or after September 11, 2001, serves an aggregate of at least 24 months, but less than 30 months, on active duty in the Armed Forces (including service on active duty in entry level and skill training); and 

(B) after completion of service described in subparagraph (A) 

(i) continues on active duty for an aggregate of less than 24 months; or 

(ii) before completion of service on active duty of an aggregate of 30 months, is discharged or released from active duty as described in subsection (c). 

(e) An individual who—

(A) commencing on or after September 11, 2001, serves an aggregate of at least 6 months, but less than 12 months, on active duty in the Armed Forces (excluding service on active duty in entry level and skill training); and 

(B) after completion of service described in subparagraph (A) 

(i) continues on active duty for an aggregate of less than 6 months; or 

(ii) before completion of service on active duty of an aggregate of 6 months, is discharged or released from active duty as described in subsection (c). 

(f) A discharge or release from active duty in the Armed Forces characterized by the Secretary concerning as honorable service and placement on the retired list, transfer to the Fleet Reserve or Coast Guard Reserve, or placement on the temporary disability retired list. 

(g) A discharge or release from active duty in the Armed Forces for—

(A) a medical condition which preexisted the service of the individual as described in the applicable paragraph of subsection (b) and which the Secretary determines is not service-connected;

(B) hardship; or

(C) a physical or mental condition that was not characterized as a disability and did not result from the individual's own willful misconduct but did interfere with the individual's performance of duty, as determined by the Secretary concerned in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

(d) Prohibition on Treatment of Certain Service as Period of Active Duty.—The following periods of service shall not be considered a part of the period of active duty of the individual entitled to educational assistance under this chapter is based:

(1) A period of service on active duty of an officer pursuant to an agreement under section 219(b) of title 10.

(2) A period of service on active duty of an officer pursuant to an agreement under section 4348, 6959, or 9348 of title 10.

(3) A period of service that is terminated because of a defective enlistment and induction.
than a program covered by subsections (e) and (f) the amounts specified in subsection (c) to meet the expenses of such individual’s subsistence, tuition, fees, and other educational costs for pursuit of such program of education.

(b) Approved Programs of Education.—A program is an approved program of education for purposes of this chapter if the program of education is offered by an institution of higher learning (as that term is defined in section 345(f) of this title) and is approved for purposes of chapter 30 of this title (including approval by the State approving agency concerned).

(c) Educational Assistance.—The amounts payable under this subsection for pursuit of an approved program of education under this chapter are:

(1) An amount equal to the established charges for the program of education, except that the amount payable under this paragraph may not exceed the maximum amount of established charges regularly charged in-State students for full-time pursuit of approved programs of education for undergraduates in the State in which the program of education is located the institution of higher education from which the individual is enrolled.

(2) Payment of the amount payable under paragraph (1) for a program of education offered through distance education shall be made on a monthly basis.

(3) Payment of the amount payable under paragraph (1) for a program of education not offered on a half-time basis or less shall be made for the entire quarter, semester, or term, as applicable, of the program of education.

(g) Payment of Established Charges to Educational Institutions.—(1) The educational assistance payable under subsection (c)(1)(A) and of similar amounts payable under paragraphs (2) through (7) of subsection (c) for a program of education shall be made for the entire quarter, semester, or term, as applicable, of the program of education.

(h) Established Charges Defined.—(1) In this chapter, the term ‘established charges’ means the actual charges (as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary) for tuition and fees which are required to be charged the individual for the term, quarter, or semester.

(i) The term ‘established charges’ shall be determined for purposes of this chapter by:

(A) In the case of an individual enrolled in a program of education offered on a term, quarter, or semester basis, the tuition and fees charged the individual for the term, quarter, or semester.

(B) In the case of an individual enrolled in a program of education not offered on a term, quarter, or semester basis, the tuition and fees charged the individual for the entire program of education.

(1) The amount of benefits described in subsection (a) that are payable under this section may not exceed $1,200 per month, for a maximum of 12 months, or until a maximum of $4,800 is utilized.

(2) The amount provided an individual under this subsection is in addition to the amounts of educational assistance paid to the individual under section 3313 of this title.

(d) No Charge Against Entitlement.—Any benefits provided an individual under subsection (a) in addition to any other educational assistance benefits provided the individual under this chapter.

§3315. Licensure and certification tests

(a) In General.—An individual entitled to educational assistance under this chapter shall also be entitled to payment for one licensing or certification test described in section 3322(b) of this title.

(b) Time Available.—The amount payable under subsection (a) for a licensing or certification test may not exceed the lesser of—

(1) $2,000; or

(2) The fee charged for the test.

(c) No Charge Against Entitlement.—Any amount paid an individual under subsection (a) in addition to any other educational assistance benefits provided the individual under this chapter.

§3316. Supplemental educational assistance: mental skills or specialty; members serving additional service

(a) Increased Assistance for Members with Critical Skills or Specialty.—(1) In the case of an individual who has a skill or specialty designated by the Secretary concerned as a skill or specialty in which there is a critical shortage of personnel or for which it is difficult to recruit or, in the case of critical skills, retain personnel, the Secretary concerned may increase the monthly amount of educational assistance otherwise payable to the individual under paragraph (1) of section 3313(c) of this title, or under paragraphs (2) through (7) of such section (as applicable), by—

(2) The amount of the increase in educational assistance authorized by paragraph (1) may not exceed the amount equal to the monthly amount of increased basic educational assistance payable under section 3315 of this title.

(b) Supplemental Assistance for Additional Service.—(1) The Secretary concerned may provide for the payment of educational assistance under this chapter of supplemental educational assistance for additional service authorized by subchapter III of chapter 30 of this title. The amount so payable shall be payable as an increase in the monthly amount of educational assistance otherwise payable to the individual under paragraph (1) of section 3313(c) of this title, or under paragraphs (2) through (7) of such section (as applicable), in accordance with the provisions of subchapter III of chapter 30 of this title.

(2) Eligibility for supplement educational assistance under this subsection shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subchapter III of chapter 30 of this title, except that any reference in such provisions to eligibility for basic educational assistance under a provision of subchapter II of chapter 30 of this title shall be treated as a reference to eligibility for educational assistance under the appropriate provision of this chapter.

§3317. Public-private contributions for additional educational assistance

(a) Establishment of Program.—In circumstances where educational assistance provided pursuant to section 3313(c)(1)(A) does not cover the full cost of established charges (as specified in section 3313(c) of this title), the Secretary shall carry out a program under which colleges and universities can, voluntarily, enter into an agreement with the Secretary to pay a portion of those established charges not otherwise covered under section 3313(c)(1)(A), which contributions shall be matched by equivalent contributions toward such costs by the Secretary. The program shall only apply to covered individuals described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 3311(b).

(b) Designation of Program.—The program under this section shall be known as the ‘Yellow Ribbon G.I. Education Enhancement Program’.

(c) Agreements.—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with each college or university seeking to participate in the program under this section. Each agreement shall specify the following:

(1) The manner (whether by direct grant, scholarship, or otherwise) of the contributions to be made by the college or university concerned.

(2) The maximum amount of the contribution to be made by the college or university concerned with respect to any particular individual in any given academic year.

(3) The maximum number of individuals for whom the college or university concerned will make contributions in any given academic year.

(4) Such other matters as the Secretary and the college or university concerned jointly consider appropriate.

(d) Matching Contributions.—(1) In instances where the educational assistance provided an individual under section 3313(c)(1)(A) of this title does not cover the full cost of tuition and mandatory fees at a college or university, the Secretary shall provide up to 50 percent of the remaining costs for tuition and mandatory fees if the college or university enters into an agreement with the Secretary to match an equal percentage of any of the remaining costs for such tuition and fees.

(2) Amounts available to the Secretary under section 3324(b) of this title for payment of the costs of this chapter shall be available to the Secretary for purposes of paragraph (1).

(e) Outreach.—The Secretary shall make available on the Internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs and on the public Internet the list of colleges and universities participating in the program under this section.

§3318. Time limitation for use of and eligibility for entitlement

(a) In General.—Except as provided in this section, the period during which an individual entitled to educational assistance under this chapter is eligible for educational assistance under the appropriate provision of this chapter expires at the end of the 15-year period beginning on the date of such individual’s last discharge or release from active duty.

(b) Exceptions.—(1) Subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 3301 of this title shall apply to educational assistance under the appropriate provision of this chapter.

(c) Regulations.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations with respect to the termination of an individual’s entitlement to educational assistance under this chapter in the same manner as such subsections apply under section 3301 of this title with respect to the termination of the period described in section 3301(a) of this title.

(d) Section 3301(f) of this title shall apply with respect to the termination of an individual’s entitlement to educational assistance under chapter 30 of this title, except that, in the administration of such section for purposes of this chapter, the reference to section 3301(c) of this title shall be deemed to be a reference to section 3312 of this title.

(3) For purposes of subsection (a), an individual’s last discharge or release from active duty shall not include a period of active duty of less than 90 days of continuous service, unless the individual is discharged or released as described in section 3311(a).

§3322. Bar to duplication of educational assistance benefits

(a) In General.—An individual entitled to educational assistance under this chapter who is also eligible for educational assistance under chapter 31, 32, or 33 of this title, chapter 107, 1606, or 1607 of title 10, or the provisions of the Hostage Relief Act of 1989 (Public Law 99–449; 5 U.S.C. 5961 note) may not receive assistance under two or more such programs concurrently, but shall elect (in such form and manner as the Secretary may prescribe) under which chapter such service is to be credited.

(b) Inapplicability of Service Treated Under Educational Assistance Programs.—A period of service counted for purposes of repayment of an educational loan under chapter 169 of title 10 may not be counted as a period of service for entitlement to educational assistance under this chapter.

(c) Service in Selected Reserve.—An individual who serves in the Selected Reserve may receive credit for such service under only one of this chapter, chapter 30 of this title, chapter 169 of title 10, or the provisions of the Hostage Relief Act of 1989, or making contributions to educational assistance under chapter 30, 31, 32, or 33 of this title, chapter 107, 1606, or 1607 of title 10, or the provisions of the Hostage Relief Act of 1980, or making contributions toward entitlement to educational assistance under chapter 30 of this title, as of August 1, 2008, under chapter 33 of title 32 or the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008.

§3323. Administration

(a) In General.—(1) Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, the provisions specified in section 3301(f) of this title shall apply to the provision of educational assistance under this chapter.

(2) In applying the provisions referred to in paragraph (1) to an individual entitled to educational assistance under this chapter for purposes of this section, the reference in such provisions to the term ‘eligible veteran’ shall be deemed to refer to an individual entitled to educational assistance under this chapter.
"(3) In applying section 3474 of this title to an individual entitled to educational assistance under this chapter for purposes of this section, the reference in such section 3474 to the term ‘educational assistance allowance’ shall be deemed to refer to educational assistance payable under section 3313 of this title.

"(4) In applying section 3482(g) of this title to an individual entitled to educational assistance under this chapter for purposes of this section:

"(A) the first reference to the term ‘educational assistance allowance’ in such section 3482(g) shall be deemed to refer to educational assistance payable under section 3313 of this title; and

"(B) the first sentence of paragraph (1) of such section 3482(g) shall be applied as if such sentence ended with ‘equipment’.

"(b) INFORMATION ON BENEFITS.—(1) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall provide the information described in paragraph (2) to each member of the Armed Forces at such times as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly prescribe in regulations.

"(2) The information described in this paragraph is information on benefits, limitations, procedures, eligibility requirements (including time-in-service requirements), and other important aspects of educational assistance under this chapter, including application forms for such assistance under section 3313 of this title.

"(3) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall furnish the information and forms described in paragraph (2), and other educational materials on educational assistance under this chapter, to educational institutions, training establishments, military education personnel, and such other persons and entities as the Secretary considers appropriate.

"(c) REGULATIONS.—(1) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this chapter.

"(2) Any regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for purposes of this chapter shall apply uniformly across the Armed Forces.

"§3324. Allocation of administration and costs.

"(a) ADMINISTRATION.—Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, the Secretary shall administer the provisions of educational assistance under this chapter.

"(b) EXCLUSION.—Payments for entitlement to educational assistance earned under this chapter shall be made from funds appropriated to, or otherwise made available to, the Department of Veterans Affairs for the payment of readjustment benefits.”.

"(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The tables of chapters at the beginning of title 38, United States Code, and the beginning of part II of such title, are each amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 32 the following new item:


"(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

"(1) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO DUPLICATION OF BENEFITS.—

"(A) Section 3303 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

"(i) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting ‘‘33,’’ after ‘‘32,’’ and

"(ii) in subsection (c), by striking ‘‘both the program established by this chapter and the program established by chapter 106 of title 10’’ and inserting ‘‘two or more of the programs established by this chapter, chapter 33 of this title, and chapters 106 and 107 of title 10.’’

"(B) Paragraph (4) of section 3095(a) of such title is amended—

"(i) in subsection (a), by striking subsection (a)(i) or (a)(ii) of that paragraph, the amount of educational assistance payable to the individual under chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code (as so added), or under paragraphs (2) through (7) of

"(2) CESSATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD GI BILL.

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual making an election under paragraph (1) who is described by subparagraph (A)(i) of that paragraph, the number of months of entitlement to educational assistance under chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code (as so added), shall be the number of months equal to—

"(i) the number of months of unused entitlement of the individual under chapter 30 of title 38, United States Code, as of the date of such election;

"(ii) the number of months, if any, of entitlement revoked by the individual under paragraph (3)(A); and

"(B) CANCELLATION OF UNREVOKED ENTITLEMENT.—Any entitlement revoked by an individual under this paragraph shall not be available to the dependents of the individual for purposes of entitlement under such chapter for the remainder of the period of eligibility of such individual; and

"(C) AVAILABILITY OF UNREVOKED ENTITLEMENT.—Any entitlement described in subparagraph (A) that is not revoked by an individual under section 3313(c) of such title shall remain available to the dependents of the individual for purposes of entitlement under such chapter for the remainder of the period of eligibility of such individual.

"(3) CONTINUING ENTITLEMENT TO EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE NOT AVAILABLE UNDER POST-9/11 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the event educational assistance to which an individual making an election under paragraph (1) would be entitled under chapter 30 of title 38, United States Code, or chapter 107, 1606, or 1607 of title 10, United States Code, is not authorized to be available to the individual under the provisions of chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code (as so added), the individual shall remain entitled to such educational assistance in accordance with the provisions of the applicable chapter.

"(B) EXCEPTION.—The utilization by an individual of entitlement under subparagraph (A) shall be chargeable against the entitlement of the individual to educational assistance under chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code (as so added), at the rate of one month of entitlement under such chapter for each month of entitlement utilized by the individual under subparagraph (A) (as determined as if such entitlement were utilized under the provisions of chapter 30 of title 38, United States Code, or chapter 107, 1606, or 1607 of title 10, United States Code, as applicable).

"(4) ADDITIONAL POST-9/11 ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS HAVING MADE CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD GI BILL.

"(A) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.—In the case of an individual making an election under paragraph (1) who is described by clause (i), (iii), (iv), or (v) of subparagraph (d)(2) of section 3313 of such title, the amount of educational assistance payable to the individual under chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code (as so added), shall be the number of months of entitlement to educational assistance under the Montgomery GI Bill Program (3311 of title 38, United States Code, as so added), at the rate of one month of entitlement under such chapter for each month of entitlement utilized by the individual under subparagraph (A) (as determined as if such entitlement were utilized under the provisions of chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code (as so added), or under paragraphs (2) through (7) of
that section (as applicable), shall be the amount otherwise payable as a monthly stipend under the applicable paragraph increased by the amount equal to—

(1) the sum of contributions toward basic educational assistance made by the individual under section 3011(b) or 3012(c) of title 38, United States Code, as of the date of the election as so amended; and

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C), redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D), and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

(A) for months occurring during the period beginning on August 1, 2008, and ending on the last day of fiscal year 2009, $1,073; and

(B) for months occurring during the period beginning on August 1, 2008, and ending on the last day of fiscal year 2010, $1,125.

(3) for purposes of subparagraph (1), a State shall be entitled to educational assistance under chapter 33 of such title (as so amended) in an amount equal to the quarter, semester, or term, as applicable, before the exhaustion of the individual’s entitlement to educational assistance under chapter 33 of such title as so amended.

(4) CONTINUING ENTITLEMENT TO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CRITICAL SKILLS OR SPECIALLY QUALIFIED AND ADDITIONAL SERVICE.—An individual making an election under paragraph (1)(A) who, at the time of the election, is entitled to increased educational assistance under section 3015(d) of title 38, United States Code, or section 1631(i)(1) of title 10, United States Code, or supplemental educational assistance under subchapter III of chapter 30 of title 38, United States Code, shall remain entitled to such increased educational assistance under such chapter until—

(A) the individual’s entitlement to educational assistance under chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, as so amended, shall be reduced to the level of educational assistance payable under section 3313(c) of title 38, United States Code, or section 1631(i)(1) of title 10, United States Code, or supplemental educational assistance under subchapter III of chapter 30 of title 38, United States Code, or

(B) the individual, at the time of the election, is entitled to increased educational assistance under section 3015(d) of title 38, United States Code, or section 1631(i)(1) of title 10, United States Code, or supplemental educational assistance under subchapter III of chapter 30 of title 38, United States Code, has accumulated a total of 12 months of payments of basic educational assistance payable under paragraphs (1)(B) or (1)(C) of such section (as so amended), at which time the individual’s entitlement to increased educational assistance under chapter 33 of such title shall cease.

(5) IRREVOCABILITY OF ELECTIONS.—An election under paragraph (1) or (3)(A) is irrevocable.

(6) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect on August 1, 2008.

SEC. 3005. Section 3674(a)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “may not exceed” and all that follows through the end and inserting “shall be $19,000,000.”

TITLE IV—EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

FEDERAL-STATE AGREEMENTS

SEC. 4001. (a) IN GENERAL.—Any agreement under this title shall provide that the State will establish, for each eligible individual who files an application for emergency unemployment compensation, an emergency unemployment compensation account with respect to such individual’s benefit year.

(b) AMOUNT IN ACCOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount established in an account under subsection (a) shall be equal to the lesser of—

(A) 50 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents’ allowances) payable to such individual for any week of total unemployment, or

(B) 13 times the individual’s average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year.

(2) WEEKLY BENEFIT AMOUNT.—For purposes of this subsection, an individual’s weekly benefit amount for any week is the amount of regular compensation (including dependents’ allowances) under the State law payable to such individual for such week for total unemployment.

(c) SPECIAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, if at the time that the individual’s account is exhausted or at any time thereafter, such individual’s State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under paragraph (2)), then, such account shall be augmented by an amount equal to the amount originally established in such account (as determined under subsection (b)(1)).

(2) EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a State shall be considered to be in an extended benefit period, at any given time

(A) such a period is then in effect for such State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970; and

(B) at any time thereafter, the Governor of the State has declared the effect for such State under such Act if section 283(d) of such Act—
(1) were applied by substituting “4” for “5” each place it appears; and
(2) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A); or
(C) in paragraph (1) would then be in effect for such State under such Act if—
(i) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and
(ii) such section 203(f)—
(1) were applied by substituting “6.0” for “6.5” each place it appears; and
(2) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii).

PAYMENTS TO STATES HAVING AGREEMENTS FOR FEDERAL/STATE EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

SECTION 4005. (a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be paid to each State that has entered into an agreement under this title an amount equal to 100 percent of the emergency unemployment compensation paid to individuals by the State pursuant to such agreement.

(b) TREATMENT OF REIMBURSABLE COMPENSATION.—No payment shall be made to any State under this section in respect of any compensation to the extent the State is entitled, in respect of such compensation under the provisions of any Federal law other than this title or chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code. A State shall be reimbursed to any reimbursement under such chapter 85 in respect of any compensation to the extent the State is entitled to reimbursement under this title in respect of such compensation.

(c) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—Sums payable to any State by reason of such State having an agreement under this title shall be payable upon certification by the Secretary that reimbursement (as may be determined by the Secretary), in such amounts as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this title for any reimbursement under such chapter 85 in respect of any compensation to the extent the State is entitled to reimbursement under this title in respect of such compensation.

(d) APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN PAYMENTS.—There are appropriated out of the employment security fund of the Federal- State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3004 note) amounts appropriated pursuant to the preceding sentence shall not be required to be repaid.

FRAUD AND OVERPAYMENTS

SECTION 4005. (a) IN GENERAL.—If an individual knowingly has made, or caused to be made by another, a false statement or representation of a material fact, or knowingly has failed or caused another to fail, or attempted to cause another to fail, to disclose a material fact, and as a result of such false statement or representation or of such nondisclosure such individual has received an amount of emergency unemployment compensation under this title to which such individual was not entitled, such individual—
(1) shall be subject to further emergency unemployment compensation under this title in accordance with the provisions of the applicable State unemployment compensation law in connection with a claim for unemployment compensation; and
(2) shall be subject to prosecution under section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

(b) REPAYMENT.—In the case of individuals who have received amounts of emergency unemployment compensation under this title to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such emergency unemployment compensation to the State agency, except that the State agency may waive such repayment if it determines that—
(1) the payment of such emergency unemployment compensation was without fault on the part of any such individual; and
(2) such repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience.

(c) RECOVERY OF FRAUD.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—The State agency may recover the amount to be repaid, or any part thereof, by deductions from any unemployment compensation payable to such individual under this title or from any unemployment compensation payable to such individual under any State or Federal unemployment compensation law administered by the State agency or under any other State or Federal law administered by the State agency which provides for the payment of any unemployment compensation to which they were not entitled, except that such single deduction may exceed 50 percent of the weekly benefit amount from which such deduction is made.

(2) OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING.—No repayment shall be required, and no deduction shall be made, until a determination has been made, in accordance with the opportunity for a fair hearing to which the individual is entitled, that such determination has been made.

(d) REVIEW.—Any determination by a State agency under this section shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as a determination by the Secretary under the applicable unemployment compensation law, and only in that manner and to that extent.

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 4006. In this title, the terms “compensation,” “regular compensation,” “extended compensation,” “benefit year,” “base period,” “regular unemployment compensation law,” and “week” have the respective meanings given such terms under section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3004 note).

APPLICABILITY

SECTION 4007. (a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), an agreement entered into under this title shall apply to weeks of unemployment—
(1) beginning after the date on which such agreement is entered into;
(2) ending on or before March 31, 2009.

(b) TRANSITION FOR AMOUNT REMAINING IN ACCOUNT.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), in the case of an individual who has amounts remaining in an account established under section 4002 as of the last day of the week in which the applicable State law ending on or before March 31, 2009, emergency unemployment compensation shall continue to be payable to such individual for such amounts for any week beginning after such last day for which the individual meets the eligibility requirements of this title.

(c) TRANSITION ON ACCOUNT.—If the account of an individual is exhausted after the last day of such last week (as so determined), the section 4002(c) shall not apply and such amount shall not be augmented under such section, regardless of whether such individual’s State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under paragraph (2) of such section).

LIMIT ON COMPENSATION.—No compensation shall be payable by reason of paragraph (1) for any week beginning after June 30, 2009.

TITLE V—MEDICAID PROVISIONS

SECTION 5001. (a) MORATORIA ON CERTAIN MEDICAID REGULATIONS.—
(1) EXTENSION OF CERTAIN MORATORIA IN PUBLIC LAW 110–18.—Section 7020(a)(1) of the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Amendments Act, 2007 (Public Law 110–18) is amended—
(A) by striking “prior to the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “prior to March 20, 2009”;
(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting after “Federal Regulations” the following: “or in the final regulation, relating to such parts, published on May 29, 2007 (72 Federal Register 29748)”; and
(C) in subparagraph (B), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, including the proposed regulation published on May 23, 2007 (72 Federal Register 28963)”.

(2) EXTENSION OF CERTAIN MORATORIA IN PUBLIC LAW 110–17.—Section 206 of the Medicaid and SCHIP Extension Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–17) is amended—
(A) by striking “June 30, 2008” and inserting “April 1, 2009”;
(B) by inserting “, including the proposed regulation published on August 13, 2007 (72 Federal Register 45201),” after “rehabilitation services”;
(C) by inserting “, including the final regulation published on December 28, 2007 (72 Federal Register 78363),” after “school-based transportation”;
(D) ADDITIONAL MORATORIA.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall not, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, promulgate any regulation that would impose, in the case of a State agency, any new or modified financial or regulatory requirement for purposes of implementing the provisions of this Act, except regulations as provided in this Act, and only to the extent such regulations are necessary to carry out the purpose of this Act.
audit procedures, or other administrative ac-
tion, policy, or practice, including a Medical
Assistance Manual transmittal or letter to
State Medicaid directors) to impose any re-
strictions described in subparagraph (B), (C),
or (D) if such restrictions are more restrict-
ing in any aspect than those applied to the respective provision as of
the date specified in subparagraph (E) for
such provision.

(b) FUNDS TO REDUCE MEDICAID FRAUD AND
ARUSE.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of reducing
fraud and abuse in the Medicaid program
under title XIX of the Social Security Act:
(A) there is appropriated to the Secretary
of Health and Human Services, out of any
money in the Treasury not otherwise ap-
propriated for medical assistance under
such title, $25,000,000 for fiscal year
2010 and each subsequent fiscal year.

(2) INDEPENDENT COMPREHENSIVE STUDY AND
REPORT.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July
1, 2009, the Secretary of Health and
Human Services shall enter into a contract with an
independent organization that is qualified to
perform the functions described in subparagraph (D) of paragraph
(1) to produce a report that
(i) outlines the specific problems the
Medicaid program described in this subparagraph for the provision described
in subparagraph (C), and
(ii) identifying strategies in existence to
address such problems.

(iii) recommendations on actions by the
Secretary for such purposes with respect to such provision.

(B) FUNDS TO REDUCE MEDICAID FRAUD AND
ABUSE.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of reducing
fraud and abuse in the Medicaid program
under title XIX of the Social Security Act:
(A) there is appropriated to the Secretary
of Health and Human Services, out of any
money in the Treasury not otherwise ap-
propriated for medical assistance under
such title, $25,000,000 for fiscal year
2010 and each subsequent fiscal year.

(2) INDEPENDENT COMPREHENSIVE STUDY AND
REPORT.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July
1, 2009, the Secretary of Health and
Human Services shall enter into a contract with an
independent organization that is qualified to
perform the functions described in subparagraph (D) of paragraph
(1) to produce a report that
(i) outlines the specific problems the
Medicaid program described in this subparagraph for the provision described
in subparagraph (C), and
(ii) identifying strategies in existence to
address such problems.

(iii) recommendations on actions by the
Secretary for such purposes with respect to such provision.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than Sep-
tember 30 of 2009 and of each subsequent
year, the Secretary of Health and Human
Services shall submit to the Committee on
Energy and Commerce of the House of Rep-
resentatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the activities
and the results of such activities funded
under paragraph (1) to reduce waste, fraud,
and abuse in the Medicaid program under title
XIX of the Social Security Act during the
previous fiscal year.

(3) FUNDING.—Amounts appropriated under this section shall remain
available until expended and shall be in addition to any
other amounts appropriated or made available to the Secretary for such purposes with respect to such provision.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than Sep-
tember 30 of 2009 and of each subsequent
year, the Secretary of Health and Human
Services shall submit to the Committee on
Energy and Commerce of the House of Rep-
resentatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the activities
and the results of such activities funded
under paragraph (1) to reduce waste, fraud,
and abuse in the Medicaid program under title
XIX of the Social Security Act during the
previous fiscal year.

(3) FUNDING.—Amounts appropriated under this section shall remain
available until expended and shall be in addition to any
other amounts appropriated or made available to the Secretary for such purposes with respect to such provision.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than Sep-
tember 30 of 2009 and of each subsequent
year, the Secretary of Health and Human
Services shall submit to the Committee on
Energy and Commerce of the House of Rep-
resentatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the activities
and the results of such activities funded
under paragraph (1) to reduce waste, fraud,
and abuse in the Medicaid program under title
XIX of the Social Security Act during the
previous fiscal year.

(3) FUNDING.—Amounts appropriated under this section shall remain
available until expended and shall be in addition to any
other amounts appropriated or made available to the Secretary for such purposes with respect to such provision.
“(3) by adding after paragraph (23) the following new subclause:

‘‘(IV) 2014 for payment with respect to physician contracts, including those performed outside the United States and those for commercial items.‘’

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide States with technical assistance to aid in implementation of an asset verification program under this section.

(i) REPORTS.—A State implementing an asset verification program under this section shall submit reports to the Secretary concerning the program, at such times, in such format, and containing such information as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(j) TREATMENT OF PROGRAM EXPENSES.—Notwithstanding any provision of law, reasonable expenses of States in carrying out the program under this section shall be treated, for purposes of section 1903(a), in the same manner as State expenditures specified in paragraph (6).

(2) STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1902(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)) is amended.—

(A) in paragraph (69) by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘‘; and’’;

(C) by adding after paragraph (70), as so amended, the following new paragraph:

‘‘(71) provide that the State will implement an asset verification program as required under section 1940.‘’

(3) WITHHOLDING OF FEDERAL MATCHING PAYMENTS FOR NONCOMPLIANT STATES.—Section 1903(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (22) by striking ‘‘or’’ at the end;

(B) in paragraph (23) by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘‘; or’’; and

(C) by adding after paragraph (23) the following new paragraph:

‘‘(24) if a State is required to implement an asset verification program under section 1940 and fails to implement such program in accordance with such section, with respect to amounts expended by such State for medical assistance for individuals subject to asset verification under such section, until—‘’;

(A) the State demonstrates to the Secretary that the State made a good faith effort to comply;

(B) not later than 60 days after the date of a finding that the State is in noncompliance, the Secretary informs the State of the Secretary’s decision to withhold federal funds, and the State submits to the Secretary (and the Secretary approves) a corrective action plan to remedy such noncompliance; and

(C) not later than 12 months after the date such federal funds are withheld, the State fulfills the terms of such corrective action plan.‘’.

(4) REPEAL.—Section 4 of Public Law 110–90 is repealed.

(e) ADJUSTMENT TO PAQI FUND.—Section 1948(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396s–4(a)(2), as amended by section 101(a)(2) of the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Extension Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–173), is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in subclause (III), by striking ‘‘$9,600,000,000’’ and inserting ‘‘$9,400,000,000’’;

(B) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

‘‘(IV) For expenditures during 2014, an amount equal to $3,750,000,000.‘’

(2) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by adding at the end the following new clause:

‘‘(IV) 2014.—The amount available for expenditures during 2014 shall only be available for an adjustment to the update of the conversion factor under subsection (d) for that year.‘’.

(3) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘‘; and’’; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clause:

‘‘(iv) 2014 for payment with respect to physicians’ services furnished during 2014.‘’

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 6103. This section may be cited as the ‘‘Close the Contractor Fraud Loophole Act’’.

REVISION OF THE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION

SEC. 6102. The Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be amended within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act pursuant to FAR Case 2007–006 (as published at 72 Fed. Reg. 64019, November 14, 2007) or any follow-on FAR case to include provisions that require timely notification to contractors of violations of Federal criminal law or overpayments in connection with the award or performance of covered contracts or subcontracts, including those performed outside the United States and those for commercial items.

DEFINITION

SEC. 6103. In this chapter, the term ‘‘covered contract’’ means any contract in an amount greater than $5,000,000 and more than 120 days in duration.

CHAPTER 2—GOVERNMENT FUNDING TRANSPARENCY

SEC. 6201. This chapter may be cited as the ‘‘Government Funding Transparency Act of 2008’’. 
FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN RECIPIENTS OF FEDERAL AWARDS

SEC. 6202. (a) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—

Section 2(b)(1) of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (Public Law 110–408; 31 U.S.C. 3301 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (E);

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

“(F) the names and total compensation of the five most highly compensated officers of the entity if—

(I) the entity in the preceding fiscal year received more than $100,000 in revenues from Federal awards; and

(ii) $25,000,000 or more in annual gross revenues from Federal awards; and

(iii) the public does not have access to information about the compensation of the senior executives of the entity through periodic reports filed under section 15(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)) or section 6104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”;

(b) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall promulgate regulations to implement the amendment made by this chapter. Such regulations shall include a definition of “total compensation” that is consistent with regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission at section 402 of part 229 of title 17 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or any subsequent regulation).

TITLe VII—GI BILL FINANCING PROVISION

GI BILL FINANCING PROVISION

SEC. 7001. (a) IN GENERAL.—Part I of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 1 the following new section:

“SEC. 1A. INCREASE IN TAX ON HIGH INCOME INDIVIDUALS TO FINANCE THE GI BILL.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, there is hereby imposed in addition to any other tax imposed by this title a tax equal to 0.7 percent of so much of modified adjusted gross income as exceeds $500,000 ($1,000,000 in the case of a joint return or a surviving spouse) in excess of $200,000.

“(b) MODIFIED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘modified adjusted gross income’ means adjusted gross income reduced by any deduction allowed for investment interest (as defined in section 163(d)). In the case of an estate or trust, a rule similar to the rule of section 67(e) shall apply for purposes of determining adjusted gross income for purposes of this section.

“(c) NONRESIDENT ALIEN.—In the case of a nonresident alien, individual, or individual who is treated as such for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter or for purposes of section 55,”

SEC. 8001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

EMERGENCY DESIGNATION

SEC. 8002. Each amount in each title of this Act is designated as an emergency requirement and necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of section 204 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 8003. This Act may be cited as the “Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008.”

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against consideration of section 101 of this bill.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the measure contains direct spending that causes an increase in the deficit. As a threshold matter, the Committee must determine if the measure in the measure affect “direct spending.”

In reviewing the text of clause 10 of rule XXI, the Speaker finds no definition of the term “direct spending.” Because clause 10 of rule XXI is essentially an appropriations enforcement mechanism, the Speaker finds it prudent to look to other budget enforcement schemes for guidance in defining this term. In a review of relevant budget enforcement statutes, the Speaker finds a definition of the term “direct spending” in section 250 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, hereafter section 250. The definition in section 250 provides, in pertinent part, that “direct spending” means budget authority provided by law other than appropriations Acts.

The underlying bill, H.R. 2642, is a general appropriation bill. This measure constitutes an “appropriation Act” within the meaning of section 250. The motion proposes amendments that would make emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 2008. Accordingly, the budget authority provided by the motion does not constitute “direct spending” for purposes of section 250. By extension, the Speaker finds that the motion does not affect direct spending for purposes of clause 10 of rule XXI.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XXI, the Speaker of the Committee on the Budget is required to provide estimates to the Chair on the effect of the measure on the deficit. In consonance with the Speaker’s findings, the Chair is authoritatively guided by estimates from the Committee on the Budget that the net effect of the provisions of the pending motion affects revenues and direct spending would not increase a deficit.

Accordingly, the point of order is overruled.
PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. One quiet parliamentary inquiry for the purposes of clarification, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Condensing all of that, is it my understanding, then, that this is not sustained because PAYGO does not apply to direct spending so long as it’s in an appropriations bill? Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair’s ruling will have to speak for itself in that regard.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1197, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the pending legislation.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. One quick inquiry, Mr. Speaker, if you will.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have a tough problem before the House today. We have a war which is the majority of this House despises. We have a war that we do not have the power to end so long as the President is as obstreperous as he has been on the subject. That means that we have to find a way to try to manage this war and to get his ducks in a row.

It also is going to proceed to extricate us from this war and to pay for the salaries for the troops as long as they are going to be in the war situation. That money will be estimated to run out by June of 2009.

The second amendment would simply be an up-or-down vote on the conditions that the House believes should appropriately be attached to the spending of that money, many of which the House has seen before. Those conditions will, among other things, require that virtually every unit sent to the war will be fully combat ready. They will provide that no work the United States may engage in interrogation techniques that are at variance with the Army Field Manual. In plain language, no torture. The conditions will also say that there shall be no long-term security agreements entered into with Iraq without submission of those agreements to the United States Senate for their consideration. It will establish a mechanism for extricating ourselves from combat by setting a goal, not a firm date but a goal, of 18 months from the date of enactment.

Also, we have added two conditions which would be the function of requiring Iraq to provide a dollar-for-dollar match for any of the redevelopment and reconstruction activities that are being carried out by the United States Government. The effect of that would be the allocation of 50 percent of what we provide to Iraq into loans. We’ve done it this way because we have faith that the loans would ever be repaid, and this way we guarantee that the Iraqis, who are now in a position that as they have argued in their own budget—they will have to meet these costs up front on an equal basis before the United States proceeds to expend its own money. And it would also require that the American military be provided gasoline in Iraq at the same subsidized price as the Iraqis are being subsidized. We don’t see why the United States troops who are defending that country ought to have to pay a premium.

Then we will have a third amendment, again up or down, on the other administration requests. Those include food aid. We’ve increased the international food aid recommended by the President because the President, I believe, who has read the newspapers or watched television for the last 2 weeks understands why that is a moral necessity. We have also included the administration request for the Louisiana levees exactly as they have argued that it is their own-budget—they will have to meet these costs up front on an equal basis before the United States proceeds to expend its own money. And it would also require that the United States troops who are defending that country ought to have to pay a premium.

Then we will have a third amendment, again up or down, on the other administration requests. Those include food aid. We’ve increased the international food aid recommended by the President because the President believes that anybody who has read the newspapers or watched television for the last 2 weeks understands why that is a moral necessity. We have also included the administration request for the Louisiana levees exactly as they have argued that it is their own-budget—they will have to meet these costs up front on an equal basis before the United States proceeds to expend its own money. And it would also require that the United States troops who are defending that country ought to have to pay a premium.

Now I prefer to pay for the entire war if we are going to have it. I don’t think we ought to have it. But if we were going to have it, I think it was right to pay for the whole thing. So did Mr. MURTHA and Mr. MCGOVERN. So we introduced legislation to pay for the whole war with the war surtax. We lost that argument. That is not in this bill.

I felt that if we weren’t going to pay for the war up front, then there should be no requirement to provide an offset to provide the additional GI Bill expanded benefits, which are the equivalent of only about 6 percent of the cost of this war so far. But I lost that argument.

And so this bill does pay for the expansion of GI benefits. And it pays for that in probably the best way possible, by asking the most fortunate citizens in our society, those who individually make $500,000 or more a year, or as a couple who make $1 million or more a year, we are asking them to help out in the form of a patriot premium by, in essence, asking them to pay a one-half of 1 percent surtax in order to finance the GI Bill expansion.

There are no Members’ projects whatsoever in this bill. In the military construction bill, for instance, there are 121 facilities that are provided for; 111 of those were specifically asked for by the White House, and the others were identified by the committee as top service priorities after testimony from the military services.

There’s only one proposal that could be really considered a specific project earmark, and that is one hospital which the Assistant Secretary of Defense asked to be included in the recommendations, and we’re providing planning funds for that facility.

In addition, the other items in that third amendment that be considered would deal with the following:

If we’re going to fight the war, we happen to believe that we ought to provide a “thank you” to the people who have fought it, especially because there has been no sense of shared sacrifice in this country. The only people who have been asked to sacrifice are military families again and again and again. So what we are doing is including the Webb bill, which would provide for the equivalent of a full-boat 4-year education at a public university for persons who have spent 36 months on active duty, and the benefits are scaled down in accordance with time served. It’s long past time that we do that.

We have also included emergency funding for uncompensated care so that for persons who have exhausted their unemployment benefits, they will have an additional 13 weeks available to them.

We have also in this amendment recommended delayed implementation of the administration’s rules changes in Medicaid which have been so controversial, and we include two contractor reforms which the House had already passed.

The main difference, Mr. Speaker, between this bill and the administration bill is that when something is in the bill except the unemployment compensation provision and the President pays for virtually none of his requests.

Now I prefer to pay for the entire war if we are going to have it. I don’t think we ought to have it. But if we were going to have it, I think it was right to pay for the whole thing. So did Mr. MURTHA and Mr. MCGOVERN. So we introduced legislation to pay for the whole war with the war surtax. We lost that argument. That is not in this bill.

I felt that if we weren’t going to pay for the war up front, then there should be no requirement to provide an offset to provide the additional GI Bill expanded benefits, which are the equivalent of only about 6 percent of the cost of this war so far. But I lost that argument.

And so this bill does pay for the expansion of GI benefits. And it pays for that in probably the best way possible, by asking the most fortunate citizens in our society, those who individually make $500,000 or more a year, or as a couple who make $1 million or more a year, we are asking them to help out in the form of a patriot premium by, in essence, asking them to pay a one-half of 1 percent surtax in order to finance the GI Bill expansion.

Now I prefer to pay for the entire war if we are going to have it. I don’t think we ought to have it. But if we were going to have it, I think it was right to pay for the whole thing. So did Mr. MURTHA and Mr. MCGOVERN. So we introduced legislation to pay for the whole war with the war surtax. We lost that argument. That is not in this bill.

I felt that if we weren’t going to pay for the war up front, then there should be no requirement to provide an offset to provide the additional GI Bill expanded benefits, which are the equivalent of only about 6 percent of the cost of this war so far. But I lost that argument.

And so this bill does pay for the expansion of GI benefits. And it pays for that in probably the best way possible, by asking the most fortunate citizens in our society, those who individually make $500,000 or more a year, or as a couple who make $1 million or more a year, we are asking them to help out in the form of a patriot premium by, in essence, asking them to pay a one-half of 1 percent surtax in order to finance the GI Bill expansion.
tax cut to help us make life better for the persons who have been doing the most in order to preserve the way of life which has enabled those people to do so well in life. And I make no apology for it.

Ninety-nine percent of the appropriated dollars in the bill—99 percent of the appropriated dollars in this bill—are being requested by the administration.

This war, Mr. Speaker, has screwed up our economy. The war has injected chaos in the lives of military families all across the country. We make no apology in trying to use this vehicle to respond to the needs of the two groups in society who have been hit the hardest by this war; one being those who have lost their jobs because of the turmoil we have had in the economy because of the war and other factors, and second, the military families whom we believe ought to be treated about as well as the GIs were when they came back from World War II. This war has now lasted longer than World War II. And we think we have an obligation to respond to what is actually out there on the ground in communities all across the country.

We represent our constituents. Our political philosophies. We can debate our economic theories. We can behave like little budgeteers, arguing about this comma and that comma, this offset and that offset. But in the end, we are dealing with the lives of human beings. We are dealing with the lives of families. We are dealing with people who have sacrificed incredibly much with their family members being sent to Iraq and Afghanistan once, twice, three times. Kids are not seeing their parents.

I represent a city of 37,000 people. We have had almost 35,000 casualties in this country. It is as if 4,000 people in my hometown were killed, and virtually every other person in that hometown wound up in a VA hospital. That is why I believe that we need to pay so far just by Americans on this war.

So this is a process which will give Members the opportunity to vote up or down on the major pieces that comprise this legislation.

And I urge the House to move forward.

I, myself, will be intending to vote against the first amendment. I will be voting for the second and the third amendment. I hope that every Member here today exercises his conscience. That is what they are supposed to do.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I very much appreciate your recognizing me to respond to my friend, DAVID OBEY.

I am going to speak just a little bit out of order, for two of my colleagues on the floor, DAVID OBEY, the chairman of the committee, and my colleague, Mr. MURTHA, the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, have shared with me. I thought, over some years, the traditional order of this House. I’ve seen how the committee system works, especially in the Appropriations Committee, making certain that all Members, Democrats and Republicans, had an opportunity to provide input. And now to have us move so far away from that traditional order by way of this process today is a great disappointment to me.

I can’t help but wonder if maybe there is some lack of commitment to regular order that I had never perceived before. For example, my colleague from San Diego, the chairman of the VA Subcommittee, if he had been given an opportunity, could have marked up and had hearings and otherwise on the VA portions some time ago.

This supplemental came from the President well over a year ago. We have had plenty of time to exercise the process which minimizes Members’ involvement, remembering that those Members are elected to represent their people at home.

And so the procedure we are going through today has undermined that representation.

I think many of my colleagues, particularly those who serve with me on the Appropriations Committee, know that I have a great deal of respect for the senior Senator from West Virginia, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator ROBERT BYRD. While he and I may disagree on many issues from time to time, it is fair to say that we both share a deeply held love and respect for this institution.

I just happen to be the ranking member on this full committee. I saw the text and the heart of this proposal only yesterday in the early part of the afternoon. They have had it for months in the majority, but have chosen to ignore entirely the minority in this connection. My colleagues know that I have expressed grave concern about this process before.

The House majority leader, STENY Hoyer, has said that it is disingenuous for Republicans to speak out over the Iraq war supplemental bypassing the Appropriations Committee process. He suggested that the House Republicans, while in the majority, had engaged in similar practices. That treatment would be convenient if it were, in fact, true. However, we all know that facts are stubborn things.

According to the April 29 edition of the Politico, “There have been about war funding bills that have been passed without input from the Appropriations Committee, including billions in Hurricane Katrina aid and post-Sep-te-ber 11 funds. But none of the Iraq war funding bills has bypassed the Appropriations panel in the process.”

Have there been occasions where supplemental spending bills have not been
considered by the full committee? Sure there have. But on those rare instances, such as the aftermath of September 11 and so on, there was bipartisan consensus on the need to act quickly. And we did so by working together.

In no circumstance, to my knowledge, did either the Republican majority or the Democrat minority that precluded it ever deny either the opposition party or even members of its own party a seat in the hearing on this critical legislation.

Yet here we stand today, debating the merits of a bill that only a handful of Members have even seen. Very, very few Members know what is in this legislation.

I ask you, anybody in this room, have any of you, besides David ObeY, had a chance to really read this bill and know what’s in it in detail? You’re going to be asked to vote on it anyway, regardless of that lack of input.

Members of the House, Republicans and Democrats, deserve to have their voice heard. By the end of the day, not one Member will have an opportunity to offer an amendment or propose any alternative ideas to this body for a vote.

What are Speaker Pelosi and Chairman OBEY afraid of? This is the fifth time since January 2007 that this majority has brought a supplemental appropriations bill to the House floor under a closed rule, violating the entire tradition of the appropriations process.

In order for the people’s voices to be heard, it is fundamental that the representatives’ voices are heard. What is happening here is that we are beginning to lay a pattern to destroy the representative process that allows the people to be heard through the people they send here to represent them in the first place.

Speaker Pelosi and Chairman OBEY have effectively said to virtually every Democrat and Republican serving this great body: “Your voice is irrelevant, and your input is not welcome.” Again, what are Speaker Pelosi and Chairman OBEY afraid of?

I believe this practice of circumventing our traditional committee process and ignoring the voices of rank and file Members and their constituents is detrimental to the health of the legislative process. It puts in place a process wherein a handful of powerful legislative process. It puts in place a process wherein a handful of powerful legislators become “the Great Deciders” of what should or should not be included in this almost $250 billion spending bill. This is not the “House of the Few Great Deciders.” It is the “People’s House.” It is the House of Representatives that fail to recognize this at our great peril.

On May 24, 2002, my friend and my chairman, Mr. OBEY, said, and I quote, “What a shame, when the legislative process is corrupted to polarize a product that should have been used to forge national unity.”

These words are particularly true today as Chairman OBEY and Speaker Pelosi put partisan interests ahead of the interests of the Members of the House and ahead of the people of this country. We can do better. And ladies and gentlemen, we must do better.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California. Those are some of the nicest words he has ever said about me, and I appreciate them deeply.

Let me also say that I think his speech simply bears out that because they can find no real substantive fault with the legislation, they have to fall back on what I would call the process.

I would suggest that the gentleman from California is the last person I will take lectures from when it comes to talking about an open appropriations process. I was not chairman when the Appropriations Committee began this process, but after the conference was closed and the work was done and the names are on the conference report, I was not the chairman of the committee who allowed 30 pages of unrelated new language not seen by anybody else. The conference report which insulated the pharmaceutical industry from suit if their products damaged their customers.

I was not the chairman of the committee when the conference was finished, inserted anonymously, anonymously, in the dead of night, language which changed the definition of organic foods on the agriculture bill and led to nicely enriched profits for certain people in this society.

All I can say is that the gentleman may not like the fact that we couldn’t finish discussions as fast as we wanted to on this bill. He says he has only been able to see the text for the last day or so. Let me simply suggest that at least the text he reads is the text that will be in the bill after we vote on the bill, which is more than you can say for what happened under his stewardship on several locations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Let me simply make the point, there is virtually nothing in this bill that hasn’t been around here for months. This is not new material. The President’s war request has been around here for months, as the gentleman himself has indicated.

The unemployment compensation provision that we are providing in this bill already passed the House on one occasion. The Webb bill has been around for months, and it has the support, and, in fact, the sponsorship of the majority of the House and wide bipartisan support in the Senate as well. I would suggest, I think the question is, the Pentagon is saying you’ve got to get the money to the troops, because they’re about to run out of money and won’t get paid. Yet our friends on the other side are asking us to follow a process which would have taken a much longer period of time.

You can’t have it both ways. This is a fair process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself another minute.

I am personally opposed to the first amendment which we are presenting to the House. But out of courtesy to the minority, who support it, and out of courtesy to the White House, who supports it, we are allowing that to come to a vote. Our party has not even voted on that question. We told Members, vote your conscience. I don’t see how you could be more fair than that.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Florida, Bill Young.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me, and I am here to comment on the defense part of this bill, the request by the administration, the issue of procedure.

Chairman MURTHA was very outgoing and worked together with the minority and me, as the ranking member, in drafting this bill. We have always done that. When I was chairman, we did that. When he was chairman, we did that. The defense part of this bill is a good package. That’s amendment No. 1.

As a matter of fact, we actually followed the process, and we went to the subcommittee, and the subcommittee members had a full discussion of the defense part of this bill, and the subcommittee members on both size of the aisle agreed that we had produced a pretty good bill, and it met most of what the administration had asked for.

Then we reported it on to the full committee. That’s where the process broke down. The process up to that point, while it was at the subcommittee level, the process worked fine, regular order, just like it was supposed to.

But then all of a sudden the process did break down. I don’t know to what extent any other Members might have been involved, but this Member, as the ranking member on the subcommittee, was not involved.

There were subsequent meetings, despite the fact it hadn’t gone to the full committee, it hadn’t gone to the floor of the House so that the Members could express their interest, either by amendment or by debate. There was a meeting between the leadership in the House and the Senate on the defense
package where it was actually conferenced, a conference agreement was reached. There was no conference, but a conference agreement was reached, and that is my understanding of what is in this bill today.

As Mr. Lewis has said, we just got the separate conference, and that is what is in this package last night. So it does take a little time to read all of these bills and to understand.

But I think the defense part of it, there have been an additional change after that preconference conference, or whatever it was, I don’t know that. That might have happened.

But I support amendment No. 1, and I believe that we have done a good job in providing for our troops.

The largest portions of amendment No. 1 will deal with pay, military personnel costs, what it takes to maintain the lives of our members of the military and their families. The other very large part of this package is operations and maintenance that is essential to keep the military going.

So I support this package, but I really am concerned about the process as well. I like the package, but there may be some Members on this side of the aisle and on that side of the aisle who would like to see some changes, who would like to have an opportunity to debate what is included in that package, who might want to offer an amendment that could be productive, that will be something we would all support.

But we all know, because the opportunity to do that just isn’t there. It is a little strange place.

My friend—and I think everyone knows that Mr. O’Reilly and I are friends, and that we have a strong respect for each other, and we have worked very well together in our respective positions—but he mentioned early on that we moved very quickly after September 11, the attacks on the World Trade Center, and the airplane that flew into the Pentagon, and the airplane that flew into the ground in Pennsylvania in Mr. Murtha’s district that very likely was directed at the Defense Subcommittee, which was working on the Defense appropriations bill. But we didn’t know what was happening there. We didn’t know what was next.

If you recall, all of the airplanes flying in and around the United States were grounded because we didn’t know if additional airplanes had been hijacked, we just didn’t know the extent of the attack that we were experiencing, the terrible, vicious terrorist attack against an innocent Nation. So we did move quickly, and we appropriated $3 billion—

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

Mr. Lewis of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. Young of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

So we did move quickly, and on the third day after September 11, we produced a bill. Mr. O’Reilly and I wrote that bill together, we consulted with each other, we had a couple of disagreements, we worked those out. We had some accountability in the bill. We had some thinking, we had a meeting with Senators, and on the third day we had worked together, Republicans and Democrats, to produce a bill that sailed through the House, sailed through the Senate, signed by the President. That’s the process we went through.

The process was not the regular order, but it was a process done in consultation with both parties and any Member that wanted to be included.

While I do support amendment No. 1, I think the process is terrible. I think the process is inexcusable. I cannot support the process, but I think we have a good package on amendment No. 1, which is to pay for the national defense requirements in this supplemental.

Mr. O’Reilly. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Murtha), the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. Lewis. Mr. Chairman. I yield Mr. Young said, we worked together when he was chairman. When Jerry was chairman, we worked together.

The only thing I disagree with, when it comes to the floor, I am not sure I like to see amendments. I like to see amendments. I mean, you know, I like to see it try to work in a hurry.

But, anyway, I am concerned, when I heard the other day the Secretary of Defense say that the United States military must prepare for more fighting, future wars against insurgents and militias, such as in Iraq and Afghanistan, rather than spend money and time preparing for conventional conflicts.

Overemphasizing the Department’s focus on training and equipment for counterinsurgency missions appears to be simply a rationalization of a short-term budget decision made in the waning months of this administration. I am worried because we have been saying over and over again, let’s look beyond Iraq, let’s make sure we get the military back to the position where it should be.

These decisions have left the armed forces in a continued state of readiness. Both of us, when Jerry was chairman, when Bill was chairman, we have tried to increase the amount of money for the military to increase our readiness without the support of the administration in many cases.

They have let the facilities, which directly impact service personnel, quality of life, in disrepair. Every place where we have gone, we have seen the disrepair. They have left many defense acquisition programs broken or badly damaged.

I sent a letter to the Secretary of Defense saying, Mr. Secretary, we have got some real problems here. We have got to fix these procedures by sending a budget up to it. We have got to stop the supplemental—put it in one budget so we can have some semblance of order when we look at these decisions. These decisions fail to take into account the potential missions the U.S. armed forces must prepare for and may have to undertake in the years ahead.

I find these comments questionable that he has made at a time when not one combat unit in the United States is rated as combat ready. We need a national strategy to identify both near term and long-term threats to this country. We need a vigorous debate to achieve this strategy, and it hasn’t happened since the Cold War.

Now, I hope that in the base bill and this supplemental we are moving in that direction. I hope that’s what we are going to be able to accomplish.

Now, we spend more money on intelligence than any other country in the world. Put them all together, and we spend more money. I have got Punxsutawney Phil in my district. Punxsutawney Phil comes out once a year, he sees his shadow, and 50 percent of the time he is right.

Well, I will tell you, I wouldn’t say that the intelligence effort that we spend so much money on is any more than that, because so many things have not been right.

I am concerned that if we don’t pay attention to what we know, we who have been here a long time, we are not going to be prepared not only to fight a war, but to prevent a war. We can never be the world’s policeman, and I think all of us understand that.

We need to rebuild our diplomatic alliances, and we need to restore our international credibility. Our military and diplomatic force must include the strengths of our allies. We cannot do it alone.

Now, let me say in this bill we have $3.6 billion for C-17s. We produced 34 C-130s. We went through it with the subcommittee in detail. We had to make some changes because the full committee wanted us to make some changes, $3 billion for medium and heavy trucks. I remember when we went to Saudi Arabia the first time, we asked General Schwarzkopf, what was the biggest shortage, and he said trucks.

We have tried to take care of the things we realize need to be done. We put money in for Humvees and Marine Corps facility maintenance, and we put in for medical maintenance. We transferred money to the military construction committee, and they made the decision where that money should go—and $570 billion—no one in Congress, probably in the history of Congress, paid more attention to medical care for the military than Mr. Lewis, Mr. Young, and myself. We have tried to be in the forefront in making sure that they have what they need in order to take care of the troops.
Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WALSH of New York. If they know this bill will be vetoed, if they know that our troops need food and ammunition and armor and equipment quickly, and they know that the families of our troops need a paycheck, following a veto strategy seems to be nothing more than phony, political posturing at the expense of the heroes who, with their families, sacrifice to protect our Nation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, this bill honors our troops, our veterans, and their families. I want to thank Chairman OBEY for being a true champion for our Nation’s veterans, our troops, and our military families. His leadership and partnership with Speaker Pelosi and by this bill includes an historic 21st Century GI Bill of Rights, to make college education a reality, not a dream, for America’s veterans.

Perhaps less noticed, but vitally important to our military troops and their families, we also made a commitment in this bill to significantly improve health care and daycare for military families, and housing for single servicemen and women. Better housing, health care and daycare are our duty of care to the families of our Nation know that this Congress will respect their service and sacrifice in a meaningful way.

For troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, many of whom are on their second or third tours of duty, this measure provides the essential facilities required to live and fight this war so far away from their homes. It recognizes for force protection projects wherever our troops are located.

For the young men and women just volunteering now for military service, amendment No. 3 also provides $300 million to build much-needed training barracks and other facilities. This barracks initiative will send a clear message to our newest heroes that we deeply respect their decision to serve our Nation.

For the men or women wounded or ill, this amendment provides $1.3 billion to modernize outdated and inefficient medical facilities in our military-first century troops and their families deserve better than to be treated in World War II and Korean-era medical facilities. This commitment tells our troops they will have the best care if they are wounded, and even more important to so many of them, that their families will have the best of care while they are gone.

I want to especially thank and salute Chairman MURTHA for his dedicated, strong support for this military health care initiative. All of our military troops deserve his thanks, and should thank him and respect him for his leadership here.

For the families left behind here at home while their loved ones are at combat overseas, this bill provides $200 million to build new child care and youth facilities. Our military spouses and children may not be wearing our Nation’s uniform, but they are making sacrifices and should we never forget their service to the American family.

To address the housing, training and other facilities needed at military bases that are growing as a result of the Base Realignment and Closing law, this bill fully funds the administration’s BRAC request for the fiscal year 2008.

And let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that individual Member earmarks were neither requested nor considered by our Military Construction and VA Subcommittee. Every project funded was either requested by the administration, the Department of Defense, or funded based on the merit and need for our troops.

Voting ‘yes’ on this bill is a vote to honor our troops and our veterans.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize my colleague from Virginia, FRANK WOLF, for 2 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask you as Members of this House, it will not reflect the best ideas of bipartisanship. It is not a dream, for America’s veterans.

Perhaps less noticed, but vitally important to our military troops and their families, we also made a commitment in this bill to significantly improve health care and daycare for military families, and housing for single servicemen and women. Better housing, health care and daycare are our duty of care to the families of our Nation know that this Congress will respect their service and sacrifice in a meaningful way.

For troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, many of whom are on their second or third tours of duty, this measure provides the essential facilities required to live and fight this war so far away from their homes. It recognizes for force protection projects wherever our troops are located.

For the young men and women just volunteering now for military service, amendment No. 3 also provides $300 million to build much-needed training barracks and other facilities. This barracks initiative will send a clear message to our newest heroes that we deeply respect their decision to serve our Nation.

For the men or women wounded or ill, this amendment provides $1.3 billion to modernize outdated and inefficient medical facilities in our military-first century troops and their families deserve better than to be treated in World War II and Korean-era medical facilities. This commitment tells our troops they will have the best care if they are wounded, and even more important to so many of them, that their families will have the best of care while they are gone.

I want to especially thank and salute Chairman MURTHA for his dedicated, strong support for this military health care initiative. All of our military troops deserve his thanks, and should thank him and respect him for his leadership here.

For the families left behind here at home while their loved ones are at combat overseas, this bill provides $200 million to build new child care and youth facilities. Our military spouses and children may not be wearing our Nation’s uniform, but they are making sacrifices and should we never forget their service to the American family.

To address the housing, training and other facilities needed at military bases that are growing as a result of the Base Realignment and Closing law, this bill fully funds the administration’s BRAC request for the fiscal year 2008.

And let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that individual Member earmarks were neither requested nor considered by our Military Construction and VA Subcommittee. Every project funded was either requested by the administration, the Department of Defense, or funded based on the merit and need for our troops.

Voting ‘yes’ on this bill is a vote to honor our troops and our veterans.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize my colleague from Virginia, FRANK WOLF, for 2 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask you as Members of this House, it will not reflect the best ideas of bipartisanship. It is not a dream, for America’s veterans.

Perhaps less noticed, but vitally important to our military troops and their families, we also made a commitment in this bill to significantly improve health care and daycare for military families, and housing for single servicemen and women. Better housing, health care and daycare are our duty of care to the families of our Nation know that this Congress will respect their service and sacrifice in a meaningful way.

For troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, many of whom are on their second or third tours of duty, this measure provides the essential facilities required to live and fight this war so far away from their homes. It recognizes for force protection projects wherever our troops are located.

For the young men and women just volunteering now for military service, amendment No. 3 also provides $300 million to build much-needed training barracks and other facilities. This barracks initiative will send a clear message to our newest heroes that we deeply respect their decision to serve our Nation.

For the men or women wounded or ill, this amendment provides $1.3 billion to modernize outdated and inefficient medical facilities in our military-first century troops and their families deserve better than to be treated in World War II and Korean-era medical facilities. This commitment tells our troops they will have the best care if they are wounded, and even more important to so many of them, that their families will have the best of care while they are gone.

I want to especially thank and salute Chairman MURTHA for his dedicated, strong support for this military health care initiative. All of our military troops deserve his thanks, and should thank him and respect him for his leadership here.
Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As many of our student veterans have come to realize, the current Montgomery GI Bill falls far short in meeting the needs of today’s college students. The current program is designed as a benefit for peacetime service and was never intended as a wartime benefit.

The 21st Century GI Bill in this bill will give our men and women in uniform who have served multiple tours of duty and extended tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan the educational benefits similar to the ones earned in World War II. Our veterans today have served multiple tours of duty. They are getting pulled away from school, their jobs, and their families. The current GI Bill does not honor their service sufficiently. This bill will.

I commend our bipartisan cosponsors, especially my Virginia colleague, Jim Webb, for writing this bill. This gentleman, I will tell you, has served many of our Veterans. We need to pass this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Frelinghuysen).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I oppose this legislation on two distinct grounds. On process, the American people should expect more from this Congress. They should expect that when the United States sends our brave men and women into combat, we provide them with the resources to protect themselves and to accomplish their mission, both military and humanitarian, and we do it expeditiously.

In this context, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, the Nation’s top military officer, has warned all of us and our Congress, that “The Pentagon is dangerously close to running out of money. We need the supplemental appropriations very badly before the Memorial Day recess. We stop paying soldiers on the 15th of June, and we have precious little flexibility with respect to that.”

Should it be a surprise to the majority leadership? Absolutely not. Our troops have been waiting nearly 450 days since the President delivered his request for funds to Congress. Our soldiers need this funding to continue their efforts in the global war on terror.

Yet this is a process that amounts to deliberate brinksmanship. You have waited until the 11th hour, before bringing the bill to the floor in an effort to force the President and the Congress to endorse and accept billions of dollars of nonwar, nonemergency spending.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, on substance, the funding for Iraq and Afghanistan is critical. This is a solid package, and I commend the chairman, Mr. MURTHA, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for their work.

However, my colleagues, once again we are being asked to endorse a policy that amounts to retreat from our battles with terrorists in Iraq.

But this bill in the end should not be about binding or nonbinding deadlines for withdraw or how to conduct this war. The critical mass of this bill is about supporting our troops and making sure that all of these volunteers get what they need.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from South Dakota.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman OBEY for his hard work in putting together this emergency supplemental and overcoming a number of challenges in re-reading the amendments the House is considering today.

As chairwoman of the Economic Opportunities Subcommittee of the House Veterans’ Affairs Committee with jurisdiction over veterans education benefits, I am proud to support today’s efforts to modernize the Montgomery GI Bill. Members of the subcommittee have worked diligently throughout the 110th Congress to understand how best to enhance education benefits and make them easier to access for our Nation’s veterans in the 21st century.

My stepbrother, a 3rd Class Petty Officer in the United States Navy, next week deploys to the Persian Gulf on the USS Ronald Reagan. He, like so many thousands of brave and dedicated service men and women, stands to benefit from our important vote today, a vote to invest more wisely in these men and women who make the commitment to serve our country and keep us safe, a vote that reflects our priorities as a Nation to recognize their honored service.

I urge my colleagues to support this much-needed improvement in veterans education benefits.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, Washington is broken and it needs to be changed. This bill has been excluded from the normal rules and regulations of the House, and America’s Representatives have not had their voices heard or their rights allowed. It would be a totally different bill if we had not violated the House rules and let the committee process work. Washington is broken and we need to have it changed.

For example, if we had committee meetings, we would not have had a tax increase in here. We have a huge tax increase in this bill that affects small business owners. Eighty percent or 83 percent of the taxes here, of the people that are going to be taxed here, are small businesses.

Now, in Kansas, just like a lot of America, four out five jobs are created by small businesses. And for those of

leave? What are you going to tell your kids and your grandkids later on when you say. When I was there, there was $54 trillion of debt, and I did nothing. There was $1 trillion held by the Chinese, who are spying against us, and Mr. Mr. how they are spying against us, we did nothing.

We lost our AAA bond rating, Mom or Dad or Grandma or Grandpa while you were there, did you do anything? And the answer will be: We did nothing.

I arise in opposition to this legislation. I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee since 1995, yet I cannot recall a time that the House has avoided the Appropriations Committee process with such a critical nationally and internationally important piece of legislation.

Members of the Committee—including the minority—are being shut out of the process. I wanted to offer an amendment that would prohibit U.S. government employees from attending the Olympics on the taxpayer’s dime.

When awarded the honor of hosting the 2008 Summer Olympics, China had the opportunity to set a world stage that it has changed. But China of today is worse than the China of yesterday, or of last year, or of the last decade. China is not progressing. It is regressing. It is more violent, more repressive, and more reluctant to democratic values than ever before.

China, which jails Catholic bishops, Protestant church leaders, Tibetan Buddhists, Muslim Uighurs and Falun Gong practitioners; which is spying against us and supplying weapons to regimes like Khartoum; which has Muslim Uyghurs and Falun Gong practitioners; which is spying against us and supplying weapons to regimes like Khartoum; which has
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you that have not been reading the newspaper, our country is in a period of slow growth. This is exactly the time we need to strengthen small businesses, instead of punishing them through this bill. Eighty-three percent of the people punished in this bill are people and small businesses.

If we’d had a committee process, we may not have added in other ancillary issues into this idea. Instead, we would have had a clean bill that would address the needs of our young men and women who have so faithfully served our Nation, protecting our families, take the fight to the enemy and helping us keep this country safe.

But, Mr. Speaker, Washington is broken and it needs to be changed. We have avoided the committee process and because of that, there are portions of this bill that could have been improved, portions of it that could have been improved for our veterans that have served so faithfully, come home to us and we need to take care of. But because the committee was not involved in this process, we have not had the ability to improve this care for those who have done so much for us. The reason is, Mr. Speaker, is because Washington is broken and it needs to be changed.

We need to use the committee process. The committee process is a very important part of this. It’s been violative of our own House rules. Washington is broken and it needs to be changed.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I just cannot allow the impression to continue that somehow we have violated House rules or committee rules by this procedure. The fact is that despite some Members having not been around here long enough to remember, the House used to often proceed in this way, moving amendments back and forth between the Senate and the House as a device to reach agreement on legislation. That happened routinely during the old abortion debates back in the seventies when amendments offered by Mr. Magnuson and Mr. Flood were bounced back and forth between the Houses.

The fact is also that I offered, and my staff director specifically offered, to have the minority staff participate in every discussion related to appropriation items. We pointed out, we were not drafting, in our committee, the health insurance issues. That was drafted by the authorizing committee. And we were not drafting the language with respect to Medicaid rules. That was done by the Energy and Commerce Committee.

But we offered to have the minority staff participate in all of the staff meetings that were going on with respect to anything over which the Appropriations Committee had direct jurisdiction. If they chose not to exercise that right, that’s their responsibility, not ours.

I would also point out that my understanding is that in the 109th and 110th Congress, fully 12 percent of legislation that was passed was passed using this process of moving amendments back and forth between the Senate and the House. So this may be an unusual procedure, but it is far from unprecedented.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

I rise in strong support of amendment No. 2 and amendment No. 3 to the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2008.

As a member of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, I have fought to include overseas humanitarian assistance in these supplemental appropriations bills. I want to thank Chairman OBEY for including several of these provisions in amendment No. 3 which truly reflect the will and generosity of the American people.

Because of the rising cost and shortage of food, riots and instability have hit Haiti, have hit Egypt and the Philippines. Amendment No. 3 contains a total of 1 million for P.L. 480 Food for Peace Programs, which will be made available as soon as this bill is signed into law.

In Sudan, Chad, Kenya, Somalia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, thousands of people die each day, not from conflict, but mostly from malnourishment and lack of health care and shelter. Amendment No. 3 includes $200 million for urgent humanitarian assistance, and $300 million for assistance to refugees and internally displaced persons.

These funds are desperately needed, and I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for amendment No. 3.

Mr. LEWIS of California. May I inquire of the Chair how much time is left on either side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 35½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 31 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, one of the delights of this process, passing this bill, has been to go back through the process of the past and look at some of the protestations and expressions of concern by my colleagues, now the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee. I love this quote particularly. He says, ‘‘Now this bill is going nowhere. It’s going to be vetoed.’’ Which bill are we talking about? This one or that one?

The American people know that once again Congress is putting partisan political considerations ahead of the needs of the American people. What we ought to do is to stop these political games and go forward with the regular process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, Chairman OBEY, for the time.

Today the Congressional Progressive Caucus held an event called ‘‘Winter Soldier.’’ We listened to the veterans of the Iraq occupation, and they told us about what it’s been like over there and what they’ve learned. The meeting actually followed in tradition of hearings first held during the Vietnam War. The forum gave veterans who have firsthand experience a chance to tell their stories. It was a solemn, thoughtful event.

These men and women, these men and women saw, what they’ve experienced, is really heartbreaking.

But today we have it in our power, we have it in our power to put an end to the tragedy that is the Iraq war. Today, Congress will decide if we will give the President a blank check to continue his endless occupation of Iraq, or if we will fund redeployment and reconciliation and if we will do something for the refugees in Iraq, something in their demands. They want to end the occupation, not extend it. They want us to bring our troops and military contractors home. They want us to reaffirm our commitment to the Iraqi people.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this continued occupation in Iraq, and I want to thank Chairman OBEY for his leadership and for yielding me this time. I’m so much opposed to giving this President this new funding to continue this occupation with no strings attached until last night, once again, I went to the Rules Committee to propose the Lee amendment, which would provide funding only for the safe, responsible redeployment of our troops and contractors, and also for a strong diplomatic initiative. Not one dime should be spent anymore for funding this combat operation.

We just left a hearing of our Winter Soldiers. These young men and women told us about the dehumanizing effects of what has happened to them in terms of our troops. This has got to stop.

One of their first requests was to ask us not to vote for any more funding, to fund only redeployment and to bring them home.

In honor of our troops, let’s bring them home and not send any more money over there to fight this war.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the continued occupation in Iraq and I want to thank my Chairman, David OBEY for his leadership and for yielding me the time. I am opposed to giving this president $180 billion with no strings attached to continue the disastrous war and occupation in Iraq as amendment No. 1.

The war and occupation in Iraq has put our country and economy in a hole. When you are in a hole, you’ve got to stop digging and climb your way out. Today that means funding the
safe redeployment of our American troops and contractors out of Iraq.

The Lee Amendment I offered at the Rules Committee would have accomplished that but it was not made in order. So I have no choice but to vote against providing more funding for Iraq.

Unlike amendment No. 1, amendment No. 2 contains important restrictions and limitations on funding and would begin redeployment of our troops within 30 days. The second amendment also contains two restrictions and conditions that I strongly championed. The first is the prohibition against the establishment of permanent military bases in Iraq. The second condition prohibits the President from unilaterally binding the U.S. to an agreement with the Government of Iraq that includes security assurances for mutual defense.

Finally, I support amendment No. 3 which provides urgent funding for domestic and international priorities, including a new GI bill for our brave veterans, extension of unemployment benefits, funding for peacekeeping operations in Darfur, and urgently needed international disaster assistance.

The sad fact is that in the last 5 years this Administration has spent nearly a half trillion dollars on the Iraq war and occupation and we have precious little to show for it. Iraq has been destabilized, our national prestige has been strained, and attention has been diverted from the real and urgent challenges facing the American people.

Over 4,000 American troops and tens of thousands of Iraqis have died, more than 30,000 Americans are wounded, and more than 4 million Iraqis are displaced and homeless.

It is far past time to stop the madness. I urge a "no" vote on amendment No. 1. I urge a "yes" vote on amendment No. 2 and No. 3. We must redeploy and honor our troops by bringing them home.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the minority whip, Mr. BLUNT of Missouri.

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

This week, we're in the week before we begin our annual Memorial Day work period. Historically, this has been a time when we recognized those who have served and those who are serving, those who are willing to give even their life to help protect the freedom of this country. This is a time-honored tradition in our country.

It's today that we finally come to the floor, after literally months and months of a request for this funding for troops, nearing the deadline where troop withdrawal notices or troop furlough notices have gone out. We come to the floor with a bill that puts restrictions on the troops. We come to the floor with a bill that does, in fact, finally meet those funding needs of the troops. And we come in a way that doesn't allow us to have any different ideas, have any amendments to these provisions that are brought to us today.

This is an extraordinary procedure in the way we have handled supplemental bills in the past. The only supplements that have ever been brought to the floor in the last 20 years, with a closed rule, were supplemental bills where both sides agreed that we had to immediately respond to an immediate emergency, and it was a bipartisan agreement. There is no bipartisan agreement on the way this bill is brought to the floor. And because of that, it does not meet the needs of the troops. We're telling the troops its restrictions are wrong. The time line is wrong. Even the GI benefits that all of us believe need to be updated to meet the needs of today's military, as opposed to yesterday's military, doesn't have transferability of benefits, the thing that spouses and people in the military and dependents in the military would like. It isn't designed for a military that's a volunteer Army.

There is a better House provision, but are we allowed to offer that House provision? No.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. BLUNT. We get to say yes or no because everybody in this building knows that this bill will never become law. We've waited till the week before Memorial Day to bring a bill to the floor that will not become law. The majority leader announced earlier today that maybe it will be the middle of June before we get to a bill that would actually get to the President's desk and become law, when furlough notices have gone out.

This is a shameful way for us to meet the needs of our troops, and I hope we'll get down to business next week and see if we can't actually pass a bill that will meet the needs of our troops.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished majority caucus chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues from Wisconsin and from Pennsylvania.

This is about our eighth war funding supplemental, emergency spending for the war. But what's intriguing about this one is that, in every other war supplemental, we've asked the American taxpayers to give the Iraqis approximately $50 billion to rebuild their country, schools, hospitals, roads, electricity, all so Iraq can rebuild after the war. And this is the first supplemental that we've asked to rebuild America. How are these kids going to have approximately the same amount of money?

Over the last eight funding bills for the war, we've dedicated approximately $50 billion of American money to rebuild Iraq's schools and roads. We're asking approximately a little over $5 billion to help those kids, our GI's, to rebuild their lives, to get the education that they've earned, to start on a new life for them and their family, whether they be Guard, Reserve or active duty.

So there has been no conscience, no problem when it came to Iraq's roads. They got the money. There was no problem when it came to Iraqi schools and hospitals. We said that was our moral obligation, to help Iraq get back on their feet.

What moral obligation do we have to our own GI's to get back on their feet?

Where is the decency to these kids who we've sent, not once, not twice, some of them three times who signed up to be Guard or Reserve and then we've implemented a stop-loss program that totally changed the contracts?

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is yielded 1 additional minute.

Mr. EMANUEL. We have an obligation to these children to restart their lives.

At the height of 1949, the original GI Bill of Rights for World War II was 1 percent of our GDP. This is far less. And look how well that paid off for this country. Everybody knows somebody who went to school on that GI Bill. We are doing right by those kids who are doing right by us.

You have compared this war with the equivalent of what we've done in World War II. Well, let's make it the equivalent by giving them the GI Bill. They've earned it every day doing something that not one of us have done in this context.

And yes, we've asked those who are the most well-off in this country, people we all know, to pay a little so these kids can go to college and pursue their dream that they made possible for us because of their sacrifice. And I know a lot of those people, and they're willing to pay a little more to make sure that these kids have an opportunity for the American Dream.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my colleague from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, unlike the previous speaker from Illinois, whom I greatly respect, I support the war in Iraq. I have supported it from the beginning. I support providing the resources to our soldiers who are in the fight in Iraq and Afghanistan. I pray for some 3,000 Indiana soldiers who are on the ground in Operation Iraq Freedom every day.

But though I support providing our soldiers with the resources they need to get the job done and come home safe, I cannot support this war supplemental bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the American people need to know what is going on here. I mean, this is a backroom deal for $250 billion that includes $72 billion in domestic spending that has nothing whatsoever to do with our soldiers and the war on terror. It also will increase taxes on working families by $51 billion. Higher taxes and higher domestic spending put on the backs of our soldiers is indecent, Mr. Speaker.
When my colleague from Illinois speaks about decency, it is indecent to come to this floor and play politics with our troops during a time of war. This Congress should bring a clean supplemental bill to this floor that provides our soldiers with the resources they need to get the job done and come home safe, not billions of dollars in domestic spending and higher taxes.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation to reject playing politics with the lives of our soldiers.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. I cannot believe what I just heard. The gentleman just indicated that somehow we're adding $72 billion to a bill "that has nothing whatsoever to do with the welfare of soldiers." I would point out by far the largest item that we are adding to this bill, $51 billion over 10 years, is devoted to help those very same soldiers that the people who fought, when they come home, get treated the same way that the GIIs did at the end of World War II. That isn't on the backs of the soldiers. That's trying to face our lives. It's trying to enable Reservists and Guard members and regular forces who have had their lives disrupted, who have gone to Iraq two and three times. We're trying to say, Okay, you can stay home for a while. Get yourself a college education.

The GI Bill paid back this country $7 for every dollar it cost.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The GI Bill paid back to this society $7 for every dollar that it cost. There are unfortunately some people in this House who know the cost of everything and the value of nothing. Fortunately, the people who support this third amendment today will not be among them.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SCALISE).

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

Mr. SCALISE. The people of southeast Louisiana have faced tremendous challenges during the last 2 1/2 years. Thousands of people lost their homes due to the failure of Federal levees. However, today we find out that the flood protection that they need is going to be jeopardized by a poison pill in the name of a $52 billion tax increase on the backs of small businesses that was thrown into the bill last night with no debate. Our flood protection should not be held hostage to $52 billion in new taxes on the backs of citizens, especially small businesses.

This language clearly will not make it through the legislative process and will only give false hope to a people who deserve much better. Let us go back to work, come up with a solution that works, and then work through the legislative process. I look forward to working with you to achieve that solution.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, when these people say they're going to provide the resources for the war and for the GI Bill, they're not going to pay for it, what they actually paying is China is going to provide the resources to our veterans; China is going to finance this war because that's what has been going on. They have borrowed more money from foreign sources since George Bush left office than all 42 Presidents of the United States before him put together, and they still want to keep borrowing.

And talk about working families, we are asking people who make over $1 million a year to increase their taxes $500 for these veterans to go to college so the veterans will not be subject to future deficits and future matters that may be beyond our control where the program has to be cut.

This is not about funding, and it comes from those in this country who have the most to give to the people who gave the most with no arms and no legs. I have seen them and you have seen them at Walter Reed and Bethesda.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. TANNER. And we're going to provide resources? No, we're not going to provide any resources for these veterans unless you vote for this bill. What you're doing is we're going to ask China and Japan to give the resources to our veterans. I think that's a moral outrage.

If we can send more, we can damned sure help them get through college when they get home with one arm and one leg.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize for 2 minutes the former chairman of the Veterans' Committee, STEVE BUYER of Indiana.

Mr. BUYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to limit my remarks to the veterans' education benefits that's contained in the amendment.

I don't believe that there is a Member here in the House who opposes improving the GI Bill. What I find objectionable is the way the Speaker has listened to the lectures by the then-ranking member and now the chairman of Appropriations with regard to process over the years and how conflicted he must feel, the fact that his leadership has directed him to bring a bill to the floor that has not gone through the process and, matter of fact, that there's no bipartisanship in agreement. You had brought bills to the floor before that didn't go through the appropriations process, but you had two had agreements.

So you must be incredibly conflicted at the moment because you have given us lectures on process, and now you've thrown all of your lectures out the window.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, he's throwing all of them out the window.

What upset most of us who sit on the Veterans' Affairs Committee is in fact there was a response. Chairwoman HERSETH SANDLIN and Ranking Member JOHN BOOZMAN have a bill. It's called the GI Bill 21. It was amended through regular order in the House. And what that bill did was improve the existing GI model, and the entire committee passed it.

Now what has happened, instead of using the bill that came from the Veterans' Affairs Committee, she hijacked that process to bring a bill in the Senate that the House has never even considered. We've never had any hearings on it. It might be the greatest of both worlds if we are able, Mr. MURTHA and others, for all of our comrades and buddies and pals, we better make sure it's done right.

So in this process, I also know, and I agree with Mr. TANNER's remarks, Mr. Speaker, about paychecks.

Now I'm going to vote for this. I'm going to vote for it not because I like the tax provisions. I would have much preferred some offsets. I also recognize the Senate probably aren't going to go with the tax provisions.

But we better be smart about our business here because if this House adopts this bill, we're going to have to be correcting it in conference instead of doing our business like we should have done in the House.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. I hear my colleagues on the other side talking about political games and partisanship and process. The GI Bill of 1944 made the middle class of this Nation. Many of us are here today because of the GI Bill. My dad came back from World War II and was able to get some education, but he bought a house in Levittown, New York, for a couple grand, and we became part of the middle class for the first time in our history.

We have a GI Bill for the 21st century, and that's what this supplemental has. It says to our young men and women who are fighting, We're going to pay for the full cost of college for 4 years when you get back; we're going to take care of some of the living expenses if you have a family, and we're going to put the National Guard and Reserve that are doing so much of the fighting in Iraq as eligible for most of the benefits for the GI Bill. That's what we need in the supplemental.

We have a supplemental for the war. We need a supplemental for the war. The fact the first year, 2 years of this bill for the GI Bill was paid for, we
I rise today in strong support of the long overdue modernizations to the GI Bill. The original bill, that you have heard so many talk about, was one of the best pieces of legislation that ever left this floor. It allowed millions to attend college and serve in this body, and the understanding of what these soldiers sacrifice and what our responsibility is should be known by everyone here.

At the end of war, we are asking so much, and as Senator Dole told our committee not more than a year ago, you spent billions putting them in harm’s way, you spend the billions getting them out.

We have a moral obligation to provide these veterans benefits when they return. It is also a national security issue to keep faith with our young people to know that, if they choose to sign up to defend their Nation, we will stand with them.

Now I can tell you this. I’m not an attorney like many of my colleagues here. I’m a high school teacher and a 24-year veteran of our military, but I fear people standing here talking about process, talking about legality, talking about everything like that. Your process when you were in charge, you had 5 years, Mr. Speaker, 5 years to do something about the GI Bill.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues on the Republican side had those 5 years. They chose to do nothing. They spent their time in enacting tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. They tell us today this is a tax on small business.

They do not like to fight the war, so they talk about process, talking about legality, talking about everything like that. Your process when you were in charge, you had 5 years.

The time to do this is now. We hear all this talk about the soul searching being done by my Republican colleagues. The only thing you need to do is look in the eyes of those veterans and tell them that you are unwilling to provide the necessary benefit for them to come back and make their lives whole.

This provides for our warriors in the field. It provides for our veterans, and it does it by paying for it, and for that, I encourage all of our colleagues to vote with the bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

 THE SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded to address their remarks through the Chair.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, could you give us the time, please, on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. McCrery).

Mr. McCrery. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation before us. Besides increasing taxes, this bill would create an untargeted emergency extended unemployment benefits program that would add to the deficit and ultimately increase State payroll taxes.

Moreover, this provision is untargeted, meaning it would pay extended unemployment benefits in all States, regardless of the availability of jobs in those States. Today’s national unemployment rate is 5.0 percent.

In March, 32 States had unemployment rates below 5 percent. Congress has never created a temporary extended benefits program at such a low unemployment rate when such a program was created was 5.7 percent. Especially given today’s low unemployment rate nationwide, it just doesn’t make sense to extend benefits in States where jobs already are available.

While I do not support the legislation before us on this subject, Republicans know that laid off workers are hurting, especially in States with struggling economies where jobs are not readily available.

That is why, during committee consideration of this legislation, I supported targeting extended unemployment benefits so real help would be provided where it is needed most.

Unfortunately, that effort was rebuffed in favor of the general untargeted proposal before us today.

This legislation also shows the sham that is PAYGO. The broad extended unemployment-rate program is projected to cost $16 billion over the next 5 years and increase State payroll taxes by $1 billion over that time. And this is likely just the start. The typical temporary program in recent decades has lasted only 20 months, but this program started under the legislation before us today follows that path, the ultimate cost will exceed $30 billion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. Lewis of California. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. McCrery. This program will cost about $30 billion if it follows that path.

Yet despite pledges in this House to adhere to the letter and spirit of PAYGO, this bill does neither. Our colleagues’ argument is that today’s economic conditions constitute an emergency only 20 months since 1970 had a lower unemployment rate than today. So if we’re in an emergency now, when won’t we be in an emergency? We may as well just have extended unemployment benefits 100 percent Federally paid for forever and ever. It doesn’t make sense, and it’s very costly.

Mr. Obe. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker. Just Imagine! The mortal sin that we’re accused of committing on this side of the aisle is believing that we ought to provide some additional economic assistance to people.
who have been hit the hardest by economic dislocation and have been unemployed until their benefits have expired and haven’t been able to find a job.

It’s suggested that we’re doing this “on the backs” of our fighting men and women who return home. I’d suggest that it’s just the opposite. When a man or a woman returns home from Iraq, when we find out that in addition to having their reentry problem, they also, some of them, may have post-traumatic stress trauma, they get that in addition to what they have to worry about for themselves, they also have to worry about the fact that their sister or their brother-in-law is now unemployed, adding to the burden on that family.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 30 seconds. I think those GIs recognize this is supposed to be a seamless society. We’re supposed to help take care of the people who are in the most trouble, and I don’t apologize for using some of the money that we use for veterans benefits. I don’t apologize for getting that money from some of the people in this society who have had the least stress in their lives.

It seems to me that that’s what the Judeo-Christian ethic is all about, and we plead fully guilty on this side of the aisle.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I proudly yield 1 minute to my colleague from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman. I just want to make a brief observation here.

We were here yesterday with the farm bill and witnessed the kind of traveling back in time, if you will, to the farm bill and witnessed the kind of unprecedented security commitments and assurances to Iraq from the United States, I introduced the Iraq Strategic Agreement Review Act.

So today I want to voice my support for the provision that makes it clear, as my bill does, that any security arrangement between the United States and Iraq will not be funded unless it comes in the form of a treaty or is specifically authorized by a law.

Mr. Speaker, this issue goes to the heart of our constitutional duties as a Congress and the power to declare war with which we have been entrusted as representatives.

I urge my colleagues to support this provision.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it’s important for the American people to understand that throughout the history of this Congress and this Nation that party divisions in time of war have always ended at the water’s edge, until today.

Tragically, this Congress, for this House, for the Appropriations Committee, the Speaker of the House has decided to unilaterally impose on the will of the entire Nation this appropriations bill without the benefit of a hearing, without the benefit of amendments, without the benefit of input not just from the Republican Members, Mr. Speaker, but from the Democrat Members.

It seems just an observation here that PAYGO is only used as a way not to enforce spending discipline because, if it actually does enforce any discipline, we waive it, but if it’s used to increase taxes, then, by golly, we’ve got to enforce it.

I just don’t see how one day can make such a big difference if this wasn’t the case.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAUNO).

Ms. DELAUNO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Iraq provisions included in amendment No. 2 calling for the responsible redeployment of our troops to begin within 30 days. After voting against this war, I have supported the goal of properly redeploying our troops for over 2 years.

And after President Bush and Prime Minister al-Maliki signed a “Declaration of Principles” document outlining unprecedented security commitments and assurances to Iraq from the United States, I introduced the Iraq Strategic Agreement Review Act.

So today I want to voice my support for the provision that makes it clear, as my bill does, that any security arrangement between the United States and Iraq will not be funded unless it comes in the form of a treaty or is specifically authorized by a law.

Mr. Speaker, this issue goes to the heart of our constitutional duties as a Congress and the power to declare war with which we have been entrusted as representatives.

I urge my colleagues to support this provision.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, there’s a number of unnecessary provisions in this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, there’s a number of unnecessary provisions in this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, there’s a number of unnecessary provisions in this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Name one.

Mr. CULBERSON. Well, why are we separating out Member pork in this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Name one. Mr. CULBERSON. Why are we separating out Member pork in this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Name one. Mr. CULBERSON. Why are we separating out Member pork in this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Why are we separation out provisions in this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman’s time has expired. All Members are reminded to address their remarks through the Chair.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

And through the Chair, I would invite the Member to name a specific piece of congressional pork in this bill. He cannot because there is none. He’s at least had enough time to read the bill to know that.

The only possible piece of pork in this bill is one which we inserted at the request of the Deputy-Secretary of Defense for a military hospital in Guam that came here at the request of the Secretary of Defense’s office.

You can find no Member’s pork in this package, and you know it as well as I do.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, Mr. WAMP from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I don’t want to get into the blame game because the American people are sick and tired of the blame game. I think the truth is, Republicans screwed up running this place, and now Democrats are screwing up running this place. So there’s plenty of blame to go around. And they’re sick and tired of this process debate because they don’t understand how it affects them.

But let me say to the people who are talking process. If the Congress is not going to work together on matters of the utmost importance of war, the Congress is never going to work together. And that is the underlying problem, and it does affect our lives.
I’ve got a nephew in Iraq right now. I’ve got another nephew on his way to Afghanistan and that affects our lives. I am the ranking member of the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee. I heard my chairman, Mr. Edwards, whom I very much respect, spent 2 minutes on excellent reasons why to support this bill, but not one time did he talk about anybody on this side because we didn’t have any voice in the process. He didn’t compliment anything over here because we were involved this time around. I think we should be.

And the way that they pay for the extras in this bill are with taxes. We don’t want to raise your taxes. And I know that we’re spending a lot of money in Iraq, but it’s easy for everybody to forget, over half the Democrats in the United States Senate voted to remove Saddam Hussein by force. Almost half the Democrats in the House voted to remove Saddam Hussein by force.

The President of the United States acknowledged just a week ago that he never said “Mission Accomplished,” and he shouldn’t have because it’s not. We’ve got a long way to go.

This is the serious business of freedom, and it needs to be funded without all the extraneous stuff, and frankly all the tricks associated with getting what they want in addition to what we need. And they’re doing it with tax increases, and it’s the wrong way. And I’m sorry, I’m not blaming anybody; we just need to do better.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the economy has been one of the casualties of the Iraq war. And this administration has consistently refused to be interested in dealing with the problems of the unemployed.

We tried to get this introduced when we had the stimulus package some months ago. The administration didn’t want to do anything with the unemployed. Long-term unemployment in this country is up to 17.9 percent. Now, you wouldn’t think they would care, but they still aren’t asking for it.

They have never changed their tune from 1935. They never thought we should have unemployment insurance in the Social Security Act of 1935 because they said if you give people unemployment insurance, they won’t want to go to work, they will just want to sit home and get a check. That comes from people who have never been unemployed. That comes from people who don’t know anybody who has ever been unemployed. It is simply nonsense.

We need to put the money into the economy. We need to give it to the workers who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. And this administration still sits there and says, no, we’re not going to extend unemployment benefits.

There are 26 weeks in here; 13 for everybody, and 48 weeks for those States that are over 6 percent. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. economy is one of the casualties of the Iraq war, and passing an extension of unemployment benefits is nothing less than battlefield triage for innocent American workers who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

When I first introduced legislation several months ago to extend unemployment benefits, I hoped the White House would declare a cease fire so that we could act quickly and on a bipartisan basis to help the American people and U.S. economy.

Instead, months went by while the administration pretended the gathering economic storm was nothing to worry about. And matters just kept getting worse.

Long-term unemployment—the percentage of unemployed workers who have not been able to find a job for at least 6 months—now stands at 17.8 percent. That is something to worry about. And act on.

My bipartisan unemployment extension bill will extend benefits in every State for an additional 13 weeks, and in States where the overall unemployment rate exceeds 6 percent, there is another 13-week extension.

We are going to help the American people weather this storm. And at the same time, we’re going to lessen the economic blow to the U.S. economy.

We know people spend their unemployment benefits quickly, and we know a dollar in benefits yields $1.73 in positive economic impact as the money ripples through the economy.

Governors, mayors, state legislators, economists, advocates for working families, and the faith community are all asking for this extension of unemployment benefits.

Only those on the far right are opposed. They say the unemployment benefits keep people from going out and looking for a job, but they are both out of line and out of touch.

Across America the average unemployment benefit is less than $300 a week—below the poverty-level for an American family.

What we’re doing today is throwing a lifeline to the American people. Enough damage has already been done to the U.S. economy because of all the money spent on the endless Iraq war.

It’s time for Congress to tend to the economic casualties at home.

Vote for extending unemployment benefits because it is a vote for helping the American people.
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system has provided a temporary income support to workers who lose their jobs. The counter-cyclical partnership between states and the federal government was designed to accumulate and hold significant funds in trust accounts during good economic times and pay out benefits during bad economic times and simultaneously stimulate a stagnant economy.

State legislators are concerned that the percentage of unemployed workers is rising and that state unemployment insurance agencies have experienced reduced funding appropriated by Congress in recent years. Nationally, unemployment insurance claims levels and the exhaustion of benefits rate have been on the rise and states are struggling to respond with less federal administrative funding than previous years, especially in those states with high unemployment rates.

In the 2008 legislative session, at least one state had to appropriate general funds to support the administration of the program. These funds should have been appropriated by Congress as part of the FY 2008 appropriations legislation and/or through Reed Act distributions to meet the needs of the program. Economic assumptions did not anticipate the increases in unemployment claims that the Congressional Budget Office now projects as a result of the current economic slowdown.

During the current Congress, several bills were introduced (e.g., S 1871, LIR 2233, HR 3920, HR 5749) to extend benefits or modifications to state unemployment systems and enact unemployment insurance legislation that would provide adequate resources for administering the program. Economic assumptions did not anticipate the increases in unemployment claims that the Congressional Budget Office now projects as a result of the current economic slowdown.

The gentleman wants to know why do we have money in this bill for the census? Simple. It’s because the Secretary of Commerce asked us to put it in because they’ve had a huge technical screw-up in the Department of the Census. The last time I checked, the Secretary of Commerce was appointed by the President of the United States, Mr. George W. Bush. He wants to know why we have money in this bill for prisons. Simple. We’ve been told by the Bureau of Prisons—last time I looked, it’s run by the Bush Administration—that if we didn’t provide this money, because of cost overruns they’re going to have to fire guards and lay off people in Federal prisons. Anybody interested in law and order I don’t think is going to be happy about that.

So it seems to me it is responsible to respond to emergencies on both the domestic side and on the international side.

I’m sorry that the gentleman doesn’t seem to be aware of the fact that we have, in writing, requests from both of those agencies, but that happens to be the fact. And that’s why we have money in this bill for prisons.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Georgia 1 additional minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. There is money in here for the census. And I learned in eighth grade geography we do a census every 10 years. Why should that be put on an emergency bill? We know that the end of the decade comes. That funding should be done in an appropriate freestanding manner.

The Bureau of Prisons? Why are we passing that on the backs of soldiers? Contractor language. And I’m a former member of military construction and I represent four military installations. MILCON is very important to me. But why is it put on the back of a supplemental emergency bill? That is not what we do here. It should go through the regular appropriations process. It should go through a subcommittee. It should go through a full committee before it comes to the House floor. It should not be an amendment that is put on a freestanding bill. It should not be an amendment.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. There is money in here for the census. And I learned in eighth grade geography we do a census every 10 years. Why should that be put on an emergency bill? We know that the end of the decade comes. That funding should be done in an appropriate freestanding manner.

The Bureau of Prisons? Why are we passing that on the backs of soldiers? Contractor language. And I’m a former member of military construction and I represent four military installations. MILCON is very important to me. But why is it put on the back of a supplemental emergency bill? That is not what we do here. It should go through the regular appropriations process. It should go through a subcommittee. It should go through a full committee before it comes to the House floor. It should not be an amendment that is put on a troop’s bill.

I think that if we look back in history at the way that we were sticking it to, if you will, the minority party when we were in the majority, I think you guys have a very good case for that. In fact, I respect Mr. OBEY. I have a page full of quotes from him.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to answer the gentleman’s question.

I yield myself 10 seconds. Once again, when they can’t argue about the substance, they whine about process. That’s not going to impress very many people. I certainly didn’t in Mississippi yesterday.

With that, I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished Speaker of
the House, the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I want to commend you, Chairman OBEY, and Mr. MURTHA, for your tireless work on behalf of our men and women in uniform. Bringing this critical legislation to the floor today, I am particularly interested in part two and three of the resolution.

We’re all grateful for the fact that this will be the last time we will vote on an Iraq supplemental in the House of Representatives. Again, I thank the chairman and the chairman for their important work in this regard.

When the House completes its work today, we will have achieved three goals. First, we will have set a new direction in Iraq that will end this sad chapter in American history and bring our brave men and women home. That is necessary because President Bush, in his request to the Congress, insisted on his false premise, without the proper training and equipment for our troops, without a strategy for success or an exit strategy from Iraq.

Isn’t it sad that here we are, over 5 years after over 4,000 of our precious treasure have died, tens of thousands of our men and women in uniform have been wounded, many of them permanently. Our reputation in the world has been greatly diminished, harming our ability to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and eradicate disease and alleviate poverty, and all of the other leadership roles we have played in the past. It has come at a tremendous cost in dollars to American taxpayers, trillions of dollars, which we have taken deeply into debt, which has taken us into recession. More on that later. But think of the opportunity cost of that money, what we could have done to invest in education and health care. We will pay any price, any time to protect the American people, but not to follow the whim of the impaired judgment of this Bush administration.

Only when we finally end this war can we rebuild our military. And that is another cost of this war, diminishing the capacity of our military to meet challenges and threats to our security wherever they may occur. When we do that, we will be able to refocus our attention on the real war on terror.

So this action that we are proposing today, a new direction in Iraq that will end the war, will rebuild our military, refocus on the real war on terror, and restore our reputation in the world. That is why this legislation directs that a redeployment begin within 30 days of enactment, and with the goal of being completed by December 2009, be completed by then. The new President will have the flexibility to bring our troops home safely, honorably, responsibly, and soon.

Essential to restoring our reputation in the world is to regain our moral authority, which has been lost in this war. That is why under the conditions of this bill, and those we have been blocked from enacting, that we will end the war, which we started, and we will come home, honorably and soon.

What we will also accomplish in this bill is to honor our responsibility to our men and women in uniform. I have been to the theater; to the war area; five or six times in the course of this military action, sometimes with Mr. MURTHA, with Mr. SKELETON, with Mr. LANTOS, with our committee Chairs of jurisdiction.

And when we meet the young people there, they always say the same thing: “What is going to happen to me when I come home? What am I going to happen to me when I go home?”

Some of the soldiers were telling me about their lives at home, and one of them was very quiet, and I said to him, “What did you do before you came to Iraq?”

He said, “I was in high school, ma’am.” He was in high school. He was a teenager with a gun over his shoulder, fighting a war for this country’s security, it has to happen. But this young man, a teenager, fighting that fight without any thought about what was going to happen to him when he came home.

What we would like to say in the final amendment here is that when you come home, young man, we will thank you for your service to our country by sending you to college. That’s what the student veterans have asked us for. That is what we have done for veterans in the past. That is what we owe these young people now. And in doing so, we will be doing a great thing not only for them but for our country because their education will be part of the economic recovery of our country.

This bill, Mr. President, it is clear. President Bush and the Republicans in Congress, has taken us deeply into debt, which has taken us deeply into recession, and now has taken our economy to a place where we have record numbers of people unemployed. Today 7.6 million people are unemployed. Of these, 1.4 million Americans, jobless Americans, have been looking for work for over 6 months. And our economy has lost 260,000 jobs this year so far alone. These people need our help as they continue to seek work in this difficult economy.

Third in this bill, we will begin to address America’s domestic priorities. We will strengthen America’s economy by investing in our veterans and our workers here at home.

As I mentioned, this war, President Bush’s war, which is enabled by the complicity of the Republicans in Congress, has taken us deeply into debt, which has taken us deeply into recession, and now has taken our economy to a place where we have record numbers of people unemployed. Today 7.6 million people are unemployed. Of these, 1.4 million Americans, jobless Americans, have been looking for work for over 6 months. And our economy has lost 260,000 jobs this year so far alone. These people need our help as they continue to seek work in this difficult economy.

I urge my colleagues to support the second and the third amendments that hopefully presentation will. And in closing, I want to, as always, salute our men and women in uniform for their service, their sacrifice, their courage,
Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the Republican
Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER).

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves today as a minority
party watching a very perplexing bill come towards us. It’s perplexing
in the sense that we watch a majority party which has promised America to end
the war, which many of us, I think, rightly view and the world will view as an
American defeat because it has failed and cannot be changed to the point
where America can win. We’ve also watched a majority party tell us that
the spending on the Iraq war has destroyed the American economy. We can
differ on that but that is their position. And we now watch the Democratic
Party bring forward a bill that will fund a failed war and will evidently, by
their logic, further decimate the American economy.

Now how does one come to the conclusion that this is a necessary step for
said party? Well, you have discretionary spending added into it. Now, I
would ask the gentleman, this fine piece of legislation has been attached to this
bill, which was introduced by the gentle-
man from Washington, to help people
who are unemployed. Thanks to the
policies of my State legislature, which has raised taxes and helped drive busi-
ness out of Michigan, we have seen that
people need unemployment insurance
to get themselves through dif-
ficult times in the hopes they can find employment.

Which brings me to the next problem with this, which is in an attempt to
help veterans, we are raising taxes on
small business income. Eighty percent
of the income that will be taxed comes from small business. So now what we have
attained to show that we can fund a war that we believe has failed
with money that has decimated the
American economy by going overseas;
yet we will try to help the unemployed,
who will further suffer from this, and we will try to help veterans who come
back from that war by making sure
that there are no jobs here waiting for
them.

Again, it is a very perplexing bill. I
would suggest to the gentleman who
earlier suggested there was nothing
Congress could do to end this war to rethink the position.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the
gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. McCOTTER. Congress still holds
the power of the purse. If the war is not
funded, the war cannot continue.
That’s perhaps a position I disagree
with, but it is a factual matter. If you
are serious about this, you would do
that.

Or you would have a straightforward
vote on funding the troops to ensure
that we continue to move forward and
that America is not defeated in Iraq.
You would have dealt with the
McDermott bill and sent it to the
President despite his veto threat be-
cause he has also threatened to veto
this legislation. There would be much
Republican support for this. And then
you would deal with the veterans in
the way they should be.

Now many friends of mine are Blue
Dogs. You were not questioned on your
patriotism when you determined that
this money for veterans had to be off-
set. You were not even asked about
big government than veterans. I would
suggest that those of us who want to
make sure our economy recovers and
do not want to tax it into submission
and decimation should not have any
patriotism questioned about sup-
porting veterans by opposing tax in-
creases and instead looking for cuts in
Federal pork to pay for it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1
minute to the distinguished gentleman
from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker,
i urge my colleagues to reject the
President’s demand for war money and
to instead support an amendment that
will force the redeployment of our
troops there to fully fund the benefits
that our veterans deserve.

A half decade after “Mission Accom-
plished,” the President is asking once
again for $100 billion to fund a war
that cannot be won militarily. But,
Mr. Speaker, it’s past time to look
at the President in the eye and say, “Read my
lips: No.”

Our military is superb, but it cannot
impose peace in a country plagued by
sectarian violence. Peace will not come
to Iraq until Iraqis stop killing each other.

Nevertheless, the President’s fol-
lowers demand hundreds of billions
more for combat operations while they
insist on blocking a relatively small
investment in caring for our veterans.
This is an outrage, and we owe our service-
men and women the best. The years
of neglecting their safety and well-being
must come to an end.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to
join me in rejecting funds for war, in
requiring withdrawal from Iraq, and in
providing the education and health
care benefits our veterans deserve.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speak-
er, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague
from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

(Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky asked and
was given permission to revise and ex-
tend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank
the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing here with
a bill that until today has never seen
the light of day. This bill was con-
cocted in the back room of the Speak-
er. We were not allowed to have input
on it. We have not been allowed to have
amendments. Jack Murtha’s sub-
committee was not allowed to have a hearing on this or
discuss it with his subcommittee mem-
bers. No subcommittee on appropri-
ations was allowed to have a hearing
and debate the issues.

Mr. MURTHA. Will the gentleman
yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to
the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. We did have a meet-
ing, and I explained the part of our bill
to the subcommittee, and we had no
dissension at all. We had a lot of sug-
gestions. We spent a long time on the
bill. We spent at least an hour, much
more time than we usually spend on a
bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. You say
you met with the subcommittee and in-
formed them about what’s in the bill
that the Speaker wrote? I agree with
this.

Mr. MURTHA. Absolutely.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. That’s
what I’m saying.

Mr. MURTHA. Okay.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. And the
full chairman of the committee did the
same thing. He didn’t draft this bill. This bill was given to him. And the
Members of the minority have had no
say in what’s in this bill.

The people of this country deserve to
have their representatives in Congress
have a say-so in what comes before the
House and what’s debated on the House
floor, and we have not been given that.

This is a dictatorship here. This bill
has not seen the light of day. It has not
been the subject of amendments. We
have not been allowed to ask questions.
We didn’t know what was in it until
yesterday, a bill this thick.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. That’s
the process here is flawed. And it’s the first time that I recollect in my
28 years here of a bill coming to the
floor, an appropriations bill, without
the minority’s having a say-so unless
they had agreed to it. This is a new
procedure we are having here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gen-
tleman’s time has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield the
gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. That’s
objection number one. We did not have
a chance to have a say-so on this bill. The
American people have been shut out
of a discussion of what’s in this bill,
until today.

Number two, this bill is loaded down
with matters that are not related to
helping the brave men and women on
the battlefield on the other side.

Now, there are all sorts of amend-
ments that you’re hearing today that
were offered, one of which contains a
lot of spending and a lot of spending
that’s not related to helping the troops
overseas.

And so I am disappointed. I’m dis-
appointed in the fact that the Approp-
riations Committee was bypassed,
therefore the people were denied a
voice, and this bill brought directly to
the floor without ever having had a
single day of hearings in the sub-
committees and the full committee.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1
minute to the distinguished gentleman
from Florida (Mr. BOYD).
Mr. BOYD of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, the last GI Bill was written after World War II, and 64 years later we’re passing a new expanded GI Bill that will provide important education benefits for our service members. Simply put, ladies and gentlemen, it’s the right thing to do.

In the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, our guardsmen and our reservists have been used and deployed by our Commander in Chief at a level that we haven’t seen since World War II. Many of these guardsmen and reservists were in a career profession before these wars, and many will come home unable to continue that career profession because of physical or mental injuries sustained during their service in that war.

This GI Bill will restore the promise of a full 4-year education for our benefits, 60 years since the last one was written, and make the veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan part of the American economic recovery efforts just as the veterans of World War II were.

I want to thank the Speaker and the House leadership for bringing this bill to the floor.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I reserve my time.

Mr. BOYD of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this bill was brought to the floor in a fiscally responsible manner. By fully funding this GI Bill for the next 10 years and paying for it up front, we have made this legislation better for our veterans and better for the American people.

We are asking those who benefit the most from living in a strong country to pay to take care of those who risk their lives to defend it instead of borrowing the money from China or bucking the costs to our children and grandchildren.

Supporting this bill is the right thing to do. And I want to thank Chairman OBEY and Chairman MURTHA for also including the Iraq loan provisions which will require the Iraqis to pay for the security training of their own people and the reconstruction efforts.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOYD of Florida. The Speaker inquired of the gentleman from California how many speakers he has remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. As of this moment, we have one additional speaker. I may take 10 seconds to close or somewhat less than that.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY).

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Chairman OBEY and Chairman MURTHA.

As service and distinguished body, we again stand ready to break with President Bush and demand change in Iraq. And again, we have a chance to do what is right after years of pursuing the wrong strategy, a misguided strategy, that I saw firsthand and a battle my fellow paratroopers are still fighting today.

Today, we can come together to do what is right. Today, we can change direction in Iraq, refocus on al Qaeda in Afghanistan and give our troops the GI Bill that they have earned.

The question before us is clear: Do we proceed in a bipartisan way with the support of military experts and American public opinion to allow more political posturing and more of the same while American troops are stuck refereeing a religious civil war?

That is the choice we all must make. And to those who stand in the way of change and accountability in Iraq, the American people are paying attention.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with those who want a change. I am proud to fight for accountability in our foreign policy and proud to fight until our brave veterans get the benefits that they deserve.

A year ago, I called on my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to stand ready for change. I renew that same call today. Neither our troops nor our veterans can wait for us to change our foreign policy in Iraq, not until next year’s sixth anniversary, or the seventh anniversary, or the tenth.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas.

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

I rise in opposition to one more dollar being spent on the war in Iraq but many, many dollars spent on the brave men and women. I thank the leadership and I thank this committee for allowing us to spend dollars because of a responsibility to our troops with the GI Bill.

I also offer to my constituents, but also to this body, that we have an emergency, as well, with our summer jobs program. And I hope that we will find a way to fund a summer jobs program for that.

Let me say that there is not a tax burden in this bill, and I thank our leadership for understanding PAYGO. This is nothing more than an opportunity for those who make over $1 million to experience the burden, if you will, of the sacrifice this Nation is making on behalf of our troops. The moneys that are expended, only $500 for those making over $1 million and more, will be given to our troops with the GI Bill of Rights.

Where do we stand? I stand with the flag on behalf of the American troops. This is a great bill. Vote against the funding for the war and vote for the re-deployment of our troops, a better domestic plan, and yes, an opportunity to pass the GI Bill of Rights, the GI Bill for our young men and women.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the continued funding of the Iraq war. While I offer my support for Amendments No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, No. 4, No. 5, and No. 6, while amendments 2 and 3 contain provisions beneficial to the American people, designed to improve our economy and protect our young men and women, amendment 1 continues a disastrous policy of providing unrestricted funding to continue the Bush administration’s war in Iraq.

Last night, I offered three amendments to this legislation in the rules committee. My first amendment would have added three sense of Congress paragraphs: “(1) The war in Iraq should end as safely and quickly as possible and our troops should be brought home; (2) the performance of United States military personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan should be commended, their courage and sacrifice have been exceptional, and when they come home, their service should be appropriately, including through the observance of a national day of celebration; and (3) the primary purpose of funds made available by this Act should be to transition the mission of United States Armed Forces in Iraq and undermined their redeployment, and not to extend or prolong the war.”

This amendment is borne from my deeply held belief that we must commend our military for their exemplary performance and success in Iraq. As lawmakers continue to debate U.S. policy in Iraq, our brave men and women continue to willingly sacrifice life and limb on the battlefield. Our troops in Iraq did everything we asked them to do. We sent them overseas to fight an army; they are now caught in the midst of an insurgent civil war and continuing political upheaval. The United States will not and should not permanently prop up the Iraqi government and military. U.S. military involvement in Iraq will come to an end, and, when U.S. forces leave, the responsibility for securing their nation will fall to Iraqis themselves. However, whether or not my colleagues agree that the time has come to withdraw our American forces from Iraq, I believe that all of us in Congress should be of one accord that our troops deserve our sincere thanks and congratulations.

I very strongly believe that our Nation has a moral obligation to ensure that our veterans are treated with the respect and dignity that they deserve. One reason we are the greatest Nation in the world is because of the brave young men and women fighting for us in Iraq and Afghanistan. They deserve honor, they deserve dignity, and there is no other way to know that a grateful Nation cares about them.

The second amendment that I offered explicitly states that the goals laid out by the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002, AUMF, have all been achieved by our troops.

As my amendment describes, the brave men and women of our military have done everything we asked them to do. The United States Armed Forces successfully toppled the Taliban, secured the key cities of Iraq in only 21 days. Because of the skill and dedication of the members of the Armed Forces, the entire world has now been assured that Iraq does not possess weapons.
of mass destruction that could threaten the United States or any member nation of the international community. The Armed Forces performed magnificently in conducting military operations designed to ensure that the people of Iraq would enjoy the benefits of a democratically elected government that is capable of sustaining itself economically and politically and defending itself militarily. In June 2004, the Armed Forces facilitated the transfer of sovereignty from the Coalition Provisional Authority to the interim Government of Iraq, which governed Iraq until December 2005 when national elections were held in which more than 8 million Iraqi men and women voted in elections that were free and fair. When our troops have achieved the objectives for which they were sent to Iraq, they are now caught in the midst of a sectarian conflict. Unfortunately, there is no military solution to Iraq’s ongoing political and sectarian conflicts. This is a war without end. Though President Bush continues to state that they would either foster a stable and lasting peace. Thus far, the Iraqi government has demonstrated an inability or an unwillingness to deliver on the political benchmarks that they themselves have set as essential to achieving national reconciliation, which was the rationale and stated objective of the recent troop surge. Continuing to put the lives of our soldiers and our national treasure in the hands of what by most informed accounts—even by members of the Bush Administration—is an ineffective central Iraqi government is irresponsible and contrary to the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

The third amendment that I offered would provide funds for summer youth employment and training activities under the Workforce Investment Act. Unfortunately, many of our youth have to help out their families in these troubling economic times. Many of the youth who could obtain skills and training in their summer jobs are those that seek to stabilize and reconcile Iraq by force, only the Iraqi government can secure a lasting peace. But since 2000, the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program, SYETP, has lost its direct funding, and is now effectively buried among 10 competing programs within the Workforce Investment Act, WIA. With unemployment soaring and the summer heat approaching, there is an urgent need to bring back summer jobs for youth. We need to be cognizant of the fact that many families count on their children working during the summer to raise money for college.

Families are facing a foreclosure crisis, the rising cost of gas, and health care; this amendment provides more money for workforce preparedness among our youth. When our nation is engaged in a war of responsibility it will last a lifetime, aiding not only them, but their families, and our communities. This amendment would provide our youth the skills and training they need to enter the workforce, and the money they and their families need to make it in these tough economic times.

However, the legislation we are considering today contains many important provisions, but, unfortunately, the first amendment continues funding for a war that I strongly oppose. I oppose amendment No. 1 because I stand with the American taxpayers who have paid over $600 billion to finance the misadventure in Iraq. I stand with the 4076 fallen heroes who gave their last measure of devotion to their country. Last May, I was proud to vote for H.R. 1591, a supplemental spending bill that would have provided funds for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, which included a timetable for the redeployment of U.S. troops. Though this bill passed the House majority, the President opted to veto this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I must oppose Amendment No. 1. This amendment provides a total of $162.9 billion for the Department of Defense for FY 2008 and FY 2009, funds that are handed over without any strings. The amendment does not shield our troops in Iraq, a war that so many of my colleagues in Congress oppose, and which only 32 percent of Americans now support. The amendment does not require that war funds can only be used for the redeployment of American troops home from Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against the 2002 Iraq War Resolution. I am proud of that vote. I have consistently voted against the Administration’s practice of submitting a request for supplemental funding for the ongoing war effort not only for its non-budgetary and non-appropriations process which would subject the funding request to more rigorous scrutiny and require it to be balanced against other pressing national priorities. I cannot support legislation that provides the President with the authority to pro- long his ill-advised war effort unrestrained.

I rise today in strong support of Amendment No. 2. This amendment lays out a responsible U.S. policy toward Iraq, requiring that troops begin deployment from Iraq within 30 days, with a goal of completing the withdrawal of combat troops by December 2009. As a Member of both the Out of Iraq and the Progressives Caucuses, I am proud to vote for legislation that, like other measures passed by this Congress, begins the process of withdrawing U.S. men and women from this war.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this legislation specifically requires that any agreement between the United States and the Government of Iraq committing future U.S. forces must be specifically authorized by Congress. The governments of Iraq and the United States announced their intention to forge a strategic framework agreement, a long-term, bilateral pact, to be completed by July 31, 2008. This negotiated agreement is intended to be based on the Declaration of Principles for a Long-Term Relationship of Cooperation and Friendship Between the Republic of Iraq and the United States of America, signed November 26, 2007, by Iraqi Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki and President Bush.

Under the Declaration of Principles, the parties will negotiate a security agreement, under which the United States will support the Iraqi government and Security Forces in providing security and stability and fighting al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups. The Declaration of Principles envision a security agreement setting forth a wide-ranging set of commitments, which will cover areas such as intelligence, law enforcement, economics, and security. In hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, administration officials have indicated that the President intends to negotiate this agreement as an executive agreement, not subject to Congressional approval. It is essential that any agreement which commits future U.S. troops to the defense of Iraq is outside the purview of existing authorizations, and such an agreement must be submitted to the Congress for approval. This legislation also prohibits the establishment of permanent bases in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 2 requires that the Iraqi government step up and pay its share of reconstruction costs, because we are concerned that the United States has paid and continues to pay a disproportionate amount for Iraq reconstruction, especially when the Iraqi government reportedly has a $25–30 billion budget surplus this year. To date the United States has appropriated more than $45 billion for Iraq reconstruction.

American funded reconstruction programs have included: the training and equipping of Iraqi security forces, a $30 billion-rich nation. Though still facing problems including a lack of technology, damage from previous mismanagement, the effects of looting, and water intrusion, Iraqi oil production is currently at around 2 million barrels per day. The price of oil has skyrocketed to over $100 a barrel and Iraq’s oil revenues are generating an estimated $356.4 billion this year alone, according to the OAG, yet it is U.S. tax-payers who continue to foot the bill for Iraq reconstruction.

The government of Iraq is stashing its money in global banks, including a reported $30 billion in the U.S., instead of investing this money in the development of crucial Iraqi infrastructure. This legislation requires the Iraqi government to take responsibility for the future of its own nation. There are a number of budgetary provisos in this amendment. It requires the President to reach an agreement and submit budget costs for U.S. Armed Forces operating in Iraq so that our military pays what Iraq pays. It requires that troops meet the Pentagon’s definition of combat ready before they are deployed to Iraq; Prohibits troops from being deployed longer than Pentagon guidelines recommend; and requires that troops spend adequate time at home between deployments. This legislation makes substantial strides toward cleaning up the Iraq war. By requiring an executive order to make all contractors working in war zones subject to prosecution for offenses that would otherwise be in violation of U.S. law; extend- ing the statute of limitations for fraud cases during wartime; and amending the federal criminal code to prohibit profiteering and fraud involving contractors overseas. In addition, it prohibits interrogation techniques not author- ized in the Army Field Manual, a provision necessary in eliminating torture.

Mr. Speaker, the third amendment to H.R. 2642 provides over $21.2 billion for much needed domestic programs and foreign aid. By extending unemployment benefits, expanded veterans’ education benefits, and placing a moratorium on the Bush Administrations’ seven Medicaid regulations; this amendment gets us closer to where the Economic Stimulus package should have taken us.

This amendment will provide increased funds for food aid, military hospitals, and the reconstruction of the Louisiana levees.

As many of you know, we are facing an international food crisis. According to the International Monetary Fund, IMF, global food...
prices have increased an average of 43 percent. In fact since March 2007, wheat has increased by 146 percent, soybean has increased by 71 percent, corn by 41 percent, and rice prices have increased by 29 percent, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Many factors have played into this crisis. In China, India, and other emerging markets experiencing rapid economic growth, consumers are increasing their demand for food, oil, and energy resources. Rising energy costs have directly raised the cost of agricultural production. Adverse weather-related events have lowered crop yields, particularly affecting wheat harvests. Depreciation of the U.S. dollar accounts for part of the increase in U.S. food prices, while increased production of biofuel has raised the price of corn.

Sadly, approximately 1 billion people—or one sixth of the world’s population—subsist on less than $1 per day. Of this population, 162 million survive on less than $0.50 per day. Overall, increased food prices particularly affect developing countries, and the poorest people within those countries, where populations spend a larger proportional share of income on basic food commodities.

That is why I, along with other Hunger Caucus members, hosted a forum on the Food Crisis and what it is doing to our children. We met with leaders of the international aid community to come up with pragmatic solutions to the global hunger crisis, both in the short term and the long term.

In my district I submitted an appropriations request for the Houston Food Bank to expand their collection and distribution of food to the good people of Houston. We each have to do our part, not only in our district by supporting much needed programs and organizations, but across this great Nation and the rest of the world.

This amendment would give $9.9 billion, $496 million above the President’s request, for the State Department, USAID and international Food Assistance. It is simply unacceptable in this day and age that children are going hungry. We have millions of dollars to bail out Bear Stearns, let’s find that same money to help the children around the world.

This bill is about our global moral responsibility. It is about investing in our future. It is about respecting the basic human right to have food.
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written in the Appropriations Committee. We did not, obviously, write language that has previously passed the House under the control of other committees. The Energy and Commerce Committee produced the language, for instance, on the Medicare rules, and the authorizing committee produced the language on unemployment compensation. That's normal.

In fact, the Speaker herself was joking the other day and teasing me, indicating that there were three items that she had wanted in the bill that the committee had turned down. So I would suggest this is not quite the dictatorship that the myth-makers on the other side of the aisle are trying to portray.

Having said that, let me explain what it is we are doing here today, since the minority leader was courteous enough to ask. What we are trying to do is to recognize a sad fact, which is that as long as George Bush is President of the United States, we are not going to be able to shut down the war. So what we are trying to do is proceed in the most responsible possible manner in order to assure that the next President, whoever he or she is, has at least 3 or 4 months in which to get his or her hands on the American people and we get out of this god-awful mess in Iraq, which I regard to be the most misguided foreign policy decision in my lifetime.

What we are trying to do is to recognize that we do not have a majority in the United States Senate to shut down this war. And so we are looking at ways to provide Members with an opportunity to speak out on whether they want to see that war funding go ahead or not, a straight up-or-down vote. No coercion, at least on this side of the aisle, no whipping that question on this side of the aisle. Members were told, “Vote your conscience.”

We are also trying to do two other things. We are trying, once again, to attach conditions to the use of this money. Now I myself will vote against the first amendment because I have no guarantee that the conditions in the second amendment will survive Senate action. If they did, I would be perfectly comfortable with the first amendment because I think the first amendment is a straight effort to do what I just described a minute ago.

But the reason we want to pursue the second amendment is because we think it is about time that the Iraqis, now that they are generating oil surpluses and budget surpluses, believe it is about time that they begin to assume the costs of their own reconstruction, at least 50 percent of it. This is why we have a 50-50, dollar-for-dollar match requirement, which we are imposing on the Iraqis if we are to be expected to spend any more money in reconstructing Iraq. We think that's eminently sensible.

We also think it is about time that Iraq quit overcharging the U.S. military for the price of gasoline. There is no reason why we should be paying through the nose at a much higher price than Iraqis are paying for gasoline.

And thirdly, we are asking the President of the United States to remember that the United States of America still exists, too, and that there are some problems that we need to address here. In fact, the administration itself has recognized some of them because the administration sent down a reprogramming request to deal with the problem of the Bureau of Prisons. The reprogramming request to deal with the census. We didn't think we ought to fix those problems by cutting even more deeply into local law enforcement funding, because those budgets have already been cut far too much. So we rejected the way that the administration wanted to pay for those items. And instead we have included them in this bill fully, fully paid for.

We also have the temerity to believe that if we are going to fight this war, then we ought to also provide a thank you note, a healthy thank you note, for the people who fought the war on our behalf. That is why we are insisting that we pass the expansion of the GI Bill so that you can take people whose lives have been disrupted for years, military families from the east coast to the west coast, their lives have been disrupted for years. We want to say “we want to at least partially compensate you by giving you the opportunity for college education at any State university in your State.” And we have provisions that will even expand beyond that if they go to other schools that also participate in helping finance their education. We make no apology for including that.

We have heard from at least three speakers on that side of the aisle that we are providing $51 billion for that on the backs of the soldiers.
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It isn't on their backs. It's an effort to help them. I would point out in the previous GI Bill in World War II, this country got a return of $7 for every dollar that it invested in the GI Bill. We recognize the value of doing that again. We recognize the moral obligation of doing that again, and we make no apology in going forward with it.

We also make no apology for recognizing that when we have millions of Americans unemployed, that there is no harm done by providing to those who have been unemployed the longest and have exhausted their benefits, with 13 weeks of additional assistance as those people have been fired from jobs. This Congress sits here in a comfortable room making $160,000 a year, nickel nursing about our efforts to provide a few additional benefits to people who have been unemployed that long.

If we don't recognize that provision, we ought to be ashamed of ourselves, I ask each and every Member to vote your conscience. I am not going to tell you how to vote on any of the amend-
and program decisions that should be addressed in the regular authorization and appropriations bills for fiscal year 2009.

The following table summarizes by appropriation account or general provision, the recommendation:
### CHAPTER 1

**DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FY 2008**

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY**

**Military Personnel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military Personnel</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army (emergency)</td>
<td>11,807,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>886,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>1,820,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>1,286,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>304,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>72,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>16,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>5,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard Personnel, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>1,369,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard Personnel, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Military Personnel**

17,553,589

**Operation and Maintenance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation and Maintenance</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army (emergency)</td>
<td>16,343,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>2,952,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>5,922,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve (emergency)</td>
<td>3,847,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Reserve (emergency)</td>
<td>164,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Reserve (emergency)</td>
<td>109,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps Reserve (emergency)</td>
<td>70,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force Reserve (emergency)</td>
<td>185,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army National Guard (emergency)</td>
<td>685,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air National Guard (emergency)</td>
<td>287,369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance**

30,250,336

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iraq Freedom Fund (emergency)</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (emergency)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq Security Forces Fund (emergency)</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq Security Forces Fund (emergency)</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal, Other**

2,950,000

**Grand total, Operation and Maintenance**

33,200,336

**Procurement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procurement</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>954,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missile Procurement, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>581,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>5,393,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>344,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>15,967,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>3,411,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons Procurement, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>317,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>304,945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>1,260,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>2,153,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>7,028,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missile Procurement, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>66,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>205,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>1,903,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Defense-Wide (emergency)</td>
<td>408,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard and Reserve Equipment (emergency)</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Procurement</strong></td>
<td><strong>41,030,995</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test &amp; Evaluation, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>162,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test &amp; Evaluation, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>366,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test &amp; Evaluation, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>278,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (emergency)</td>
<td>816,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,624,093</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revolving and Management Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Working Capital Funds (emergency)</td>
<td>1,837,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Defense Sealift Fund (emergency)</td>
<td>5,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Revolving and Management Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,842,560</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Department of Defense Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Health Program (emergency)</td>
<td>1,363,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance (emergency)</td>
<td>(907,064)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement (emergency)</td>
<td>(91,900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, development, test and evaluation (emergency)</td>
<td>(364,900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological health &amp; traumatic brain injury (emergency)</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Defense Health Program (emergency)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,438,864</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (emergency)</td>
<td>65,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Inspector General (emergency)</td>
<td>6,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Other Department of Defense Programs</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,510,575</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Provisions--Chapter 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special transfer authority (emergency)</td>
<td>(2,500,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Cooperation Account (transfer authority) (emergency)</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions (emergency)</td>
<td>-146,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, General Provisions</strong></td>
<td><strong>-140,031</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Chapter 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>96,622,127</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, a number of needs were identified that were not adequately addressed by the Department of Defense. Major initiatives in the recommendation include:

- Facilitating Reintegration and Modernization (FSRM): The recommendation includes an additional $500,000,000 for FSRM at Army and Marine Corps facilities; Department of Defense Identified Operations Shortfalls: The recommendation includes $3,617,308,000 to address the increasing price of fuel and other petroleum products;
- Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program: The recommendation includes $65,400,000 to support the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration program to help members of the National Guard and Reserve transition from combat to civilian life. The recommendation is summarized as follows:


- The recommendation provides additional resources to aid U.S. military operations in Afghanistan and to strengthen the Afghan Security Forces. Afghan Security Forces are critical to the stability of Afghanistan and essential to our fight against al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations.

- The recommendation also doubles the Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP) in Afghanistan from fiscal year 2007 levels to address critical small scale humanitarian efforts. Included in this amount are the necessary resources to support the CERP program for the additional Marines in Afghanistan. These and other efforts related to Afghanistan are discussed elsewhere in this report and in the classified annex.

- The recommendation includes $91,000,000 in the Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide; Procurement, Defense-Wide; Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide; and the Defense Health Program appropriation accounts to address gaps identified by the President's Commission on Care for America's Returning Wounded Warriors.

- The funding will enable improvements in case management, data sharing, and the disability evaluation system (DES). Additionally, the funding will support the ongoing DES Pilot program, information technology development, support for case management, and improvement of Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs data sharing gateways, and distribution of wounded warrior care and benefits informational handbooks.

- The recommendation provides additional resources to address gaps identified by the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

- The recommendation includes $293,023,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.

- The recommendation also provides $17,553,599,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.

- The recommendation includes an additional $17,553,599,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.

- The recommendation includes $50,000,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.

- The recommendation includes an additional $17,553,599,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.

- The recommendation includes $293,023,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.

- The recommendation provides additional resources to address gaps identified by the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

- The recommendation includes $293,023,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.

- The recommendation provides additional resources to address gaps identified by the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

- The recommendation includes $293,023,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.

- The recommendation provides additional resources to address gaps identified by the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

- The recommendation includes $293,023,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.

- The recommendation includes an additional $17,553,599,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.

- The recommendation provides additional resources to address gaps identified by the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

- The recommendation includes $293,023,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.

- The recommendation provides additional resources to address gaps identified by the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

- The recommendation includes $293,023,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.

- The recommendation provides additional resources to address gaps identified by the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

- The recommendation includes an additional $17,553,599,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.

- The recommendation includes $293,023,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.

- The recommendation includes an additional $17,553,599,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.

- The recommendation includes $293,023,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.

- The recommendation includes an additional $17,553,599,000 for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization; $1,000,000 for the Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries; $70,000,000 for the Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine and $47,100,000, in various budget activities for disability evaluation system and case management.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY**

**ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFicers**
- **BASIC PAY** 1,142,768
- **RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL** 230,280
- **BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING** 286,673
- **BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE** 38,324
- **SPECIAL PAYS** 517,490
- **SOCIAL SECURITY TAX** 87,416
- **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1** 2,302,951

**ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL**
- **BASIC PAY** 2,747,209
- **RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL** 598,216
- **BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING** 902,271
- **SPECIAL PAYS** 2,507,642
- **SOCIAL SECURITY TAX** 210,161
- **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2** 6,965,499

**ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL**
- **BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE** 300,904
- **SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND** 1,365,832
- **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4** 1,666,736

**ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL**
- **ACCESSION TRAVEL** 11,472
- **TRAINING TRAVEL** 9,537
- **OPERATIONAL TRAVEL** 101,482
- **ROTATIONAL TRAVEL** 126,759
- **SEPARATION TRAVEL** 20,326
- **TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS** 1,344
- **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5** 265,420

**ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COST**
- **INTEREST ON SOLDIERS DEPOSITS** 21,780
- **RESERVE INCOME REPLACEMENT PROGRAM** 8,200
- **UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION** 142,384
- **DEATH GRATUITIES** 72,900
- **SGLI EXTRA HAZARD PAYMENTS** 116,805
- **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6** 362,049

**UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS**
- **ACCELERATION OF GROW THE FORCE** 100,000
- **CHANGE IN RESERVE AND GUARD MOBILIZATION LEVELS** -101,000
- **YEAR OF EXECUTION/RATE CHANGES** 246,000
- **TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS** 245,000

**TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY** 11,807,655
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC PAY</td>
<td>119,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL</td>
<td>22,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING</td>
<td>32,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE</td>
<td>3,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL PAYS</td>
<td>31,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SECURITY TAX</td>
<td>9,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1</td>
<td>220,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC PAY</td>
<td>139,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL</td>
<td>26,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING</td>
<td>60,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL PAYS</td>
<td>132,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SECURITY TAX</td>
<td>10,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2</td>
<td>370,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE</td>
<td>14,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND</td>
<td>14,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4</td>
<td>29,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESSION TRAVEL</td>
<td>7,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONAL TRAVEL</td>
<td>12,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTATIONAL TRAVEL</td>
<td>14,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPARATION TRAVEL</td>
<td>5,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5</td>
<td>39,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESERVE INCOME REPLACEMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION</td>
<td>28,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEATH GRATUITIES</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGLI EXTRA HAZARD PAYMENTS</td>
<td>10,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6</td>
<td>42,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE IN RESERVE MOBILIZATION LEVELS</td>
<td>21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR OF EXECUTION/RATE CHANGES</td>
<td>143,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS</td>
<td>164,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY</td>
<td>866,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC PAY</td>
<td>197,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL</td>
<td>46,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING</td>
<td>64,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE</td>
<td>7,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL PAYS</td>
<td>33,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SECURITY TAX</td>
<td>15,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1</strong></td>
<td>363,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC PAY</td>
<td>487,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL</td>
<td>116,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING</td>
<td>121,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL PAYS</td>
<td>552,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SECURITY TAX</td>
<td>37,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2</strong></td>
<td>1,314,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE</td>
<td>53,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4</strong></td>
<td>53,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESSION TRAVEL</td>
<td>3,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONAL TRAVEL</td>
<td>50,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5</strong></td>
<td>53,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEATH GRATUITIES</td>
<td>23,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGLI EXTRA HAZARD PAYMENTS</td>
<td>20,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6</strong></td>
<td>44,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCELERATION OF GROW THE FORCE</td>
<td>93,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE IN RESERVE MOBILIZATION LEVELS</td>
<td>-103,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS</strong></td>
<td>-9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS</strong></td>
<td>1,820,571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC PAY</td>
<td>187,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL</td>
<td>35,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING</td>
<td>56,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE</td>
<td>6,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL PAYS</td>
<td>27,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SECURITY TAX</td>
<td>14,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1</strong></td>
<td>328,177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Total, Military Personnel, Air Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>R commendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASIC PAY</td>
<td>468,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL</td>
<td>89,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING</td>
<td>127,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL PAYS</td>
<td>86,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SECURITY TAX</td>
<td>35,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2</td>
<td>808,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE</td>
<td>35,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND</td>
<td>68,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4</td>
<td>104,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONAL TRAVEL</td>
<td>5,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5</td>
<td>5,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION</td>
<td>16,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEATH GRATUITIES</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGLI EXTRA HAZARD PAYMENTS</td>
<td>21,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6</td>
<td>39,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,286,163</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reserve Personnel, Army

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>R commendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL TRAINING</td>
<td>56,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL TRAINING</td>
<td>56,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECRUITING AND RETENTION</td>
<td>186,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1</td>
<td>304,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY</strong></td>
<td><strong>304,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reserve Personnel, Navy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>R commendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS &amp; DRILLS 24/28)</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL TRAINING</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL TRAINING</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1</td>
<td>72,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY</strong></td>
<td><strong>72,800</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>[in thousands of dollars]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY 1: RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL TRAINING</td>
<td>15,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1</td>
<td>16,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS</td>
<td>16,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY 1: RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL TRAINING</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY 1: RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS &amp; DRILLS 24/28)</td>
<td>124,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL TRAINING</td>
<td>190,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL TRAINING</td>
<td>441,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT</td>
<td>380,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECRUITING EFFORTS</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETENTION EFFORTS</td>
<td>143,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1</td>
<td>1,369,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY</td>
<td>1,369,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY 1: RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GROW THE FORCE
The recommendation includes funding to support the Army and Marine Corps plans to grow their end strength in an effort to better sustain operational tempo and relieve strain on current units.

WOUNDED WARRIOR PROGRAMS
The recommendation fully funds the identified requirements for enhanced Traumatic Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance (TSGLI) benefits and wounded service members' separation pay, and provides additional funding for health care professional bonuses to support the recruitment of additional medical personnel.

COST AND RATE INCREASES
The recommendation includes funding for recent increases for Basic Allowance for Housing, Basic Allowance for Subsistence, Permanent Change of Station, Unemployment Compensation, and Cost of Living Adjustments.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
An appropriation of $33,200,336,000 is recommended for Operation and Maintenance.

The recommendations for each operation and maintenance account are shown below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARMY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANEUVER UNITS</td>
<td>28,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES</td>
<td>1,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE</td>
<td>29,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEATER LEVEL ASSETS</td>
<td>24,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVIATION ASSETS</td>
<td>59,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT</td>
<td>16,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION &amp; MODERNIZATION</td>
<td>408,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT</td>
<td>41,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>14,551,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMANDER'S EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM</td>
<td>1,026,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLIGHT TRAINING</td>
<td>33,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL BA-1</strong></td>
<td>16,221,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURITY PROGRAMS</td>
<td>102,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL BA-4</strong></td>
<td>802,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT EFFICIENCIES</td>
<td>-300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION</td>
<td>-380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY</strong></td>
<td>16,343,512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, NAVY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS</td>
<td>753,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEET AIR TRAINING</td>
<td>81,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA &amp; ENGINEERING SERVICES</td>
<td>1,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT</td>
<td>26,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT</td>
<td>11,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>116,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS</td>
<td>568,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT &amp; TRAINING</td>
<td>4,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>219,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT</td>
<td>11,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>4,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONIC WARFARE</td>
<td>4,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARFARE TACTICS</td>
<td>5,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES</td>
<td>573,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>23,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAPONS MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>28,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT</td>
<td>1,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION</td>
<td>2,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE OPERATING SUPPORT</td>
<td>193,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL BA-1</strong></td>
<td>2,647,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE</td>
<td>94,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL BA-2</strong></td>
<td>94,147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### [in thousands of dollars]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFFICER ACQUISITION</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING</td>
<td>35,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLIGHT TRAINING</td>
<td>24,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING</td>
<td>3,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL BA-3</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,366</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>1,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNAL RELATIONS</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT</td>
<td>2,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>11,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>6,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE</td>
<td>4,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL BA-4</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,955</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PROGRAMS</td>
<td>32,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAST GUARD SUPPORT</td>
<td>112,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTRACT EFFICIENCIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>-25,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATIONS &amp; MAINTENANCE, NAVY</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,952,864</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONAL FORCES</td>
<td>104,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITIME PREPOSITIONING</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, &amp; MODERNIZATION</td>
<td>46,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE OPERATING SUPPORT</td>
<td>6,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL BA-1</strong></td>
<td><strong>157,601</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECRUIT TRAINING</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICER ACQUISITION</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING SUPPORT</td>
<td>1,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE OPERATING SUPPORT</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL BA-3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,299</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS</strong></td>
<td><strong>159,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE</td>
<td>1,620,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES</td>
<td>9,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES</td>
<td>72,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)</td>
<td>10,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>576,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPOT MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>190,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION &amp; MODERNIZATION</td>
<td>72,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE SUPPORT</td>
<td>860,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT</td>
<td>2,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS</td>
<td>64,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HQ</td>
<td>66,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUNCH VEHICLES</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE SUPPORT</td>
<td>2,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL BA-1</td>
<td>3,549,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRLIFT OPERATIONS</td>
<td>1,843,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPOT MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>63,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE SUPPORT</td>
<td>67,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL BA-2</td>
<td>1,974,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE SUPPORT</td>
<td>1,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING</td>
<td>98,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLIGHT TRAINING</td>
<td>60,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING SUPPORT</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION &amp; MODERNIZATION</td>
<td>2,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE SUPPORT</td>
<td>6,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL BA-3</td>
<td>170,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE SUPPORT</td>
<td>72,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>5,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT</td>
<td>8,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURITY PROGRAMS</td>
<td>1,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>170,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL BA-4</td>
<td>278,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT EFFICIENCIES</td>
<td>-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE</td>
<td>5,922,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE                     |                |
| JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF                                     | 26,216         |
| SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND                                | 760,811        |
| SUBTOTAL BA-1                                             | 787,027        |
| AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE                       | 7,109          |
| DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY                             | 8,245          |
| DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY                        | 106,078        |
| DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY                                  | 105,815        |
| DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY                           | 2,636          |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION AGENCY                    | 196,927        |
| DOD HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY                              | 36,670         |
| DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY                        | 52,000         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY (DLSA)</td>
<td>12,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY (DSCA)</td>
<td>950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE</td>
<td>27,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES (WHS)</td>
<td>7,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PROGRAMS</td>
<td>1,087,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL BA-4</td>
<td>2,600,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,387,562</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVIATION ASSETS</td>
<td>37,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>127,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>164,839</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS</td>
<td>91,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS</td>
<td>6,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>3,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES</td>
<td>8,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE OPERATING SUPPORT (BOS)</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>109,876</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING FORCES</td>
<td>23,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING SUPPORT</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE OPERATING SUPPORT</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITIES, SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION &amp; MODERNIZATION</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>70,256</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES</td>
<td>165,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>165,994</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVIATION ASSETS</td>
<td>102,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>583,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD</strong></td>
<td><strong>685,644</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## In thousands of dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS</td>
<td>287,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD</strong></td>
<td>287,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IRAQ FREEDOM FUND</strong></td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINISTRY OF DEFENSE (MOD) EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>54,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD TRAINING</td>
<td>71,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD SUSTAINMENT</td>
<td>513,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINISTRY OF INTERIOR (MOI) EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>67,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOI TRAINING</td>
<td>422,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOI SUSTAINMENT</td>
<td>271,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND</strong></td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IRAQ SECURITY FORCES FUND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINISTRY OF DEFENSE (MOD) EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>522,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD TRAINING</td>
<td>66,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD SUSTAINMENT</td>
<td>154,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINISTRY OF INTERIOR (MOI) EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>332,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOI TRAINING</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOI SUSTAINMENT</td>
<td>86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATED ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>153,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, IRAQ SECURITY FORCES FUND</strong></td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The recommendation includes $1,026,841,000 for the Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP). Included in this amount is $479,000,000 for CERP in Afghanistan and $2,000,000,000 for our ongoing operations in the Global War on Terror in the Philippines. Small scale, humanitarian projects led by the Joint Interagency Task Force—Philippines should have a tremendous impact on combating the spread of terrorist cells in the Philippines. However, the provision of these funds does not represent an invitation to expand CERP beyond its current mission and application.

CERP projects are also currently benefiting the 2.7 million internally-displaced Iraqis. The Department should determine which of its own resources to returning them to their homes, or resettling them permanently in functioning communities. However, recognizing that CERP is an effective tool for meeting urgent humanitarian needs, the Secretary of Defense is urged to encourage commanders to give priority to humanitarian and reconstruction projects that respond to the needs of internally-displaced Iraqis who have settled in their area of responsibility.

CERP has proven beneficial to both U.S. commanders and the Iraqi people, but there is concern over the Department's growing requests for these funds. Since its inception in 2004, this program has grown exponentially, from $180,000,000 in fiscal year 2004 to $956,400,000 in fiscal year 2007. Congress provided $500,000,000 in the fiscal year 2008 supplemental bridge appropriation but the Department is obligating funds for this program at a rate that would exceed the authorized level of $977,441,000 before the end of the fiscal year.

While there is a need to maintain commanders' flexibility and control in administering CERP funds, there is concern that, in the absence of any minimum standards for project monitoring or specific performance indicators, commanders exercise varying levels of oversight and typically compile only anecdotal evidence on the impact of projects. Furthermore, CERP funds are administered at the battalion level, often by troops whose primary operational Speciality has no connection to program or acquisition management. The limited information provided to Congress about CERP projects makes it difficult to conduct thorough oversight over how this program is administered, what its actual impact is on the Iraqi people, and how it fits into our overall strategy for Iraq.

To provide Congress sufficient visibility over the use of funding provided for CERP, the Department is directed to: (1) establish minimum guidance for commanders to follow in monitoring project status and performance indicators to assess the impact of CERP projects; (2) provide more complete information so Congress can effectively report on CERP; and (3) conduct thorough oversight over how this program is administered, what its actual impact is on the Iraqi people, and how it fits into our overall strategy for Iraq.

The continued lack of transparency and accountability concerning contracts and contractors serving in both theaters of operation (Iraq and Afghanistan) is concerning. The Department of Defense has indicated a need to consolidate reporting of operation and maintenance funding for contracted services in this supplemental appropriation. This includes $6,000,000,000 for the Army-managed Logistics Civil Augmentation Program (LOGCAP), which provides for a spectrum of services to include power generation, management of facilities, dining operations, security, information technology support, reconstruction, analysis, and other relevant information. The Army requested $987,000,000 to fund operation and maintenance contract in excess of $1,000,000: contractor name; — amount; — purpose; — start and end date; — type of contract; and — award of amounts per fiscal year, if applicable. This report should also identify the Department of Defense organization responsible for oversight of the contracts and should reflect the type of services provided, such as vehicle maintenance, food service, security, information technology support, reconstruction, analysis, and other relevant information.

This report should also include a discussion of the Army's policy on the movement of fuel and other contract items in and around Iraq and Afghanistan. The Department should include a discussion of the following organizations and how they work collaboratively to ensure appropriate contract oversight in theaters of operation for Iraq and Afghanistan:

- LOGCAP;
- APCAP;
- Defense Reconstruction Support Office;
- Joint Contracting Command Iraq/Afghani-
- Deputy Assistant Secretary—Army (Pol-
- Project and Contracting Office, Wash-

Further, the report should include the number of military contractors and federal civilian personnel assigned to each of these offices, the number of contractors assigned to each office and the roles the contractors perform. As part of this report, should the Department of Defense determine that it has insufficient in-house capability to effectively monitor and control CERP funds, the Department should then develop a robust staffing proposal and submit it to the House and the Senate Committees on Appropriations for consideration in the next defense appropriations bill. The report should be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

The recommendation includes contract service efficiencies in the amount of $757,000,000 as follows: Army $300,000,000; Navy $25,000,000 and Air Force $432,000,000.

The Army requested $867,000,000 to fund purchases of subsistence items in support of Department of Defense civilian employees and contractors deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan areas of operations. This also includes subsistence that is provided to these individuals within the Department of Defense facilities.

The Army estimates that 5,000 Department of Defense civilians and 73,000 contractor personnel constitute the "Department of Defense authorized personnel". This is an average cost for subsistence of nearly $13,000 per individual per year.

Based on the unresolved issues, the recommendation includes a ten percent reduction to the nearly $1,000,000,000 request for this program to encourage better management and accountability of subsistence funds. Currently the Department's Cost of War Report does not account for obligation of funds for subsistence. The Secretary of Defense is directed to, within 90 days of enactment of this Act, submit a comprehensive report to the Senate Committee on Appropriations that provides the following information on Department of Defense dining facilities: why the cost per person is so high; and the number of contractors and subcontractors who provide subsistence to the Department of Defense in the theater of operations.

Further, the report should include the number of contractors and subcontractors supplying subsistence items to contractors and civilians deployed to the Iraq and Afghanistan theaters of operations and a description of the method for ensuring the best value subsistence contracts are awarded; and describes the method for ensuring the most fuel efficient and effective mode of transportation is used; 4) Identifies the number of contractors and subcontractors supplying subsistence items to contractors and civilians deployed to the Iraq and Afghanistan theaters of operations (by location); the number and types of subsistence contracts from local vendors in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the method and factors used to determine local purchase of these items in and around the Iraq and Afghanistan theaters of operation; and 5) Provides the Department's policy on access to subsistence items in and around the Iraq and Afghanistan theaters of operation and associated internal control procedures.
The Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) influence over the Department of Defense’s public-private competitions is concerning because the 2008 National Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 110-181) prohibits OMB from directing or requiring any initiation, continuation, or completion of a public-private competition or the Department taking action based on such an OMB direction or requirement. Questions have been raised as to whether this provision is being implemented. The OMB continues to influence public-private competitions and contracting out of federal employees at the Department of Defense stronger provisions may be needed.

SUPPORT TO GLOBAL REPOSITIONING OF GROUND FORCES

The impact to the Army and Marine Corps of rebasing activities, particularly as large numbers of service members return from overseas bases to the Continental United States (CONUS), must be addressed. The recommendation provides $496,000,000 to the Army for Facilities Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization program and $52,000,000 to the Marine Corps’ Facilities Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization program to offset the disruption and stress in the military as a result of the military repositioning of forces. These funds will be used to repair barracks, improve child care facilities, and enhance community services at Army and Marine Corps bases throughout the United States.

OPERATING TEMPO

The supplemental funding requested in the operating tempo account is largely a function of anticipating operating tempo for continuation of military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq through September 2008. The actual operating tempo in fiscal years 2007 and 2008 has differed from the estimated levels. Therefore, the recommendation provides operation and maintenance funding to account for the actual operating tempo.

DIRECTED REPROGRAMMING

The recommendation directs a reprogramming of funds totaling $380,000,000 from unfunded operation and maintenance requirements in support of Iraq and the Global War on Terror.

THE JOINT STAFF

The recommendation includes no funding for the Combating Terrorism Readiness Fund because the requirement was funded through the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-116).

SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE (ISR) ACCELERATION

The recommendation includes an additional $76,458,000 in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide to accelerate the fielding of ISR capabilities to Special Operations Command for use in missions pertaining to high value targets. The Secretary of Defense is urged to include sustainment costs for these items in future budget requests.

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY: LITHIUM BATTERIES SUPPLIES

Primary lithium batteries have been and remain a critically consumable warfighting asset for our military. A reliable and sustainable U.S. manufacturing source for these supplies is critical to maintaining the full warfighting capabilities of our military forces. The Defense Logistics Agency is encouraged to take the necessary actions to ensure that at least one supplier of LiSO2 batteries and one supplier of LiMnO2 batteries continue manufacturing in the U.S. with a reasonable sustaining rate of production.

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY

The recommendation includes no funding for NIMBLE ELDER because the requirement was funded through the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-116).

FAMILY ADVOCACY PROGRAM

The recommendation includes $50,000,000 for family advocacy programs to provide counseling services concluding with child psychologists, Parents as Teachers and other intervention efforts. This funding will enhance the activities of the Family Advocacy Program for children and families managing the difficult challenges of military service. There is concern about the growing need for family members to help alleviate the mental stresses associated with deployments. These activities provide products, programs, and services to help military families when a service member is deployed, killed or seriously wounded.

DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY

The recommendation includes no funding for Personnel Directives staff support because the Defense Human Resources Activity (DTRA) and the Department of Defense are repositioning the ISAC Tracker (SPOT), $2,500,000 for the Prevention of Wartime Contracting Fraud (PMWCF), $150,000,000 for the Global Train and Equip Program. The Department of State is tasked primarily the responsibility of the Department to train and equip allied nations for counterterrorism operations, yet the Department of Defense continues to request funds to augment these efforts due to the Global War on Terror. Training allied nations is primarily the responsibility of the Department of State. As such, the Administration is urged to request the appropriate level of funding for the Global Train and Equip Program from the Department of State in the next fiscal year.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

There is deep concern over the waste, fraud, and abuse that spiked the Department’s contracting activities that support contingency operations overseas. The Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics (USD(AT&L)) is tasked with contractor oversight in forward areas of operations. In an effort to further many of the initiatives developed by USD(AT&L), the recommendation includes additional resources to fully fund these requirements, including: $8,000,000 for the Synchronized Predeployment and Operational Track system, $400,000 for the Materiel Readiness Board (MRB). The recommendation also includes $3,000,000 for the WMD Commission, and directs that $1,200,000 would be available for the WMD Commission.

IRAQ FREEDOM FUND

The recommendation includes $50,000,000 for the Iraq Freedom Fund only for the Task Force to Improve Business and Stability Operations—Iraq to execute the Factory Restart Program.

AFGHANISTAN AND IRAQ SECURITY FORCES

Reprogramming: The Department of Defense has been provided significant flexi-
9mm pistol. The first was cost, and for the Afghan National police, the second key consideration was the fact that the pistol already was in service with the Afghan National Army. Based on concerns expressed by U.S. trainers, ongoing procurements of pistols under 2007 and 2008 contracts are delivering a pistol manufactured with the desired features that were lacking in the pistols procured in 2005 and 2006. Future purchases will be made by competitive bid and the requirements will specify features consistent with the U.S. M9 service pistol. The government agencies of the United States and Afghanistan are commended for having made these appropriate adjustments in the acquisition of pistols for the Afghan National Army and Afghan National Police. They are cautioned that haste and incomplete definition of requirements, and inadequate testing, can lead to acquisition of military equipment that once in use by the military may prove to be inadequate in performance, reliability and safety. Finally, the Department of Defense and the Department of State are urged to work cooperatively to ensure that programs for the provision of equipment to the Afghan National Army and Afghan National Police employ rigorous requirements definition and disciplined contracting procedures, and that the Secretary of Defense initiate a review of the utility of pistols provided to the Afghan National Army and Afghan National Police under U.S. Foreign Military Sales transactions and assist where necessary in the replacement and demilitarization of inferior pistols.

PROCUREMENT
An appropriation of $41,030,995,000 is recommended for Procurement. The recommendations for each procurement account are shown below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY FIXED WING CARGO AIRCRAFT</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL MODS (TIARA) (Note: Includes $3,000,000 for Airborne ISR Sensor</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reset)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH-64 MODS</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS</td>
<td>311,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH-60 MODS (Note: Includes $30,000,000 for A to L Initiative, and $14,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650,000 for Aircraft Safety Enhancements)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIOWA WARRIOR</td>
<td>44,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASE INFRARED CM</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>403,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL</td>
<td>10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY</td>
<td>954,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS PROCUREMENT, ARMY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELLFIRE MSL (BASIC/IHW/HFII)</td>
<td>228,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAVELIN</td>
<td>121,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)</td>
<td>67,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMY TACTICAL MISSILE SYSTEM (ATACMS) BLK I A (Note: Funds 84 unitary</td>
<td>92,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missiles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRIOT MODS</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITAS/TOW MODIFICATIONS</td>
<td>27,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS PROCUREMENT, ARMY</td>
<td>561,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCUREMENT OF W&amp;T CV, ARMY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT</td>
<td>921,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRYKER VEHICLE</td>
<td>1,989,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIST VEHICLE (MOD)</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLE SYSTEMS SERIES (MOD)</td>
<td>84,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)</td>
<td>41,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)</td>
<td>388,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWITZER, LIGHT, TOWED, 105MM, M119</td>
<td>17,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM (M1A2 SEP)</td>
<td>1,030,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN (7.62mm)</td>
<td>61,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACHINE GUN, CAL .50 M2 ROLL</td>
<td>27,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M249 SAW MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW)</td>
<td>1,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN (40mm)</td>
<td>30,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORTAR SYSTEMS (Note: Includes $15,000,000 for Expanded Organic Mortar</td>
<td>48,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M107, CAL 50, SNIPER RIFLE</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4 CARBINE</td>
<td>79,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOTGUN, MODULAR ACCESSORY SYSTEM (MASS)</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION (CROWS)</td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWITZER, LT WT 155MM</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4 CARBINE MODS</td>
<td>125,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS</td>
<td>7,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M240 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS</td>
<td>3,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHALANX MODS</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)</td>
<td>14,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM)</td>
<td>8,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&amp;TCV, ARMY</strong></td>
<td>5,393,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.62MM ALL TYPES</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40MM ALL TYPES</td>
<td>9,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM, ALL TYPES</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOULDER FIRED ROCKETS ALL TYPES</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOLITION MUNITIONS ALL TYPES</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRENADES ALL TYPES</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMULATORS ALL TYPES</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION ALL TYPES</td>
<td>54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS LESS THAN $5M</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES</td>
<td>200,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY</strong></td>
<td>344,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS</td>
<td>232,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED</td>
<td>37,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS</td>
<td>67,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHEELED VEHICLE (HMMWV) (Note: Includes $23,500,000 for Roll Over Trainers for Home Station, Mob Station, and Theater)</td>
<td>1,521,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)</td>
<td>673,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE TRUCKS &amp; ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>45,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEH (FHTV) (Note: Includes $185,000,000 for HEMTT Wrecker)</td>
<td>2,274,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)</td>
<td>309,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY</td>
<td>179,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916</td>
<td>520,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXTENDED SERVICE</td>
<td>273,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM</td>
<td>325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE EQUIPMENT (Note: Includes $13,000,000 for Kevlar Overhead Protective Gunners Kits, and $7,000,000 for Spark Mine Rollers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF TERM</td>
<td>22,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART-T (SPACE)</td>
<td>2,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT) (Note: Funds additional communications links (SIPR/NIPRI))</td>
<td>38,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMY GLOBAL CMD &amp; CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)</td>
<td>2,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)</td>
<td>23,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINCGARS FAMILY</td>
<td>500,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGE TO FUTURE NETWORKS</td>
<td>1,698,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM &amp; ELEC EQUIP FIELDING</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL) (Note: Includes $35,000,000 for CSEL Radios for ARNG and SOF)</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY</td>
<td>455,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)</td>
<td>74,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>7,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)</td>
<td>75,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP (Note: Includes $10,500,000 for Biometric Automated Tool Sets)</td>
<td>143,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION SYSTEMS</td>
<td>9,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS-SYS (ASAS) (MIP)</td>
<td>103,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPHET GROUND (MIP)</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYS (TUAS) (MIP)</td>
<td>233,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM (SUAS)</td>
<td>24,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (MIP)</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL EXPLOITATION SYSTEM (MIP)</td>
<td>19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCGS-A (MIP)</td>
<td>62,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MIP)</td>
<td>15,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR</td>
<td>10,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES</td>
<td>149,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGHT VISION DEVICES (Note: Includes $30,000,000 for Mini-Thermal Binoculars)</td>
<td>435,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WEAPON SIGHT</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADIATION MONITORING SYSTEMS</td>
<td>1,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTER-ROCKET, ARTILLERY &amp; MORTAR (C-RAM)</td>
<td>245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENHANCED PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SETTER</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFILER</td>
<td>75,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (Firefinder Radars)</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE &amp; BELOW (FBCB2)</td>
<td>425,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLDR)</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32</td>
<td>10,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM</td>
<td>6,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTERFIRE RADARS</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - MIP</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS</td>
<td>263,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE SUPPORT CMD &amp; CONTROL C2 FAMILY</td>
<td>19,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAAD C2</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR &amp; MSL DEFENSE PLANNING &amp; CONTROL SYS (AMD PCS)</td>
<td>48,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNIGHT FAMILY</td>
<td>18,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>71,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC AIMS II</td>
<td>56,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)</td>
<td>57,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)</td>
<td>77,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>9,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>227,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQUOYAH FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATION SYSTEM</td>
<td>12,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS, NUCLEAR BIOLOGICAL</td>
<td>72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION</td>
<td>83,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMOKE &amp; OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## In thousands of dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL BRIDGING</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON</td>
<td>42,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (GSTAMIDS) (Note: Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explosive Detection Equipment - FLIR)</td>
<td>19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP</td>
<td>7,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEATERS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL UNITS</td>
<td>13,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS, AND LATRINES</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT (Note: Includes $102,000,000 for Land</td>
<td>110,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrior)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE PROVIDER</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>12,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARGO AERIAL DELIVERY PROGRAM</td>
<td>49,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>65,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM &amp; WATER</td>
<td>64,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS</td>
<td>6,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL</td>
<td>8,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>265,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADER, MTZD, HVY</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING</td>
<td>1,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOADERS</td>
<td>9,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRANES</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) FOS</td>
<td>14,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST EQUIP ESP</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>152,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER</td>
<td>109,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM</td>
<td>33,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>57,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>133,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)</td>
<td>10,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>50,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3) (Note: Funds Unattended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensors for Situational Awareness)</td>
<td>2,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIP (OPA3)</td>
<td>23,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING PRE-FAB RELOCATABLE</td>
<td>134,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC CRITICAL ITEMS</td>
<td>131,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARLOCKS</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE EXPEDITIONARY TARGETING SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS- COMBINED</td>
<td>490,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(BETSS-C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY** 15,967,340
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA-18G (Note: Provides 2 aircraft)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP) (Note: Provides 13 aircraft)</td>
<td>768,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) (Note: Provides 2 aircraft)</td>
<td>140,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH-60S (MYP) (Note: Provides 2 aircraft)</td>
<td>68,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH-60R (Note: Provides 2 aircraft)</td>
<td>70,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC-130J (Note: Provides 9 aircraft)</td>
<td>602,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA-6 SERIES</td>
<td>192,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-8 SERIES (Note: Funding for Litening Pods)</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-18 SERIES</td>
<td>60,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-46 SERIES</td>
<td>18,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH-1W SERIES</td>
<td>33,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-53 SERIES (Note: No funding for AMARC or IMDS)</td>
<td>63,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-60 SERIES</td>
<td>6,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1 SERIES</td>
<td>42,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-3 SERIES</td>
<td>313,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-130 SERIES</td>
<td>28,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA-6 SERIES</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES</td>
<td>3,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT</td>
<td>5,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER PLANT CHANGES</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>136,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM (Note: Funds Marine Corps Helicopter Defensive Weapons)</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY SERIES (Note: Includes funding for Defensive Weapon System)</td>
<td>45,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (Note: Includes funding for UH-1Y first deployment)</td>
<td>412,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAR CONSUMABLES</td>
<td>16,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>209,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,411,254</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOMAHAWK (Note: Provides 123 missiles)</td>
<td>103,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLAM-ER (Note: Provides 9 missile kits)</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELLFIRE (Note: Provides 525 missiles)</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS</td>
<td>22,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIWS MODS</td>
<td>67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARINE CORPS TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM</td>
<td>67,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY</strong></td>
<td><strong>317,456</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY &amp; MARINE CORPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION (JDAM)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES</td>
<td>6,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL ARMS AND LANDING PARTY AMMUNITION</td>
<td>32,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION</td>
<td>27,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES</td>
<td>3,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 MM, ALL TYPES</td>
<td>23,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 MM, ALL TYPES</td>
<td>30,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 MM, ALL TYPES</td>
<td>35,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 MM, ALL TYPES</td>
<td>59,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTG 25 MM, ALL TYPES</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRENADES, ALL TYPES</td>
<td>9,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKETS, ALL TYPES</td>
<td>8,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES</td>
<td>51,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES</td>
<td>3,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUZE, ALL TYPES</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON LETHALS</td>
<td>5,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMMO MODERNIZATION</td>
<td>2,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS</strong></td>
<td><strong>304,946</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD BOATS</td>
<td>19,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL SUPPORT CENTER</td>
<td>3,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT (Note: No funding for DDG-51 equipment)</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROGRAM (Note: No funding for antenna upgrades)</td>
<td>17,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCCS-M EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATCALS</td>
<td>26,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEM</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION</td>
<td>12,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS</td>
<td>29,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT (Note: No funding for NITES upgrades)</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>73,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES</td>
<td>4,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION &amp; MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>111,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL VEHICLES</td>
<td>104,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (Note: Includes $3,600,000 for Rugged Deployable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite Communications)</td>
<td>126,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS</td>
<td>556,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>40,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4ISR EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>16,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>34,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY</td>
<td>1,260,135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAV7A1 PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (PIP)</td>
<td>26,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHT ARMORED VEHICLE (LAV) PIP</td>
<td>43,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (IRV)</td>
<td>8,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1A1 FIREPOWER ENHANCEMENTS</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER</td>
<td>62,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION</td>
<td>16,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM</td>
<td>17,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIFICATION KITS (BA2)</td>
<td>14,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td>34,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAVELIN</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIFICATION KITS (BA3)</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER (Note: Includes one year logistics support)</td>
<td>84,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>7,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM</td>
<td>8,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIFICATION KITS (BA4)</td>
<td>15,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS UNDER $5M (COMM &amp; ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT)</td>
<td>2,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS</td>
<td>78,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADAR SYSTEMS</td>
<td>22,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM</td>
<td>18,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>26,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>153,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES</td>
<td>87,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMAND POST SYSTEMS</td>
<td>43,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADIO SYSTEMS (Note: No funding for Enhanced Land Mobile Radios)</td>
<td>359,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS SWITCHING &amp; CONTROL SYSTEMS</td>
<td>22,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)</td>
<td>153,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS</td>
<td>377,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH REPLACEMENT</td>
<td>13,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAILERS</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS</td>
<td>4,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (BA5)</td>
<td>8,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIPMENT ASSORTED</td>
<td>2,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>13,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS</td>
<td>21,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED</td>
<td>76,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>6,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD SYSTEMS</td>
<td>124,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>17,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING DEVICES</td>
<td>30,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTAINER FAMILY</td>
<td>18,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>37,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTED VEHICLE (ITV)</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGE BOATS</td>
<td>13,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (BA6)</td>
<td>4,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</td>
<td>2,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,153,390</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-17 (Note: Includes funding for 15 C-17 aircraft)</td>
<td>3,604,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-130J (Note: Includes funding for 18 C-130J aircraft and 7 MC-130J aircraft)</td>
<td>1,802,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV-22 OSPREY (Note: deletes funding for initial spares)</td>
<td>300,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAPER UAV (Note: Includes funding for 18 Reaper systems)</td>
<td>340,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 (Note: No funding included for Digital Mission Recorder)</td>
<td>40,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-52</td>
<td>10,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-15 (Note: Funding not included for BLOS, Tactical Targeting Network and 56 JHMSCS)</td>
<td>139,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-16 (Note: Includes no less than $50,000,000 for the Air National Guard</td>
<td>72,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOS/BLOS radios and targeting pods upgrades</td>
<td>72,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-5 (Note: Fully funds aft crown skin project)</td>
<td>27,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-17</td>
<td>72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-32</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-37</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-40</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-130 (Note: Includes radar upgrades for LC-130 aircraft)</td>
<td>152,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPASS CALL</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARP</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-3</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH-60</td>
<td>6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS</td>
<td>36,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER WAR CONSUMABLES</td>
<td>68,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES</td>
<td>88,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,028,563</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE</td>
<td>65,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE MODS</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,943</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMALL ARMS</td>
<td>25,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARTRIDGES</td>
<td>33,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS</td>
<td>7,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITIONS</td>
<td>13,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION</td>
<td>12,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLARES</td>
<td>112,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUZES</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE</td>
<td>205,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES</td>
<td>23,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE</td>
<td>34,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES (Note: Includes MRAP adjustment)</td>
<td>66,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES</td>
<td>15,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALVORSEN LOADER</td>
<td>19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUNWAY SNOW REMOVAL AND CLEANING EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>6,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (VEHICLES)</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>7,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM (Note: Funding not included for C-RAM and CROWS)</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM—AF FAMILY OF SYSTEMS</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE (Note: only for ANG installations)</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (BASE SUPPORT) (Note: Includes $12,000,000 for Intelligence Communications Equipment and no funding for Senior Leader in Transit Conference Capsules)</td>
<td>61,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRIBUTED GROUND SYSTEMS</td>
<td>56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</td>
<td>1,511,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</td>
<td>1,903,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV-22</td>
<td>173,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-130 MODS</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS</td>
<td>1,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMANNED VEHICLES</td>
<td>14,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS</td>
<td>59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</td>
<td>86,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE</td>
<td>408,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMY RESERVE</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMY NATIONAL GUARD</td>
<td>625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD &amp; RESERVE EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARMY AVIATION

Urgent needs have been identified in certain Army aviation programs. Accordingly, the recommendation provides additional funding as follows: $30,000,000 for UH-60A to UH-60J and UH-60L to remanufacture 30 aircraft; $14,650,000 for UH-60 aircraft safety enhancements; $38,000,000 for Kiowa Warrior Safety Enhancement program; and $196,100,000 for Army fixed and rotary wing aircraft survivability enhancements in infrared countermeasures.

There is strong support for the Army plan to replace the aging Kiowa Warrior fleet with Armored Reconnaissance Helicopters (ARRH) as soon as possible. However, the funding provided in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2008 fully funded the ARRH production capacity for fiscal year 2008. Accordingly, the recommendation includes no additional funding for the Army Reconnaissance Helicopter program.

M4 CARBINE

Numerous concerns have been raised about continued procurement of the M4 carbine. These concerns range from performance issues (such as jamming in dusty environments) to the current sole source contract. The Army recently conducted tests on the M4 and similar weapons in the same class to assess performance. The Army is also evaluating the capability of the M4 and other weapons to determine if a new performance requirement is needed. To allay the concerns regarding performance and competition in contracting, the Secretary of the Army is directed to provide a report to the congressional defense committees no later than June 15, 2008, on the findings of the recent comparative capability assessment and with a determination as to whether a change in the acquisition strategy is needed.

FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES

The recommendation includes $763,600,000 for the Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles program. This funding level includes $94,000,000 to reimburse the program for funds that were used under rapid acquisition authority to procure Sky Warrior intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance assets.

SINGLE CHANNEL GROUND AND AIRBORNE RADIO SYSTEM (SINCGARS)

The recommendation includes $500,347,000 for the procurement of SINCGARS radios, which will fully fund Army SINCGARS radio requirements for fiscal year 2008. However, the Army has yet to fully address certain issues including concerns of the Army Science Board regarding SINCGARS compatibility with the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS), encryption modernization, and compatibility with local first responder radios. The Army is urged to move forward with a plan that addresses these and other urgent tactical radio issues.

The Army has recently updated the acquisition strategy for the SINCGARS family of radios. This changed a “market survey” seeking sources of supply that are compliant with the operational requirements. The Army is encouraged to implement “best value” selection criteria in any upcoming competition instead of operational requirements. These are stated as the minimum needed and advanced capabilities and features would be evaluated according to the value they bring above that minimum functionality level. Not more than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall provide a report and briefing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate addressing the acquisition objective, encryption modernization and compatibility with the JTRS program and a procurement plan that includes a strategy for full, fair and open competition.

MARITIME PATROL AIRCRAFT

The Navy has recently grounded 39 P-3 Orion Maritime Patrol Aircraft due to cracks discovered during inspections. These aircraft have logged significant hours flying in support of the Global War on Terror. To keep these aircraft flying until the replacement Multi-Mission Aircraft (P-8A Poseidon) is fielded, $315,900,000 is provided for the procurement and installation of wing repair kits.

MARINE CORPS AIRCRAFT DEFENSIVE WEAPONS

Marine Corps aircraft deployed in theater should have a capable self defense system. Some of the deployed Marine Corps aircraft have less than capable or outdated defensive systems. To improve the capability of deployed Marine Corps aircraft, $15,000,000 is provided for the procurement of defensive weapons for V-22 aircraft and $3,500,000 is provided for the procurement of defensive weapons for CH-46 aircraft.

GROW THE FORCE—MARINE CORPS

The recommendation provides funds identified by the Marine Corps associated with growing the size of its force. To include $26,400,000 for lightweight 155mm howitzers, $12,000,000 for weapons, $14,000,000 for trailers and $100,000,000 for armored vehicle sets.

MARINE CORPS GROUND-BASED OPERATIONAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (G-BOSS)

The fiscal year 2008 supplemental request included $640,000,000 for G-BOSS, a capability that will provide updated base security for the Marine Corps. Public Law 110-161 provided $340,000,000 of that total program requirement. Briefings with the Marine Corps indicated $260,000,000 is needed for lightweight 155mm howitzers, $3,500,000 for trailers and $100,000,000 for armored vehicles. The recommendation includes no funding the Air Force to replace its handgun. $5,000,000 was provided in fiscal year 2007 to perform a study on replacing the handgun that was not executed because there was no validated requirement for a new handgun. This remains an unsubstantiated need for fiscal year 2008 supplemental funds and the Air Force is urged to request funds in the defense budget if it intends to pursue this program in the future.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

The recommendation for the National Guard and Reserve Equipment Account is $750,000,000. Of this amount, $325,000,000 is for the Army National Guard and $125,000,000 is for the U.S. Army Reserve to meet urgent equipment needs that may arise this fiscal year. This funding will allow the Army Guard and Army Reserve to procure high priority items such as: AH-64 helicopter modifications from Boeing for the Army Guard; HH-60 Blackhawk medical evacuation helicopters for the Army Reserve; UH-60 helicopter model A to L conversions; HM2MV utility vehicles; Heavy Extraction, Mobile, and Light Utility (HEMLU) Logistics Storage and Distribution Systems; sniper detection devices; MILSATCOM, NAVSTAR GPS, and other communications equipment; Night Vision equipment; psychological operations equipment; Water Purification Systems; Air Traffic Control Simulator Systems; Light Medium and Medium Tactical Vehicles; trucks, tractors, and line equipment; Armored Vehicles; Joint Service Transportable Decontamination Systems—Small Scale (JSTDS–SS); Logistics Automation Systems (SAMS-E, CAISI, and VSAI); and tactical bridging and portable operating equipment.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

An appropriation of $1,624,093,000 is recommended for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation.

The recommendations for each research, development, test and evaluation account are shown below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY (Note: Includes development of surveillance technology)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS</td>
<td>8,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL WHEELS (Note: Adapt SPARK Mine Rollers to OEF)</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE</td>
<td>38,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (Note: Includes $16,000,000 for Enhanced DIHMRS Capability)</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM</td>
<td>23,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE EXPEDITIONARY TARGETING SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS-COMBINED (BETSS-C)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUEL PRICE INCREASE - KWAJALEIN</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHT WEIGHT MISSILE LAUNCHER</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVALUATION, ARMY</td>
<td>162,958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD) (Note: Includes funding for IED Detection Program)</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETRACT LARCH</td>
<td>18,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETRACT MAPLE</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINK EVERGREEN</td>
<td>47,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-LETHAL WEAPONS (Note: Funds only for ADS and Silent Guardian)</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER HELICOPTER DEVELOPMENT (Note: Includes funding for CH-53 VDE)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-8B AIRCRAFT–ENGINE DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>6,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-22A (Note: Funding for Defensive Weapons System)</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>8,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT (Note: Includes funding for wound care research)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT</td>
<td>8,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARINE CORPS COMMS SYSTEMS (Note: Funds only for GBOSS, CREW, CESAS, and TPS-59)</td>
<td>55,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT /SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS (Note: No funds for PERM)</td>
<td>10,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARINE CORPS CMBT SERVICES SUPT (Note: Funds only for M1A1 Crew Weapon and Test Equipment)</td>
<td>1,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYS</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</td>
<td>108,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVALUATION, NAVY</td>
<td>366,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATERIALS</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS</td>
<td>5,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1B</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL DIAMETER BOMB</td>
<td>7,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT (Note: Includes $300,000 for deployed</td>
<td>19,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civilians and $18,818,000 for fuel cost increase)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITY RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION-T&amp;E</td>
<td>1,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGHT FIST USSTRATCOM</td>
<td>1,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-16 SQUADRONS (Note: Only for BLOS for SINCGRS)</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPASS CALL</td>
<td>5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROG (CIP)</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYS (JSTARS)</td>
<td>64,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAGON U-2 (JMIP)</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS</td>
<td>1,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL HAWK UAV (Note: Only for fixing imagery and shading issues)</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</td>
<td>89,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVALUATION, AIR FORCE</td>
<td>278,427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE               |                |
| AEGIS BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE (Note: Only for activities associated with | 112,360         |
| the February 2008 satellite intercept)                                 |                |
| GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD                                                 | 26,374         |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS USD (P)                                            | 15,000         |
| DHRA - WOUNDED WARRIOR                                                 | 29,300         |
| CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM (CIP)                                  | 4,500          |
| DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS                              | 3,170          |
| SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS                                           | 2,270          |
| MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JCS)                                          | 1,028          |
| UNMANNED VEHICLES (Note: Only for Global Observer)                     | 39,000         |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS                                                    | 593,588        |
| TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE          | 816,598        |
JOINT STARS

An appropriation of $64,109,000 is recommended for the Joint Stars aircraft program. $22,600,000 is for the Primary Mission Equipment and Diminishing Manufacturing Source (PME/DMS) development program. $1,409,000 is for the Surface Warfare Joint Capability Technology Demonstration. $36,000,000 is for increased bandwidth and beyond line of site capability for the aircraft. $4,100,000 is for Single Channel Ground to Air Radio System (SINCGARS) voice initial capability insertion.

C-17 HEADS-UP DISPLAY

Beginning in fiscal year 2012 the current C-17 Heads-Up Display (HUD) will no longer be supportable due to problems associated with parts obsolescence. Given this timeline, the Air Force may use C-17 research, development, test and evaluation funds already appropriated in fiscal year 2008 to start a replacement program for the HUD.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

An appropriation of $1,837,450,000 is recommended for the Defense Working Capital Funds. The recommendations for each Defense Working Capital Fund account are shown below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositioned War Reserve Stocks</td>
<td>511,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spares Augmentation—Combat Losses</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spares Augmentation—OIF Demands</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Costs</td>
<td>7,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY</strong></td>
<td>660,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUND, NAVY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Costs</td>
<td>272,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUND, NAVY</strong></td>
<td>272,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Costs</td>
<td>594,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE</strong></td>
<td>594,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater Distribution Center, Kuwait</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Fuel Losses</td>
<td>43,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Transportation</td>
<td>96,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Reutilization and Marketing Options</td>
<td>5,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Fuel Terminal Operations</td>
<td>16,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Costs</td>
<td>146,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE</strong></td>
<td>320,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>1,837,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

An appropriation of $5,110,000 is recommended for the National Defense Sealift Fund.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

An appropriation of $1,438,864,000 is recommended for the Defense Health Program.

The recommendations for operation and maintenance, procurement and research, development, test and evaluation are shown below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE</strong></td>
<td>907,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IN-HOUSE CARE</strong></td>
<td>38,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Personnel Backfill</td>
<td>37,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Care of Former Members w/ Severe Injuries</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIVATE SECTOR CARE</strong></td>
<td>491,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respite Care for Active Duty Members</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Care for Families of Seriously Injured Members</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSOLIDATED HEALTH CARE SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td>43,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of Combat Wounded</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center of Excellence for Eye Injuries</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Office for Interoperable Electronic Health Record</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Evaluation System &amp; Case Management</td>
<td>7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORMATION MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td>19,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Medical Communications Infrastructure</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Civilian Hires</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Evaluation System &amp; Case Management</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION AND TRAINING</strong></td>
<td>20,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Recruiting/Retention of HC Professionals</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Civilian Hires</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS</strong></td>
<td>293,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army FSRM</td>
<td>140,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy FSRM</td>
<td>93,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force FSRM</td>
<td>59,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROCUREMENT</strong></td>
<td>91,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Evaluation System &amp; Case Management</td>
<td>4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Medical Communications Infrastructure</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Medical Procurement</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Medical Procurement</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION</strong></td>
<td>364,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Evaluation System &amp; Case Management</td>
<td>21,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Casualty and Psychological Health Research</td>
<td>273,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Neuroscience and Regenerative Medicine</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSYCHOLOGICAL HEALTH AND TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY</strong></td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td>1,438,864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The recommendation includes an additional $293,023,000 for sustainment, restoration and modernization of military medical projects for the Army, Navy and Air Force. The average "recapitalization rate" (aggregate investment in infrastructure) for civilian hospitals is 21 years and the current Department of Defense medical facility recapitalization rate exceeds 35 years. This funding is only a temporary band-aid for certain facilities and the Department is urged to request the necessary military construction funds.

UNFUNDED FISCAL YEAR 2008 PROCUREMENT REQUIREMENTS

The recommendation includes an additional $62,000,000 for unfunded procurement requirements for the Army and Navy. The Air Force does not have any unfunded procurement requirements for fiscal year 2008. Providing the most advanced medical equipment is essential for the care of our service members and their families and the Services have a limited ability to procure critical medical technology because of the exponential cost growth for medical equipment and the restrictions on the service medical accounts. Additional procurement resources have been provided to the Services for the past two years and the Department must make a concerted effort to reflect these requirements in future budget submissions for the Defense Health Program.

BATTLE CASUALTY AND PSYCHOLOGICAL HEALTH RESEARCH

The recommendation includes an additional $273,800,000 to address prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and mitigation of deployment-related injuries and psychological health concerns. These funds are targeted to accelerate ongoing programs and are for peer reviewed research into emergent approaches and technologies. These funds are directed towards the following research areas: final development of medical devices for use in theater (including portable suction machines and EKGs for theater hospitals); blood safety and blood products; burns (including tissue viability and fluid resuscitation); orthopedic and other trauma treatment and rehabilitation (including face, visual/ocular and nerve damage, dental, and auditory systems); suicide prevention and counseling (including reducing nurse stress and fatigue at military treatment facilities); traumatic brain injury and psychological health (including Post Traumatic Stress Disorder); injury prevention; wound infection and healing; treatment for severe cutaneous leishmaniasis; and wound infection vaccines. These funds shall be executed through the Army’s Medical Research and Materiel Command. The Army is directed to work in conjunction with the Navy and the Air Force to augment all Department of Defense research efforts in these areas. The Department is directed to provide a report with a detailed plan for the use of these funds and timeline for execution by August 1, 2008.

CENTER FOR NEUROSCIENCE AND REGENERATIVE MEDICINE

The recommendation includes an additional $70,000,000 to increase investigators and research capabilities in Traumatic Brain Injury and regenerative medicine across the Armed Forces. The focus of this initiative is an intramural start-up for the study of blast injury to the brain and post traumatic stress by studying actual combat casualties cared for at Walter Reed Army Medical Center and the National Naval Medical Center and using sophisticated neuroimaging technology at the National Institute of Health’s Clinical Center.

POST TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AND TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY

In addition to amounts otherwise available to the Defense Health Program, $75,000,000 is available to continue work for traumatic brain injury and psychological health.

DRUG INTERDiction AND Counter-Drug ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

An appropriation of $65,317,000 is recommended for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense for operations in Afghanistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Thailand and Turkmenistan.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

An appropriation of $6,394,000 is recommended for the Office of the Inspector General. This is an increase of $2,000,000 in research, development, test and evaluation funding for the development of an Investigative Data System for the Defense Criminal Investigative Service.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, THIS CHAPTER

The amended bill includes the following general provisions for this chapter:

Section 9101 establishes the period of availability for obligation of appropriations provided in this chapter.

Section 9102 provides that funds made available in this chapter are in addition to amounts provided elsewhere for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2008.

Section 9103 provides for special transfer authority of up to $250,000,000 of funds in this chapter to the Secretary of Defense for transfer purposes in Iraq and Afghanistan and conditions in section 8005 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2008.

Section 9104 provides that of the funds made available for the Department of Defense, $1,036,841,000 may be used to execute programs under the Commander’s Emergency Response Program for Iraq, Afghanistan, and the Philippines.

Section 9105 provides for transfer of funds to the Defense Cooperation Account to appropriations or funds as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

Section 9106 provides that not to exceed $20,000,000 of funds made available under “Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense” may be used to support counter-drug activities of certain governments, and that such support is in addition to support provided under any other provision of law.

Section 9107 provides for up to 20 heavy and light armored vehicles for force protection purposes in Iraq and Afghanistan and up to 21 vehicles from funds previously appropriated.

Section 9108 provides for the transfer of funds to the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund.

Section 9109 provides for up to $150,000,000 to support the development of foreign national counterterrorism capabilities.

CHAPTER 2—BRIDGE FUND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY OVERVIEW

RECOMMENDATION

On May 2, the Administration presented a request of $60,062,936,000 for supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense, not including military construction. The recommendation in title IX, chapter 2, is $65,921,157,000.

The following table summarizes by appropriation account or general provision, the recommendation:
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 2</th>
<th>Defense Bridge Fund Appropriations for FY 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense--Military</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>839,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard Personnel, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Military Personnel</td>
<td>1,164,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation and Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Army (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Navy (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer out) (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Guard (By transfer) (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Air Force (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Defense-Wide (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Army Reserve (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Navy Reserve (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Army National Guard (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Air National Guard (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (emergency) | 2,000,000 |
| Iraq Security Forces Fund (emergency) | 1,000,000 |
| Subtotal, Other | 3,000,000 |
| Grand total, Operation and Maintenance | 54,916,009 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Army (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Army (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Navy (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Air Force (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Defense-Wide (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Procurement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test &amp; Evaluation, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>113,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test &amp; Evaluation, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>72,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (emergency)</td>
<td>202,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation</td>
<td>387,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Department of Defense Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Health Program (emergency)</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance (emergency)</td>
<td>(1,100,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (emergency)</td>
<td>188,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint IED Defeat Fund (emergency)</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Other Department of Defense Programs</td>
<td>3,288,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Provisions--Chapter 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special transfer authority (emergency)</td>
<td>(4,000,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund (emergency)</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Chapter 2</td>
<td>65,921,157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLASSIFIED ANNEX

The recommendations for intelligence activities are published in a separate and detailed classified annex. The intelligence community, Department of Defense and other organizations are expected to fully comply with the recommendations and direction in the classified annex accompanying this Act.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The Secretary of Defense is directed to provide a report to the congressional defense committees within 30 days of enactment of this Act on the allocation of the funds within the accounts listed in this chapter. The Secretary shall submit updated reports 30 days after the end of each fiscal quarter until funds listed in this chapter are no longer available for obligation. The Secretary is directed that these reports shall include: a detailed accounting of obligations and expenditures of appropriations provided in this chapter by program and subactivity group for the continuation of military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and a listing of equipment procured using funds provided in this chapter. It is expected that, in order to meet unanticipated requirements, the Department of Defense may need to transfer funds within these appropriation accounts for purposes other than those specified in this report. The Department of Defense is directed to follow normal prior approval reprogramming procedures should it be necessary to transfer funding between different appropriation accounts in this chapter.

Additionally, the Department of Defense is directed to submit monthly supplemental execution reports to the congressional defense committees that include the following information by appropriation: funding appropriated, funding allocated, monthly obligations, monthly disbursements, cumulative fiscal year obligations, and cumulative fiscal year disbursements.

MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROTECTED VEHICLES

The recommendation includes $1,700,000,000 for the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund. This funds requirements for ballistic testing, sustainment and transportation of Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles, as identified by the Department. The Department shall continue to adhere to the execution and reporting requirements contained in section 8122 of Public Law 110–116. Additionally, the Secretary of Defense is directed to include future requests for Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle sustainment in the base budget starting with the fiscal year 2010 President’s budget request submission.

MILITARY PERSONNEL

An appropriation of $1,194,000,000 is recommended for Military Personnel. The recommendations for each military personnel account are shown below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC PAY</td>
<td>85,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL</td>
<td>24,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING</td>
<td>25,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE</td>
<td>3,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SECURITY TAX</td>
<td>6,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1</td>
<td>145,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC PAY</td>
<td>190,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL</td>
<td>55,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING</td>
<td>58,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SECURITY TAX</td>
<td>14,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2</td>
<td>319,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE</td>
<td>17,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND</td>
<td>251,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3</td>
<td>269,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEATH GRATUITIES</td>
<td>10,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGLI AND TSGLI PAYMENTS</td>
<td>94,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6</td>
<td>104,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY</strong></td>
<td>839,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEATH GRATUITIES</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGLI AND TSGLI PAYMENTS</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY</strong></td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEATH GRATUITIES</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGLI AND TSGLI PAYMENTS</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS</strong></td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEATH GRATUITIES</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGLI AND TSGLI PAYMENTS</td>
<td>63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6</strong></td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE</strong></td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS &amp; DRILLS 24/28)</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL TRAINING</td>
<td>58,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL TRAINING</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT</td>
<td>51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY</strong></td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An appropriation of $54,916,009,000 is recommended for Operation and Maintenance.

The recommendations for each operation and maintenance account are shown below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCREMENTAL WARTIME OPERATING COSTS</td>
<td>23,343,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPOT MAINTENANCE/RESET</td>
<td>7,886,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITIES/BASE SUPPORT</td>
<td>5,205,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>778,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</td>
<td>86,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY</strong></td>
<td>37,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCREMENTAL WARTIME OPERATING COSTS</td>
<td>2,517,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPOT MAINTENANCE/RESET</td>
<td>236,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>594,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAST GUARD SUPPORT</td>
<td>112,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</td>
<td>38,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY</strong></td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCREMENTAL WARTIME OPERATING COSTS</td>
<td>2,109,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPOT MAINTENANCE/RESET</td>
<td>430,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>369,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS</strong></td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCREMENTAL WARTIME OPERATING COSTS</td>
<td>2,689,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPOT MAINTENANCE/RESET</td>
<td>238,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airlift Operations</td>
<td>2,031,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</td>
<td>40,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE</strong></td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE JOINT STAFF</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td>901,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISR SUSTAINMENT</td>
<td>123,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY (DCAA)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY (DCMA)</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCE ACTIVITY (DHRA)</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY (DISA)</td>
<td>31,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY (DLSA)</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY (DODEA)</td>
<td>102,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY (DSCA)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY (DTRA)</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</td>
<td>1,073,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,648,569</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td>79,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>79,291</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td>42,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,490</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td>47,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE</td>
<td><strong>47,076</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td>12,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,376</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td>333,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD</td>
<td><strong>333,540</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td>52,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD</td>
<td><strong>52,667</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINISTRY OF DEFENSE (MOD) INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>300,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>234,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD TRAINING</td>
<td>138,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD SUSTAINMENT</td>
<td>480,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINISTRY OF INTERIOR (MOI) INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>210,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOI EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>42,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOI TRAINING</td>
<td>313,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOI SUSTAINMENT</td>
<td>275,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATED ACTIVITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETAINEE OPERATIONS – TRAINING</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETAINEE OPERATIONS – SUSTAINMENT</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## IRAQ SECURITY FORCES FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINISTRY OF DEFENSE (MOD) EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD TRAINING</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD SUSTAINMENT</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINISTRY OF INTERIOR (MOI) EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOI TRAINING</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOI SUSTAINMENT</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, IRAQ SECURITY FORCES FUND</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY

The recommendation includes $200,000,000 for coalition support funds and $100,000,000 for lift and sustainment of coalition partners in Iraq and Afghanistan.

AFGHANISTAN AND IRAQ SECURITY FORCES

Reprogramming. The Department of Defense has been provided significant flexibility in executing this program in the past but new reprogramming procedures are required at this juncture. With respect to the Iraq Security Forces Fund and the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, the Department is directed to submit prior approval reprogramming requests to the congressional defense committees for proposed transfers of funds in excess of $20,000,000, to the Infrastructure subactivity groups or other construction related projects.

PROCUREMENT

An appropriation of $4,435,320,000 is recommended for Procurement. The recommendations for each procurement account are shown below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIOWA WARRIOR</td>
<td>59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY</td>
<td>84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT</td>
<td>394,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1 ABRAMS TANK MOD</td>
<td>47,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM</td>
<td>130,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRYKER VEHICLE</td>
<td>248,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORTAR WEAPON SYSTEM</td>
<td>1,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY</td>
<td>822,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES</td>
<td>46,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY</td>
<td>46,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMMWV RECAP PROGRAM</td>
<td>390,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMTT EXTENDED SERVICE PROGRAM</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMI TRAILER, FLATBED</td>
<td>58,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMI TRAILER, TANKER</td>
<td>26,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL BRIDGING, FLOAT-RIBBON</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRY SUPPORT BRIDGE</td>
<td>76,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL TRAILER/DOLLY SETS</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL RADIOS</td>
<td>4,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL COMMUNICATIONS FOR COMBAT CASUALTY CARE</td>
<td>12,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGHT VISION DEVICES</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGHT VISION THERMAL WEAPONS SIGHT</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOADERS</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACTORS</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SUPPORT SYSTEM</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M921</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPHET GROUND</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM</td>
<td>9,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY</td>
<td>1,009,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>3,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL VEHICLES</td>
<td>5,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS UNDER $6 MILLION</td>
<td>5,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>13,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,948</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIGHT ARMORED VEHICLE (LAV)-PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (PIP)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAPONS &amp; COMBAT SYSTEMS UNDER $5M</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODULAR WEAPONS SYSTEM (Note: Includes FK4 Underbody Armor, M1114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag KIts, M1A1 IED Survivability Enhancements)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (Note: Includes Blue Force Tracking Support,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform Devices, Spares and Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADAR SYSTEMS</td>
<td>105,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4T TRUCK HMWWV (RESET)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD SYSTEMS (Note: Including CREW Upgrades)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT (Note: Includes Electronic Security Systems</td>
<td>211,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and G-BOSS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTER RC IED WARFARE</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS</strong></td>
<td><strong>565,426</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAIRCM (Note: Includes funds for EC130/C-17 LAIRCM)</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-16 MODIFICATIONS (Note: Only for the National Guard $34,200,000 for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-16 Advanced Identification Friend/Foe (AIFF))</td>
<td>34,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-15 MODIFICATIONS (Note: $34,000,000 only for National Guard AESA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems)</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MQ-9 REAPER (Note: Includes 5 UAVs)</td>
<td>87,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREDATOR/REAPER GCS RETROFIT</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>201,842</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HALVORSEN</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</td>
<td>1,487,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,500,644</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

- **C-130 MODIFICATIONS** (Note: Funds are provided for the Special Operations Command Gunship Multispectral Sensor 2 Readiness Spares)  
  Recommendation: 17,000
- **SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT**  
  Recommendation: 43,640
- **SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENT** (Note: $20,750,000 is for Special Operations Command ISR Mission Equipment Package and $13,000,000 for Sensors for Additional Leased ISR Aircraft)  
  Recommendation: 33,750
- **SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS** (Note: For SOF Soldier Protection and Survival System)  
  Recommendation: 16,250
- **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS**  
  Recommendation: 66,597

**TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE**: 177,237
FORCE PROTECTION AND RESET

The recommendation provides funding for critical force protection and reset initiatives identified by the Marine Corps, to include $30,000,000 for Light Armored Vehicle survivability upgrades; $97,500,000 for Frag Kit 4 underbody armor and M1114 Frag Kits; $165,175,000 for Blue Force Tracker platform devices; and $201,750,000 for jammer upgrades.

SPECIAL OPERATIONS PSYCHOLOGICAL OPERATIONS

The Special Operations Command is encouraged to use funds provided in fiscal year 2009 for the Department of Defense to fund psychological operations equipment for C-130 aircraft.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

An appropriation of $387,828,000 is recommended for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation only for classified programs.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

An appropriation of $1,100,000,000 is recommended for the Defense Health Program. The recommendations for the Defense Health Program are shown below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN-HOUSE CARE</td>
<td>740,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSOLIDATED HEALTH CARE SUPPORT</td>
<td>220,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>78,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>1,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION AND TRAINING</td>
<td>51,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>9,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,100,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY AND PSYCHOLOGICAL HEALTH

The recommendation includes $300,000,000 to support programs and activities relating to the treatment, care, rehabilitation, recovery and support of the Armed Forces for traumatic brain injury and psychological health issues. Of the funds provided, $200,000,000 is in In-House Care, $75,000,000 is in Consolidated Health, and $25,000,000 is in Education and Training. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, in coordination with the Service Surgeons General and the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Health Protection and Readiness, is directed to provide a report to the congressional defense committees no later than August 1, 2008 with a detailed spend plan including funding requirements, sources of funding, and a break out of initiatives.

DRUG INTERDICTIO AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

An appropriation of $188,000,000 is recommended for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense for operations in Afghanistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

An appropriation of $2,000,000,000 is recommended for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATTACK THE NETWORK</td>
<td>725,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFEAT THE DEVICE</td>
<td>950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAIN THE FORCE</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

GENERAL PROVISIONS, THIS CHAPTER

The amended bill includes the following general provisions for this chapter:

Section 9201 establishes that the funds made available in this chapter are not available until October 1, 2008.

Section 9202 establishes the period of availability for obligation for appropriations provided in this chapter.

Section 9203 provides for special transfer authority up to $4,000,000,000 of funds in this chapter.

Section 9204 provides that the Secretary of Defense continue to provide quarterly reports to Congress on a comprehensive set of indicators and measures for progress towards military and political stability in Iraq.

Section 9205 provides that the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense; the Commander, Multi-National Security Transition Command-Iraq; and the Commander, Combined Security Transition Command-Afghanistan, shall submit a report detailing, among other assessments, the total cost of training and equipping the Iraq and Afghanistan security forces.

Section 9206 provides that funds available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to provide supplies, services and transportation to coalition forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Section 9207 provides that supervision and administrative costs associated with a construction project funded through operation and maintenance, Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, or Iraq Security Forces Fund may be obligated at the time a construction contract is awarded.

Section 9208 provides $1,700,000,000 in emergency funding for the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund.

Section 9209 defines the Congressional Defense Committees as being the Armed Services Committees and the Subcommittees on Defense of the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate.

CHAPTER 3 — GENERAL PROVISIONS, THIS TITLE

The amended bill includes the following general provisions for this title:

Section 9301 provides that the amounts recommended under this title are designated as an emergency requirement and necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of section 204 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008.

Section 9302 provides for the obligation and expenditure of funds related to activities pursuant to section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947.

Section 9303 prohibits the use of funds to contravene laws or regulations promulgated to implement the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

Section 9304 requires a report on the United States global strategy to combat and defeat Al Qaeda and its affiliates.

Section 9305 provides that none of the funds appropriated in this title may be obligated and expended to finance programs or activities denied by Congress in fiscal year 2007 or 2008 appropriations for the Department of Defense or to initiate a new start without prior approval.

Section 9306 provides for an increase in the amount authorized for the United States contribution to NATO to $435,259,000.


RESCISSIONS

Section 9308 provides that: (a) of the funds made available for “Defense Health Program” in Public Law 110–28, $75,000,000 is rescinded and, (b) of the funds made available for “Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund” in Division L of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–161), $71,531,000 is rescinded.

Section 9309 provides that of the funding provided in the Readiness, Veterans’ Care, Katrina Recovery and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 that remains available for obligation under the Iraq Freedom Fund 2007/2008, $150,000,000 is only for the Joint Rapid Acquisition Cell program and $10,000,000 is only for the transportation of fallen service members.

Section 9310 allows Combatant Commanders to use funds available in this title in operation and maintenance to purchase an investment item of not more than $500,000 to meet operational requirements.
# TITLE IX—DEFENSE MATTERS

## CHAPTER 1

### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FY 2008

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

#### Military Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>11,535,055</td>
<td>11,807,655</td>
<td>+272,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>696,053</td>
<td>866,753</td>
<td>+170,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>1,733,971</td>
<td>1,820,571</td>
<td>+86,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>1,277,853</td>
<td>1,286,153</td>
<td>+8,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>299,200</td>
<td>304,200</td>
<td>+5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>72,800</td>
<td>+2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>15,420</td>
<td>16,720</td>
<td>+1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>+2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard Personnel, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>1,136,747</td>
<td>1,369,747</td>
<td>+233,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard Personnel, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>+400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Military Personnel**: 16,767,299  

#### Operation and Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>18,720,113</td>
<td>16,343,512</td>
<td>-2,376,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>2,498,765</td>
<td>2,952,864</td>
<td>+454,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer out) (emergency)</td>
<td>(-112,607)</td>
<td>(-112,607)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>306,050</td>
<td>159,900</td>
<td>-146,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>5,927,212</td>
<td>5,922,520</td>
<td>-4,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (emergency)</td>
<td>3,220,388</td>
<td>3,387,562</td>
<td>+167,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve (emergency)</td>
<td>118,958</td>
<td>164,839</td>
<td>+45,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve (emergency)</td>
<td>41,750</td>
<td>109,876</td>
<td>+68,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (emergency)</td>
<td>22,040</td>
<td>70,256</td>
<td>+48,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (emergency)</td>
<td>12,133</td>
<td>165,994</td>
<td>+153,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (emergency)</td>
<td>430,008</td>
<td>685,644</td>
<td>+255,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (emergency)</td>
<td>51,633</td>
<td>287,369</td>
<td>+235,736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance**: 31,349,050  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Iraq Freedom Fund (emergency)</td>
<td>103,750</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-53,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (emergency)</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>+50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Iraq Security Forces Fund (emergency)</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal, Other**: 2,933,750  

**Grand total, Operation and Maintenance**: 34,302,800  

#### Procurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>1,181,864</td>
<td>954,111</td>
<td>-227,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missile Procurement, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>641,764</td>
<td>561,656</td>
<td>-80,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>5,860,252</td>
<td>5,393,471</td>
<td>-466,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>359,600</td>
<td>344,900</td>
<td>-14,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>21,103,261</td>
<td>15,967,340</td>
<td>-5,135,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>3,859,958</td>
<td>3,411,254</td>
<td>-448,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons Procurement, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>318,281</td>
<td>317,456</td>
<td>-825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>304,945</td>
<td>304,945</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Recommended vs. Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>1,515,116</td>
<td>1,260,135</td>
<td>-254,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>2,444,490</td>
<td>2,153,390</td>
<td>-291,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>3,894,839</td>
<td>7,028,563</td>
<td>+3,133,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missile Procurement, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>66,943</td>
<td>+65,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>104,405</td>
<td>205,455</td>
<td>+101,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>2,430,034</td>
<td>1,903,167</td>
<td>-526,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Defense-Wide (emergency)</td>
<td>267,440</td>
<td>406,209</td>
<td>+140,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Acquisition Fund</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard and Reserve Equipment (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>+750,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total, Procurement: 44,438,049  41,030,995  -3,407,054

Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>163,299</td>
<td>162,958</td>
<td>-341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>610,567</td>
<td>366,110</td>
<td>-244,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>1,487,493</td>
<td>278,427</td>
<td>-1,209,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (emergency)</td>
<td>684,389</td>
<td>816,598</td>
<td>+132,209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation: 2,945,748  1,624,093  -1,321,655

Revolving and Management Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defense Working Capital Funds (emergency)</td>
<td>957,675</td>
<td>1,837,450</td>
<td>+879,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Defense Sealift Fund (emergency)</td>
<td>5,110</td>
<td>5,110</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total, Revolving and Management Funds: 962,785  1,842,560  +879,775

Other Department of Defense Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defense Health Program (emergency)</td>
<td>561,741</td>
<td>1,363,864</td>
<td>+802,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance (emergency)</td>
<td>(561,741)</td>
<td>(907,064)</td>
<td>(+345,323)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement (emergency)</td>
<td>(91,900)</td>
<td>(+91,900)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, development, test and evaluation (emergency)</td>
<td>(364,900)</td>
<td>(+364,900)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological health &amp; traumatic brain injury (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>+75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total, Defense Health Program (emergency): 561,741  1,438,864  +877,123

Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (emergency) 65,017  65,317  +300

Office of the Inspector General (emergency) 4,394  6,394  +2,000

Total, Other Department of Defense Programs: 631,152  1,510,575  +879,423

General Provisions--Chapters 1 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special transfer authority (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(2,500,000)</td>
<td>(+2,500,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Cooperation Account (transfer authority) (emergency)</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions (emergency) (Chapter 3)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-146,531</td>
<td>-146,531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total, General Provisions (Chapter 3): 6,500  -140,031  -146,531

Total, Chapter 1 and Chapter 3: 100,054,333  96,622,127  -3,432,206
Title IX: Defense Matters
(Amounts in thousands)

### CHAPTER 2

**BRIDGE FUND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FY 2009**

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY**

**Military Personnel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Type</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommend vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>839,000</td>
<td>-2,661,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard Personnel, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>+130,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Military Personnel**

| 3,805,000 | 1,194,000 | -2,611,000 |

**Operation and Maintenance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommend vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>35,560,055</td>
<td>37,300,000</td>
<td>+1,739,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>238,437</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>+3,261,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer out) (emergency)</td>
<td>(-200,000)</td>
<td>(-112,000)</td>
<td>(+88,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>(112,000)</td>
<td>(-88,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>3,644,078</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>+1,355,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (emergency)</td>
<td>3,193,494</td>
<td>2,648,569</td>
<td>-544,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>79,291</td>
<td>+79,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>42,490</td>
<td>+42,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (emergency)</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>47,076</td>
<td>+13,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>12,376</td>
<td>+12,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>333,540</td>
<td>+333,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>52,667</td>
<td>+52,667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance**

| 44,870,064 | 51,916,009 | +7,045,945 |

| Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (emergency)                   | 3,666,259 | 2,000,000   | -1,666,259            |
| Iraq Security Forces Fund (emergency)                          | 2,000,000 | 1,000,000   | -1,000,000            |

**Subtotal, Other**

| 5,666,259 | 3,000,000 | -2,666,259 |

**Grand total, Operation and Maintenance**

| 50,536,323 | 54,916,009 | +4,379,686 |

**Procurement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procurement Type</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommend vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>+84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>822,674</td>
<td>+822,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>46,500</td>
<td>+46,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>80,536</td>
<td>1,009,050</td>
<td>+928,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>27,948</td>
<td>+27,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>565,425</td>
<td>+565,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>1,209,300</td>
<td>201,842</td>
<td>-1,007,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>1,467,475</td>
<td>1,500,644</td>
<td>+33,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Defense-Wide (emergency)</td>
<td>72,733</td>
<td>177,237</td>
<td>+104,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Acquisition Fund</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Procurement**

| 2,930,044 | 4,435,320 | +1,505,276 |
### TITLE IX—DEFENSE MATTERS
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>113,228</td>
<td>113,228</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>71,741</td>
<td>72,041</td>
<td>+300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (emergency)</td>
<td>194,156</td>
<td>202,559</td>
<td>+8,403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>379,125</td>
<td>387,828</td>
<td>+8,703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Revolving and Management Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defense Working Capital Funds (emergency)</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-2,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Revolving and Management Funds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-2,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other Department of Defense Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defense Health Program (emergency)</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>+700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance (emergency)</td>
<td>(400,000)</td>
<td>(1,100,000)</td>
<td>(+700,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological health &amp; traumatic brain injury (emergency)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (emergency)</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>188,000</td>
<td>+58,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint IED Defeat Fund (emergency)</td>
<td>2,970,444</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>-970,444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Other Department of Defense Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,600,444</td>
<td>3,288,000</td>
<td>-312,444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General Provisions—Chapter 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special transfer authority (emergency)</td>
<td>(4,000,000)</td>
<td>(4,000,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Cooperation Account (transfer authority) (emergency)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund (emergency)</td>
<td>2,610,000</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>-910,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, General Provisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,612,000</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>-912,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Chapter 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66,062,936</td>
<td>65,921,157</td>
<td>-141,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand total, Title IX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>166,117,269</td>
<td>162,543,284</td>
<td>-3,573,985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TITLE IX—DEFENSE MATTERS
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008 RECAPITULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel</td>
<td>16,767,299</td>
<td>17,553,599</td>
<td>+786,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance</td>
<td>31,349,050</td>
<td>30,250,336</td>
<td>-1,098,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,953,750</td>
<td>2,950,000</td>
<td>-3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>44,438,049</td>
<td>41,030,995</td>
<td>-3,407,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation</td>
<td>2,945,748</td>
<td>1,624,093</td>
<td>-1,321,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving and Management Funds</td>
<td>962,785</td>
<td>1,842,560</td>
<td>+879,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Department of Defense Programs</td>
<td>631,152</td>
<td>1,510,575</td>
<td>+879,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Provisions</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>-140,301</td>
<td>-146,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, FY 2008 Department of Defense</strong></td>
<td>100,054,333</td>
<td>96,622,127</td>
<td>-3,432,206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY 2009 RECAPITULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel</td>
<td>3,805,000</td>
<td>1,194,000</td>
<td>-2,611,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance</td>
<td>44,870,064</td>
<td>51,916,009</td>
<td>+7,045,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5,866,259</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>-2,866,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>2,930,044</td>
<td>4,435,320</td>
<td>+1,505,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation</td>
<td>379,125</td>
<td>387,828</td>
<td>+8,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving and Management Funds</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Department of Defense Programs</td>
<td>3,600,444</td>
<td>3,288,000</td>
<td>-312,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Provisions--Chapter 2</td>
<td>2,612,000</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>-912,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, FY 2009 Department of Defense</strong></td>
<td>66,062,936</td>
<td>65,921,157</td>
<td>-141,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total, Title IX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>166,117,269</td>
<td>162,543,284</td>
<td>-3,573,985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
SUPPORT FOR IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN: TENTATIVE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

H4012
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE
May 15, 2008

AMENDMENT NO. 2
TITLE X—POLICY RELATING TO OPERATIONS IN IRAQ
SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING UNITED STATES MILITARY PERSONNEL
Section 10001 includes a sense of the Congress with respect to performance, courage, and sacrifice of the United States military personnel.

UNITS DEPLOYED FOR COMBAT TO BE FULLY MISSION CAPABLE
Section 10002 prohibits the use of funds to deploy to Iraq any combat unit of the Armed Forces that is not assessed “fully mission capable” of performing their assigned mission to the prescribed standards under the conditions and at the time of operation, consistent with the guidelines set forth in the Department of Defense’s written policies. These readiness standards may be waived on a unit-by-unit basis if the President certifies, in writing, that the deployment of a unit that is not assessed mission capable is required for reasons of national security, and submits along with the certification a report detailing the particular reasons why the unit’s deployment is necessary.

TIME LIMIT ON COMBAT DEPLOYMENTS
Section 10003 prohibits the use of funds to initially, continue, or execute any order extending the deployment for Operation Iraqi Freedom of any unit of the Army, Army Reserve or Army National Guard beyond 365 days, and any wing of the Marine Corps or Marine Corps Reserve beyond 210 days. This limitation may be waived on a unit-by-unit basis if the President certifies, in writing, that the extension of a unit’s deployment in Iraq beyond the period applicable to the unit is required for reasons of national security, and includes in the certification a report detailing the particular reasons why the unit’s extended deployment is necessary.

DWELL TIME BETWEEN COMBAT DEPLOYMENTS
Section 10004 prohibits the use of funds to initiate, continue, or execute any order that has the effect of redeploying for Operation Iraqi Freedom any unit of the Army, Army Reserve or Army National Guard if such unit has been deployed within the previous consecutive 365 days or within any unit of the Marine Corps or Marine Corps Reserve if such unit has been deployed within the previous 210 consecutive days. This limitation may be waived on a unit-by-unit basis if the President certifies, in writing, that the redeployment of a unit in advance of the expiration of the period applicable to the unit is required for reasons of national security, and includes in the certification a report detailing the particular reasons why the unit’s early redeployment is necessary.

LIMITATION ON INTERROGATION TECHNIQUES
Section 10005 provides that no person in the custody or control of the effective control of an element of the intelligence community, including contractors and subcontractors at any tier of the element of the intelligence community, shall be subject to any treatment or technique of interrogation not authorized by the U.S. Army Field Manual on Human Intelligence Collector Operations.

REGISTRATION WITH THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS
Section 10006 prohibits the use of funds to retain any individual in the custody or under the effective control of an element of the intelligence community, including contractors and subcontractors at any tier of the element of the intelligence community, unless the International Committee of the Red Cross is notified of and access to such person in a timely manner and consistent with the practices of the Armed Forces of the United States.

PROHIBITION OF PERMANENT BASES IN IRAQ
Section 10007 prohibits the use of funds to establish a permanent base in Iraq or to exercise United States control over any oil resource of Iraq.

LIMITATION ON DEFENSE AGREEMENTS WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAQ
Section 10008 prohibits the use of funds to negotiate, enter into, or implement an agreement with the Government of Iraq that includes security assurances for mutual defense, unless the agreement is in the form of a treaty requiring the advice and consent of the Senate, or is specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

PROHIBITION ON AGREEMENTS SUBJECTING ARMED FORCES TO IRI AQ CRIMINAL JURISDICTION
Section 10009 prohibits the use of funds to negotiate, enter into, or implement an agreement with the Government of Iraq that would subject members of the United States Armed Forces to the jurisdiction of Iraq criminal courts or punishment under Iraqi law.

REQUIREMENT FOR MATCHING FUNDS FROM GOVERNMENT OF IRAQ
Section 10100 prohibits the use of funds for assistance for Iraq, including training, capacity building, modernization and repair of infrastructure, unless the funds are matched by the Government of Iraq on a dollar-for-dollar basis. The provision also requires a copy of the Secretary of Defense on the Budget of the Government of Iraq, to be included in the Secretary’s quarterly report on Progress Toward Stability in Iraq.

PARTIAL REMUNERATION FROM IRAQ FOR FUEL COSTS
Section 10101 requires that, within 90 days of enactment of this Act, the President shall complete an agreement with the Government of Iraq to subsidize fuel costs for United States Armed Forces operating in Iraq, so that the price of fuel for those forces is equal to the discounted price that is provided for domestic Iraqi consumption. Funds provided under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide” for the Secretary of Defense or Washington Headquarters Services may not be obligated or expended until such agreement is complete and the President transmits a report on that agreement to the Committees of Appropriations. This limitation on funding may be waived by the President upon certification that it is in the national security interests of the United States.

TIMELINE FOR REDEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES FORCES FROM IRAQ
Section 10102 provides for the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Iraq, beginning within 30 days of enactment of this Act, with a goal of completing such redeployment within 18 months. After completion of the redeployment, U.S. Armed Forces may be deployed to maintain in Iraq, only to the extent necessary to carry out the following missions: protecting diplomatic facilities, Armed Forces, and U.S. citizens in Iraq, conducting training of, equipping, and providing logistical and intelligence support to Iraqi security forces; and engaging in targeted counterterrorism operations against al-Qaeda, groups affiliated with al-Qaeda, and other terrorist organizations in Iraq.

This section requires the Secretary of Defense to transmit a report not later than July 1, 2008, and every 90 days thereafter, a report providing a description of current efforts and future plans to reduce and transition U.S. Armed Forces to a limited presence in Iraq. The section also includes a requirement that, within 45 days of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense provide to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a strategy for civilian-led post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction assistance for Iraq.

TITLE XI—REFORMS RELATED TO WAR PROFITEERING AND FRAUD
This chapter establishes new criminal offenses to prohibit profiteering and fraud in Federal contracts associated with military assistance, relief, and efforts overseas. The penalty is a fine of up to $1,000,000 and/or a prison term not to exceed 20 years.

CHAPTER 1—ADJUSTMENT OF WARTIME STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS
This chapter extends current law on the wartime suspension of statutory limitations for federal criminal violations related to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. It also extends the statute of limitations to five years after the termination of hostilities, instead of three years as provided in current law.

CHAPTER 2—WAR PROFITEERING AND FRAUD
This chapter establishes new criminal offenses to prohibit profiteering and fraud in Federal contracts associated with military assistance, relief, and efforts overseas. The penalty is a fine of up to $1,000,000 and/or a prison term not to exceed 20 years.

CHAPTER 3—EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION MATTERS
This chapter expands the Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act of 2000 to cover all persons employed under Federal contracts and subcontracts where U.S. Armed Forces are conducting overseas military operations. MEJA provides for the prosecution of an offense that would be punishable by imprisonment for more than one year as provided in this Act. This chapter also designates the Attorney General as the principal authority for investigation and enforcement of the Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 3
TITLE I—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS, INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, AND OTHER SECURITY-RELATED MATTERS
CHAPTER 1—AGRICULTURE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE
PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE II GRANTS
The amended bill provides a total of $650,000,000 to remain available until expended to provide title II grants for fiscal year 2008. The amended bill provides $350,000,000 as requested, for the urgent humanitarian needs identified by the administration. Further, the amended bill provides an additional $500,000,000 for anticipated cost increases for food and transportation to be made available immediately.

In addition, the bill includes $4,000,000 for the Office of the Inspector General. The Inspector General is directed to continue its audit and oversight activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s use of National Security Letters (NSLs) and orders for business records, pursuant to Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act.
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LEGAL ACTIVITIES
SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

The amended bill includes $1,648,000 for General Legal Activities for the Criminal Division to provide litigation support services to the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction for its ongoing investigations and cases involving corruption in the reconstruction of Iraq. The amended bill does not include funding requested to create Iraq and Afghanistan support units within General Legal Activities, Criminal Division. These worthy activities should be supported through funds made available to the departments of State or Defense.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The amended bill includes $5,000,000 for the U.S. Attorneys for extraordinary litigation expenses associated with terrorism prosecutions in the United States.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amended bill includes $18,621,000 for the U.S. Marshals Service. Within this funding level is $7,951,000 to provide security at high-threat terrorist trials in the United States and $3,700,000 to improve court and witness security in Afghanistan.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amended bill provides $92,169,000 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and for enhanced counterterrorism activities. The FBI is directed to provide the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with a detailed plan for the obligation of these funds no later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act and to update this plan on a quarterly basis with actual obligations. The amended bill also provides $32,600,000 in bridge funding for the FBI to maintain the operations described above into fiscal year 2009.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amended bill includes $12,166,000 for the Drug Enforcement Administration to further its narco-terrorism initiative and Operation Breakthrough and to conduct financial investigations.

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amended bill includes $1,648,000 for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives for necessary costs of operations in Iraq.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amended bill provides $9,100,000 for the Bureau of Prisons to monitor communications of incarcerated terrorists, collect intelligence, and disseminate relevant information to other Federal law enforcement agencies.

CHAPTER 3—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Iraq.—Central Command has reiterated its intention eventually to consolidate the U.S. force posture in Iraq into four contingency operating bases at Al Asad Air Base, Balad Air Base/Camp Anaconda, Camp Speicher, and Victory Base, as well as four convoy centers at Camp Adder, Korean Village, Qayyarah West, and Scania. The Administration’s request has been reviewed for military construction in Iraq to ensure that the recommended projects are consistent with the consolidation plan. The projects included in the amended bill support current operations pursuant to the consolidation plan, as well as force protection and quality of life projects for deployed personnel. Each project request has also been reviewed to ensure consistency with contingency construction standards. The amended bill therefore does not include $183,000,000 for five power plants to replace expeditionary generator sets. The establishment of permanent bases in Iraq is not supported, and the amended bill does not include any funds to establish any such base, or convert any base in Iraq from a temporary to permanent status. The amended bill includes language prohibiting the obligation or expenditure of $331,700,000 provided for Military Construction, Army, and $58,300,000 provided for Military Construction, Air Force, until the Secretary of Defense certifies that none of the funds are to be used for the purpose of providing facilities for permanent basing of U.S. military personnel in Iraq.

Child Development Centers.—The amended bill recommends a total of $210,238,000 to design and build twenty new child development centers for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force as requested by the Department. The Department should be commended for following the lead of Congress by requesting funds for additional child development centers. The projects included in the amended bill will provide additional space to serve approximately 3,500 children, in addition to the facilities for 4,900 children, as requested by Congress in the enacted fiscal year 2008 appropriation.

Trainee and Recruit Facilities.—The amended bill recommends a total of $299,600,000 for eight projects providing barracks and other facilities for Army and Marine Corps trainees and recruits. These projects are included to further the eventual elimination of a large backlog of needed recapitalization for trainees and recruit facilities, and to assist the Army and Marine Corps with their efforts to grow and revitalize the force to continue the global war on terrorism.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

The amended bill recommends $1,432,700,000 for Military Construction, Army. The funds are provided as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Amended Bill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AK: Fort Wainwright</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: Fort Irwin</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>11,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO: Fort Carson</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO: Fort Carson</td>
<td>Soldier Family Assistance Center</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA: Fort Benning</td>
<td>Classrooms &amp; Battalion Dining Facilities</td>
<td>2/</td>
<td>30,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA: Fort Gordon</td>
<td>AIT Complex 1, Phase 1</td>
<td>2/</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA: Fort Gordon</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA: Fort Stewart</td>
<td>Soldier Family Assistance Center</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI: Schofield Barracks</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS: Fort Riley</td>
<td>Transitioning Warrior Support Complex</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY: Fort Campbell</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY: Fort Campbell</td>
<td>Soldier Family Assistance Center</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY: Fort Knox</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA: Fort Polk</td>
<td>Soldier Family Assistance Center</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO: Fort Leonard Wood</td>
<td>Starbase Complex 6, Phase 1</td>
<td>2/</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC: Fort Bragg</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY: Fort Drum</td>
<td>Warrior in Transition Facilities</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK: Fort Sill</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Fort Jackson</td>
<td>Student Barracks</td>
<td>2/</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX: Fort Bliss</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX: Fort Bliss</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>5,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX: Fort Bliss</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX: Fort Hood</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX: Fort Hood</td>
<td>Warrior in Transition Unit Ops Facilities</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX: Fort Sam Houston</td>
<td>AIT Barracks</td>
<td>2/</td>
<td>47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX: Fort Sam Houston</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA: Fort Eustis</td>
<td>AIT Complex 1, Phase 1</td>
<td>2/</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA: Fort Lee</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan: Bagram AB</td>
<td>Administrative Building (1/)</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>13,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan: Bagram AB</td>
<td>Aircraft Maintenance Hangar</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan: Bagram AB</td>
<td>Ammunition Supply Point</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan: Bagram AB</td>
<td>Bulk Fuel Storage and Supply, Phase 3</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan: Bagram AB</td>
<td>Bulk Fuel Storage and Supply, Phase 4</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan: New Roads</td>
<td>New Roads</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan: Bagram AB</td>
<td>Power Plant</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan: Bagram AB</td>
<td>Theater Internment Facility (1/)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan: Bagram AB</td>
<td>Theater Wing Parking</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan: Kabul</td>
<td>Consolidated Compound</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan: Various Locations</td>
<td>Counter IED Road - Route Alaska</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan: Various Locations</td>
<td>Counter IED Road - Route Connecticut</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Al Asad AB</td>
<td>Hot Cargo Ramp</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Al Asad AB</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Al Asad AB</td>
<td>Power Plant</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Al Asad AB</td>
<td>South Airfield Apron (India Ramp)</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Al Asad AB</td>
<td>Urban Bypass Road</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Baghdadd</td>
<td>MNF Embassy Compound (1/)</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Baghdadd IAP</td>
<td>Water Supply, Treatment &amp; Storage Ph III</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Adder</td>
<td>Convoy Support Center Relocation, Phase II</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Adder</td>
<td>Corps Support Center, Phase III (1/)</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Adder</td>
<td>Entry Control Point (1/)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Adder</td>
<td>Multi-Class Storage Warehouse</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Adder</td>
<td>POL Storage Area</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Adder</td>
<td>Power Plant</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Project description</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Amended Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Adder</td>
<td>Wastewater Treatment &amp; Collection System</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Anaconda</td>
<td>Hazardous Waste Incinerator</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Anaconda</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Anaconda</td>
<td>Power Plant</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Anaconda</td>
<td>Urban Bypass Road (1/1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Constitution</td>
<td>Juvenile TIFRIC</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Cropper</td>
<td>Brick Factory</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Marez</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Ramadi</td>
<td>Incinerator (1/1)</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Ramadi</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Speicher</td>
<td>Aviation Navigation Facilities</td>
<td>13,400</td>
<td>13,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Speicher</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>5,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Speicher</td>
<td>Military Control Point</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Speicher</td>
<td>Power Plant</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Speicher</td>
<td>Rotary Wing Parking Apron</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>49,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Speicher</td>
<td>Wastewater Treatment &amp; Collection Sys. (1/1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Taqqadum</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Camp Warrior</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Fallujah</td>
<td>Incinerator (1/1)</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Fallujah</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Mosul</td>
<td>Urban Bypass Road</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Qayyarah West</td>
<td>North Entry Control Point</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>11,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Qayyarah West</td>
<td>Perimeter Security Upgrade</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>14,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Qayyarah West</td>
<td>Power Plant</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Scania</td>
<td>Entry Control Point</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Scania</td>
<td>Water Storage Tanks</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Tikrit</td>
<td>Urban Bypass Road (1/1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Victory Base</td>
<td>Entry Control Point (1/1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Victory Base</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Victory Base</td>
<td>Level 3 Hospital</td>
<td>13,400</td>
<td>13,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Victory Base</td>
<td>Wastewater Treatment &amp; Collection System</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Victory Base</td>
<td>Water Treatment &amp; Storage Phase II</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Various Locations</td>
<td>Facilities Replacement</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Various Locations</td>
<td>Overhead Cover - eGlass</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait: Camp Arifjan</td>
<td>Communication Center</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide: Unspecified</td>
<td>Planning and Design (GWOT)</td>
<td>64,200</td>
<td>52,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide: Unspecified</td>
<td>Planning and Design (WIT)</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>14,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide: Unspecified</td>
<td>Planning and Design (CDC) (1/1)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 1,581,500 1,432,700

1/ Requested or deleted by the Dept. of Defense in fiscal year 2008 and/or the March 2008 Adjustments package.
2/ 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.
Facilities Replacement.—The amended bill recommends $72,000,000 to replace deteriorated expeditionary facilities at a variety of locations throughout Iraq. As CENTCOM has not provided Congress with a final plan for how these funds will be spent, bill language is included prohibiting the obligation or expenditure of these funds until CENTCOM submits a detailed spending plan, including a 1391 form for each project by location.

Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps

The amended bill recommends $423,357,000 for Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps. The funds are provided as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Amended Bill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA: Camp Pendleton</td>
<td>11th Marine Regiment HQ, Amory, BEQ</td>
<td>34,970</td>
<td>34,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: Camp Pendleton</td>
<td>5th Marine Regiment Addition, San Mateo</td>
<td>10,890</td>
<td>10,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: Camp Pendleton</td>
<td>Armory Intelligence Battalion, 16 Area</td>
<td>4,180</td>
<td>4,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: Camp Pendleton</td>
<td>Armory, Regiment &amp; Battalion HQ, 53 Area</td>
<td>5,160</td>
<td>5,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: Camp Pendleton</td>
<td>BEQ &amp; Mess Hall HQ (13) Area</td>
<td>24,390</td>
<td>24,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: Camp Pendleton</td>
<td>EOD Operations Facility</td>
<td>13,090</td>
<td>13,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: Camp Pendleton</td>
<td>ISR Camp - Intelligence Battalion</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>1,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: Camp Pendleton</td>
<td>JIEDDO Battle Courses (1f)</td>
<td>9,270</td>
<td>9,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: Camp Pendleton</td>
<td>Military Police Company Facilities</td>
<td>8,240</td>
<td>8,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: Twentynine Palms</td>
<td>Regimental Combat Team HQ Facility</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>4,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: China Lake NAWS</td>
<td>JIEDDO Battle Courses (1f)</td>
<td>7,210</td>
<td>7,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: Point Mugu</td>
<td>JIEDDO Battle Courses (1f)</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>7,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: San Diego</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1f)</td>
<td>17,930</td>
<td>17,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: San Diego MCRD</td>
<td>Recruit Barracks</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>43,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: Twentynine Palms</td>
<td>JIEDDO Battle Courses (1f)</td>
<td>11,250</td>
<td>11,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL: Whiting Field NAS</td>
<td>JIEDDO Battle Courses (1f)</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS: Gulfport NCBC</td>
<td>JIEDDO Battle Courses (1f)</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>6,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC: Camp Lejeune</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1f)</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC: Camp Lejeune</td>
<td>JIEDDO Battle Courses (1f)</td>
<td>11,980</td>
<td>11,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Parris Island MCRD</td>
<td>Recruit Barracks</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>19,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA: Yorktown NWS</td>
<td>JIEDDO Battle Courses (1f)</td>
<td>8,070</td>
<td>8,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti: Camp Lemonier</td>
<td>CJTF-HOA HQ Facility</td>
<td>29,710</td>
<td>29,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti: Camp Lemonier</td>
<td>Dining Facility</td>
<td>20,780</td>
<td>20,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti: Camp Lemonier</td>
<td>Fuel Farm (1f)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti: Camp Lemonier</td>
<td>Full Length Taxiway (1f)</td>
<td>15,490</td>
<td>15,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti: Camp Lemonier</td>
<td>Network Infrastructure Expansion</td>
<td>6,270</td>
<td>6,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti: Camp Lemonier</td>
<td>Water Production</td>
<td>19,140</td>
<td>19,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti: Camp Lemonier</td>
<td>Western Taxiway (1f)</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide: Unspecified</td>
<td>Planning and Design (GTF)</td>
<td>7,491</td>
<td>7,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide: Unspecified</td>
<td>Planning and Design (GWOT)</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide: Unspecified</td>
<td>Planning and Design (CDC) (1f)</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide: Unspecified</td>
<td>Planning and Design (JIEDDO) (1f)</td>
<td>2,951</td>
<td>2,951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 360,257 423,357

1/ Requested by the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2008 and/or the March 2008 Adjustments package.
2/ 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.
Joint IED Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) Battle Courses.—The amended bill recommends $65,331,000 to construct facilities for enhanced counter-improvised explosive device training in furtherance of the goals of the Joint IED Defeat Organization. These funds address a technical correction in the Administration’s fiscal year 2008 Global War on Terror budget request and are offset by a rescission in title IX.

Military Construction, Air Force

The amended bill recommends $409,627,000 for Military Construction, Air Force. The funds are provided as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Amended Bill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA: Beale AFB</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>17,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL: Eglin AFB</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ: McGuire AFB</td>
<td>JIEDDO Battle Courses (1/)</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM: Cannon AFB</td>
<td>Child Development Center (1/)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan: Bagram AB.</td>
<td>East Side Helo Ramp</td>
<td>44,400</td>
<td>44,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan: Bagram AB.</td>
<td>ISR Ramp</td>
<td>26,300</td>
<td>26,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan: Bagram AB.</td>
<td>Parallel Taxiway Phase 2</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>21,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan: Bagram AB.</td>
<td>Strategic Ramp</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Balad AB</td>
<td>Fighter Ramp</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Balad AB</td>
<td>Foxtrot Taxiway</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Balad AB</td>
<td>Helicopter Maintenance Facilities.</td>
<td>34,600</td>
<td>34,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan: Manas AB</td>
<td>Strategic Ramp</td>
<td>30,300</td>
<td>30,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman: Masirah AB</td>
<td>Expeditionary Beddown Site</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar: Al Udeid AB</td>
<td>Facility Replacements</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar: Al Udeid AB</td>
<td>Northwest (CAS) Ramp (1/)</td>
<td>60,400</td>
<td>60,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide: Unspecified</td>
<td>Planning and Design (GWOT)</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide: Unspecified</td>
<td>Planning and Design (CDC) (1/)</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>1,427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                     |                                  | 409,627 | 409,627      |

1/ Requested by the Department of Defense in the March 2008 Adjustments package.
Joint IED Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) Battle Courses.—The amended bill recommends $6,200,000 to construct facilities for enhanced counter-improvised explosive device training in furtherance of the goals of the Joint IED Defeat Organization. These funds address a technical correction in the Administration’s fiscal year 2008 Global War on Terror budget request and are offset by a rescission in title IX.

Military Construction, Defense-Wide

The amended bill recommends $1,009,600,000 for Military Construction, Defense-Wide. The funds are provided as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Amended Bill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GA: Fort Benning</td>
<td>Hospital Replacement</td>
<td>1/</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS: Fort Riley</td>
<td>Hospital Replacement</td>
<td>1/</td>
<td>404,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC: Camp Lejuene</td>
<td>Hospital Addition/Alteration</td>
<td>1/</td>
<td>122,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX: Fort Sam Houston</td>
<td>Burn Rehabilitation Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar: Al Udeid AB</td>
<td>Logistics Storage Warehouse</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide: Unspecified</td>
<td>Planning and Design (MTF)</td>
<td>1/</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide: Unspecified</td>
<td>Planning and Design (Guam NH)</td>
<td>1/</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,600</td>
<td>1,009,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
Medical Treatment Facilities Construction.— There is a great concern with the large backlog of needed recapitalization for medical treatment facilities for military service members and their families. The current Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP) for Tricare Management Activity military construction averages $412,000,000 per year for fiscal years 2009 through 2013, and much of this amount is accounted for by medical research facilities. With the services identifying recapitalization requirements ranging in the several billions of dollars, the current FYDP for medical construction is obviously and severely insufficient. The Department’s inventory of medical treatment facilities is riddled with aging hospitals, clinics, and other facilities that do not meet current standards for medical care. Adding to this problem is the fact that several installations are adding thousands of personnel and dependents due to Base Realignment and Closure, the relocation of units from Europe and Korea to the United States, and the Growing the Force initiative that will add 92,000 active duty personnel to the Army and Marine Corps. The amended bill therefore recommends $622,000,000 for additional medical treatment facility construction. These funds will provide for the Army’s top two priority hospital replacement projects in the United States as well as a top priority hospital addition/alteration for the Marine Corps. These funds also provide for the planning and design of a new hospital on Guam, the Navy’s top priority hospital replacement project.

The Department of Defense is also directed to develop a comprehensive master plan for medical treatment facilities construction, to include both recapitalization and new requirements. This plan shall include a comprehensive priority list of projects for all services, provide a cost estimate for each project, supply data on the current state of facilities and the projected change in demand for services due to growth for each location on the list, indicate the extent to which identified construction requirements are programmed in the FYDP, and indicate the resources required for associated planning and design work. This report shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations no later than December 31, 2008.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The amended bill recommends $11,766,000 for Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps. The funds are provided as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Amended Bill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA: Camp Pendleton</td>
<td>Public-Private Venture, Phase 6B</td>
<td>10,692</td>
<td>10,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: Twentynine Palms</td>
<td>Public-Private Venture, Phase 2A</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>1,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                       | 11,766                      | 11,766  |
The amended bill recommends $1,354,634,000 for Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 instead of $1,202,986,000 as requested by the Administration. The amount provided fully funds the Administration’s request to expedite medical facility construction at Bethesda and Fort Belvoir, and in addition provides $938,724,000 to fully fund the fiscal year 2008 budget for BRAC 2005.

Department of Veterans Affairs

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

The amended bill recommends $100,000,000,000 for General Operating Expenses to implement the provisions of title III of this Act.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS

The amended bill recommends $20,000,000,000 for Information Technology Systems to implement the provisions of title III of this Act, including support for any personnel increases within the Veterans Benefits Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CHAPTER 4—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND FOREIGN OPERATIONS

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

The budget request totals $5,073,608,000 in emergency supplemental funds for fiscal year 2008, and the State, Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-110) recommended $1,475,800,000 for immediate requirements. The amended bill provides for Department of State and Foreign Operations a total of $5,073,608,000, the same as the pending budget request.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS

The budget request included $2,283,000,000 for Diplomatic and Consular Programs, of which $757,000,000 was appropriated in the State, Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-110) for operations and security at the United States Embassy in Iraq. The amended bill includes $1,606,800,000 for Diplomatic and Consular Programs, which is $101,200,000 below the pending request. Within this amount provided, $210,000,000 is for worldwide security protection. Funds for diplomatic and consular programs are to be allocated as follows:

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Pending request</th>
<th>Amended bill</th>
<th>Change from request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq Diplomatic Operations</td>
<td>1,545,648</td>
<td>1,295,000</td>
<td>-250,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan—Diplomatic Operations and World Wide Security Program</td>
<td>162,400</td>
<td>205,200</td>
<td>42,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan—Diplomatic Operations and World Wide Security Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Peacekeeping and Stability Operations</td>
<td>4,108</td>
<td>48,128</td>
<td>43,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Workforce Initiative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Diplomatic and Consular Programs</td>
<td>1,708,008</td>
<td>1,606,800</td>
<td>-101,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Afghanistan.—Within the total, the amended bill includes $205,200,000 to support projects in Afghanistan, $42,800,000 above the request, and is for necessary expenses for diplomatic and security operations in Afghanistan. Of this amount, $162,400,000 is for enhanced security operations, including additional high threat protection teams, increased overhead cover and diplomatic activity in high threat areas, delay in procurement of armored vehicles, and local guard service. In addition, $24,000,000 is for the establishment of a Department of State-managed air transport capability for Department of State and United States Agency for International Development (USAID) personnel to manage country programs, provide support for mission and other security-related activities. Finally, $16,800,000 is for support of operations and personnel for Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) in Afghanistan, Pakistan.—The amended bill includes $7,500,000 for operations, security, and personnel engaged in diplomatic activities aimed at promoting economic development and political change in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) along the Pakistan and Afghanistan border.

Iraq.—Within the total, $1,295,000,000 is for the diplomatic and security operations of the United States Mission in Iraq, which is $250,600 below the pending request. The cost of operations of the United States Embassy in Iraq totals $2,286,000,000 for fiscal year 2008 including $1,295,000,000 provided in this Act, $375,600,000 included in the pending supplemental, and $615,400,000 in funds carried over from prior year appropriations. Of that amount, nearly $900,000,000 is for support of diplomatic and diplomatic and development personnel in Iraq. The amended bill includes funding for mission operations, security, logistics support, information technology and operations support for PRTs. Congress has provided an additional $196,543,000 since fiscal year 2006 for additional facilities requirements identified by the Department. The bill also extends the perimeter wall; construct a dining facility; construct additional housing; construct a tactical operations center for Diplomatic Security; construct a static guard camp; and construct overhead cover. The actual cost of building the New Embassy Compound (NEC) has reached a total of $788,543,000 to date. The number of permanent and temporary personnel assigned to Iraq, with the exception of USAID, should be decreased to accommodate all necessary requirements. Any improvements can be made with previously appropriated funds. USAID will play a critical role in assisting the Government of Iraq in effectively allocating its budgetary resources.

The additional $45,304,000 requested for follow-on projects for the NEC in Baghdad is not included. At least $77,027,000 in prior year funding programmed for follow-on projects is available for obligation and these funds should be used to provide secure housing for a smaller number of personnel. None of the funds provided under this heading in this Act shall be made available for follow-on projects, other than the provision in title III. However, the Department should include a detailed plan for the use of funds for follow-on projects as part of the spending plan required by this Act. In addition, the Department is encouraged to accelerate the process and the addition of follow-on projects, occupancy of the NEC offices, and construction of facilities. The Department is encouraged to aggressively review security procedures and seek the necessary authority to ensure that increased security is achieved.

Sudan.—The amended bill includes resources to support the diplomatic mission in Sudan including the United States Special Envoy for Sudan.

Local Guard Forces—Worldwide Security Protection.—The amended bill includes $48,108,000 above the request for global worldwide security protection. The amount provided is available to restore 10 positions in the global diplomatic security guard force that were redirected to Iraq to address urgent requirements elsewhere in the world.

Civilian Workforce Initiative.—The amended bill includes $50,000,000 to increase the civilian diplomatic capacity of the United States diplomatic corps and promote broader engagement with the rest of the world, including expanding training and enhancement of interagency cooperation.

The amended bill includes funds to replace Foreign Service positions worldwide which were previously moved to Iraq, and to increase the number of positions participating in critical needs foreign language training. The Department of State has transferred approximately 300 Foreign Service positions from embassies around the world to Iraq and to associated language training, leaving key posts understaffed. These funds are to be used to support United States foreign policy in priority, understaffed regions, particularly South and East Asia, the Western Hemisphere, and Africa.

The funding request for the civilian stabilization initiative are for the Active and Standby Response Corps portion of the initiative and to enhance operations of the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization. In addition to funds provided to the Department of State, the amount includes $205,600,000, in addition to the pending supplement, to implement the “Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development” to implement the USAID portion of the stabilization initiative. The funding request for the Civilian Response Corps will be considered as part of the fiscal year 2009 appropriations process and none of the funds provided in the amendment are to be used to implement the civilian response corps portion of the initiative.
Middle East Peace Process.—The diplomatic operations that accompany the Middle East peace process are supported in fiscal year 2008. The Department of State should consult with the Committees on Appropriations on the use of funds for this purpose.

Directorate of Defense Trade Controls.—Increased demands on the Directorate of Defense Trade Controls’ Office of Defense Trade Controls resulted in a need to delay the processing of applications. The Secretary of State is directed to review the workload demands and staffing needs of the office and report any recommended changes to the Committees on Appropriations not later than 45 days after enactment of this Act.

Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative.—The amended bill includes $9,000,000 to expand public outreach efforts related to the implementation of the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative (WHITI). With WHITI implementation occurring as early as June 2008, there is concern about the lack of a comprehensive, coordinated plan between the Department of State, the Department of Homeland Security, and the United States Postal Service to broadly disseminate information to the traveling public concerning the final WHITI implementation requirements at the nation’s ports of entry. The Department of State is encouraged to provide significantly increased outreach to border communities, including through radio, print media, and social marketing efforts.

Buying Power Maintenance Account.—The amended bill includes authority to transfer funds available in this Act, and in a prior Act, to the Buying Power Maintenance Account. As section 24 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act, to manage exchange rate losses in fiscal year 2008.

Office of Inspector General (Including Transfer of Funds) —The amended bill includes an additional $7,500,000 for Office of Inspector General at the Department of State, which is $7,500,000 above the pending request. Of the total, $5,000,000 is to enhance the Department of State Inspector General’s oversight of programs in Afghanistan, and $2,500,000 is for operations of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (SIGIR).

The Inspectors General of USAID, the Department of Defense, the Department of the Treasury, the Government Accountability Office, SIGIR, and the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, to the maximum extent practicable, should coordinate and de-conflict all activities related to oversight of security, stability, and reconstruction programs in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Director of Office of Inspector General should be designated as the lead for any investigations or audits of worldwide programs as they relate to the specific programs in Iraq or Afghanistan.

Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance —The amended bill includes $76,700,000 for urgent embassy security, construction, and maintenance costs, which is $83,300,000 below the request. The funds are to construct 300 secure apartments and a secure office building, including the necessary perimeter security, utility, and dining facilities, for United States Embassy in Baghdad. Currently, there are a small number of permanent construction apartments and the majority of diplomatic and Mission personnel live in limited hotels. Additional funds for this purpose are provided in subchapter B.

International Organizations Contributions to International Organizations —The amended bill includes $53,000,000 for Contributions to International Organizations, which includes contributions to the UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan and the UN Assistance Mission in Iraq, as requested.

The Department of State is directed, not later than 45 days after enactment of this Act, to provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations detailing total United States contributions, any arrears from prior years and potential arrears for fiscal years 2008 and 2009 for each of the organizations funded under this heading.

Office of the Inspector General—International Peacekeeping Activities —The budget request included $725,600,000 for Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities, of which $390,000,000, are to be provided for the United Nations Organization Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA) and $1,747,000,000 for the President’s International Disaster Assistance and Food for Peace programs.

International Organizations —The amended bill includes $1,747,000,000 for International Disaster Assistance, which is $200,000,000 above the pending request. These funds should be used to respond to urgent humanitarian requirements worldwide, including in countries severely affected by the international food crisis.

The amended bill also includes funds under this heading and in subchapter “Development Cooperation” in subchapter B to help address the international food crisis. Programs should address both rural and urban food requirements. Funds are also available to augment humanitarian assistance to those affected by Cyclone Nargis in Burma, and the recent earthquake in China.


Bilateral Economic Assistance Funds Appropriated to the President International Disaster Assistance —The budget request included $80,000,000 for International Dis astrer Assistance. The amended bill includes $200,000,000 for International Disaster Assistance, which is $200,000,000 above the pending request. These funds should be used to respond to urgent humanitarian requirements worldwide, including in countries severely affected by the international food crisis.

The amended bill also includes funds under this heading and in subchapter “Development Cooperation” in subchapter B to help address the international food crisis. Programs should address both rural and urban food requirements. Funds are also available to augment humanitarian assistance to those affected by Cyclone Nargis in Burma, and the recent earthquake in China.

Economic Support Fund —The budget request included $61,800,000 for Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development, of which $30,800,000 was provided in the State, Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–161) for operations in Iraq.

The amended bill includes $42,400,000 for Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development. Of the funds provided under this heading, the amended bill includes $41,900,000 to continue support for individuals in Iraq and Afghanistan, which is the same as the request. In addition, $31,500,000 is included to increase support for staffing, security, and operating needs in Afghanistan and Sudan, and $19,500,000 in Pakistan.

The amended bill also includes $20,000,000 to support the development of the Active and Standby Response Corps portion of the Civilian Stabilization Initiative and none of the funds provided in this Act may be used to develop the Civilian Stabilization Corps. Additional funding for this initiative is provided in the “Diplomatic and Consular Programs” account for the Department of State portion of the appropriations for fiscal year 2008.

In addition, the amended bill includes $30,000,000 to enable USAID to hire above-
### IRAQ PROGRAMS—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Pending FY 2008 request</th>
<th>Amended bill</th>
<th>Change from request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Action Program (CAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Stabilization Program (CAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Electricity Operations and Maintenance of Key U.S. Forces Infrastructure</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi National Enterprise Fund</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-124,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Economic Growth (spending included in the CSP)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Microfinance</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Capacity Development</td>
<td>178,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-178,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla Ruzicka Iraqi War Victims Fund</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>797,000</td>
<td>440,000</td>
<td>1,057,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Action Program (CAP)—The amended bill includes $75,000,000 for continued support for the Community Action Program.

### Community Stabilization Program (CSP)—Within the amount provided for Iraq, $100,000,000 is for the CSP, which is $35,000,000 below the request. Recent findings of a March 2008 DoD Inspector General audit (E-267-08-001-P) of possible fraud and misuse of some of the funds under this program are of concern. The amended bill will withhold 50 percent of funding until the Secretary of State certifies and reports that USAID is implementing recommendations contained in the audit to ensure proper use of funds.

### Enterprise Fund—The amended bill includes $200,000,000 for operations and maintenance of Key U.S. Forces Infrastructure.

### Operations and Maintenance of Key U.S. Forces Infrastructure—The amended bill includes $10,000,000 for Operations and Maintenance of key United States government-funded infrastructure, which is $224,000 below the request. These functions should be funded by the Government of Iraq and this Act includes sufficient funding to allow the United States to provide technical assistance and training. In addition, the amended bill conditions the funds on the signing and implementation of an asset transfer agreement between the United States and Iraq.

### Marla Ruzicka Iraqi War Victims Fund—The amended bill includes $5,000,000 for the Marla Ruzicka Iraqi War Victims Fund for continued assistance for Iraqi civilians who suffer losses as a result of the military operations.

### Provincial Economic Growth—The amended bill includes $40,000,000 for provincial economic growth activities, of which $10,000,000 should be available for programs to assist vulnerable Iraqi minority groups, including Christians. The Secretary of State should designate staff at United States Embassy Baghdad to oversee and coordinate such assistance.

### National Capacity Development (NCD)—Within the amount provided in ESF for Iraq, $70,000,000 is provided for NCD, which is $178,000,000 below the request.

### Afghanistan Programs

#### Roads—The amended bill includes $220,000,000 for roads, which is $20,000,000 below the request. An additional $300,000,000 for road construction in Afghanistan has been requested through the Department of Defense and the Commanders Emergency Response Program.

#### Power—The amended bill includes $150,000,000 for power, which is $25,000,000 below the request. The funding supports successful efforts by challenger power plants to fund infrastructure for gas and diesel power projects and there is a concern that diesel generators are costly to maintain and will exacerbate Kabul’s already heavily polluted air. The completion of the north-south transmission line to enable Afghanistan to purchase electricity from its northern neighbors for distribution to the rest of the country is supported. Funding for the Northern Electrical Power System or the Sheberghan Gas-Flared Plant is not included.

The World Bank should play a larger role in financing such infrastructure projects. It is noted that Afghanistan has considerable potential for small hydro and solar power development to service Afghanistan’s many remote communities that have no other access to electricity, and directs that not less than $120,000,000 be used for renewable energy projects in rural areas.

#### Rural Development and Alternative Livelihoods—The amended bill includes $65,000,000 for rural development and alternative livelihood programs and an additional $60,000,000 for counternarcotics under the “International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement” account to expand and scale up counternarcotics programs in Afghanistan. The Administration did not request funding for counternarcotics. The Secretary of State is directed to coordinate assistance on Appropriations on the use of these funds.

#### Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs)/Provincial Administration Fund—The amended bill provides $50,000,000 for PRTs in Afghanistan. The Administration did not request funds for this purpose.

#### Governance and Capacity Building—The amended bill provides $200,000,000 for governance and capacity building programs, which is $45,000,000 below the request, to fund rule of law, human rights, local and national capacity building, and good governance in targeted, low-income areas.

#### Civilian Assistance—The amended bill includes $10,000,000 for USAID’s Afghan Civilian Assistance Program to continue assistance for civilians who have suffered losses as a result of the military operations, and $2,000,000 for the NATO ISAF Post-Operational Humanitarian Reconstruction Fund for Pakistan. The amended bill does not include $60,000,000 requested for Pakistan. These needs are addressed in funding appropriated in the fiscal year 2008 supplemental.

The government of Jordan remains a key ally and has played a leading role in supporting peace initiatives in the Middle East. The Appropriations Committee believes that resources should be made available for the Government of Jordan and refugee relief organizations and should be used to meet the needs of Iraqi refugees.

#### West Bank—The amended bill includes more than $100,000,000 for economic assistance for the West Bank, which is $36,000,000 below the request. The Administration has an unobligated balance of $120,000,000 for economic assistance for the West Bank from funds appropriated in prior acts. The additional $120,000,000 will provide sufficient resources to continue programs for an additional year at the current rate of expenditure. The Department of State is directed to coordinate with the Committees on Appropriations not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act on how United States economic assistance for the West Bank will support the effort of the Palestinian Reform and Development Plan as well as a description of other donor support of this plan. The report should describe how assistance from the United States and other donors will improve conditions in the West Bank, including through job creation and housing programs.
vulnerable to drug trafficking and related violent crime. These funds should support programs that emphasize community initiatives and public-private partnerships. United States efforts should be matched with contributions from public and private sources to the maximum extent practicable. USAID is directed to consult with the Committees on Appropriations prior to the obligation of these funds.

North Korea.—The amended bill includes up to $35,000,000 for assistance for North Korea in support of its goals of the Six-Party talks, which is the same as the request. This is in addition to the $3,000,000 appropriated in division J of Public Law 116-116. The recommendation provides a provision authorizing the Secretary of State to publish a report to the Committees on Appropriations prior to the obligation of the assistance for North Korea on the Secretary of State reporting to the Committees on Appropriations that North Korea is continuing to fulfill its commitments under the Six-Party Talks agreements.

Bangladesh.—The amended bill includes $13,000,000 for assistance for Bangladesh for cyclone recovery and reconstruction assistance. The amendment authorizes assistance for Bangladesh for cyclone recovery and reconstruction assistance.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Democracy Fund

The amended bill includes $75,000,000 for Democracy Fund programs, requested under the heading “Economic Support Fund”, for democracy activities in Iraq. These funds are intended to be made available through non-governmental organizations, including the National Endowment for Democracy and the United States Institute for Peace.

International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement

The amended bill includes $419,300,000 for International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement activities in Afghanistan, Iraq, Mexico, Central America, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and the West Bank, which is $314,700,000 below the request.

Iraq.—The amended bill provides $85,000,000 for Iraq for justice and rule of law programs, which is $71,000,000 below the request. Funding for prison construction is not included.

Afghanistan.—The amended bill includes $65,000,000, which is $65,000,000 above the request, to expand programs to strengthen counternarcotics efforts, to improve the training of the Afghan police, including border police, to advance the development of a national counternarcotics strategy and professionalism of the justice sector, and to help facilitate cooperation between the police and the judiciary at both the national and regional level.

The Department of State is directed to report to the Committees on Appropriations not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act on the level and trends in Illicit Trafficking in Afghanistan at the national and regional level and should detail, nationally and by province, the steps that the Government of Afghanistan is taking to arrest and prosecute leaders of Afghan drug cartels; disarm and disband private militias; and end corruption among national and provincial police forces.

Central America.—The amended bill includes $29,300,000 for assistance for Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama. An additional $5,000,000 for Haiti and the Dominican Republic under the Merida Initiative. Although funding was requested only through the INCLE account, funding for the Merida Initiative is provided in the accounts from which such activities are traditionally funded. The amended bill provides funding for special investigations and equipment to strengthen the law enforcement and criminal justice institutions for the purpose of combating drug trafficking and related violent crime and increasing the capacity and professionalism of Central American police forces. The impunity within and between these countries is of concern, and their justice systems are corrupt and ineffective. There is a concern that United States assistance to these countries will not be spent in a transparent manner. The Secretary of State is directed to submit a report, prior to the obligation of funds, on mechanisms in place to ensure adequate monitoring and oversight.

The Secretary of State is directed to submit a report not more than 90 days after enactment of this Act to the Committees on Appropriations detailing progress in conducting a thorough, credible, and transparent investigation and prosecution by the Mexican Attorney General. Additionally, the state Department is directed to report to the Committees on Appropriations prior to the obligation of assistance that mechanisms are in place in order to ensure proper vetting of recipients of United States assistance.

A second report is required, no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act on the level and trends in Illicit Trafficking in Afghanistan at the national and regional level and should detail, nationally and by province, the steps that the Government of Afghanistan is taking to arrest and prosecute leaders of Afghan drug cartels; disarm and disband private militias; and end corruption among national and provincial police forces.

The budget request included $230,000,000 for Migration and Refugee Assistance, of which $220,000,000 was provided for Migration Assistance Program and $10,000,000 for Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-161) for emergency refugee requirements in Iraq and the West Bank.

The amended bill includes $380,000,000 for Migration and Refugee Assistance, which is $270,000,000 above the pending request. Funds should be made available to meet unmet global refugee needs, including to assist Iraqi refugees in Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, and the surrounding region, as well as internally displaced persons in Iraq. Funds may be used to offer administrative costs associated with the expanded requirements of the refugee program, in consultation with the Committees on Appropriations.

The humanitarian crisis involving Iraqi refugees and internally displaced persons is one of the greatest humanitarian crises today. USAID has dedicated insufficient resources to assist this most vulnerable segment of the Iraqi population. The Department of State is directed to urge the Government of Iraq to provide a substantial increase in funding for humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi refugee population residing in the region and within the country. In addition, the Secretary of State should ensure that the Senior Coordinator for Iraqi Refugee Issues gives particular attention to the needs of vulnerable minority groups, including ethnic and religious minorities.

The welfare and security of the 7,900 Lao Hmong refugees in the Petchaboon, northern Thailand is of concern and the Government of Thailand is urged to support a transparent screening process to identify those who have a legitimate fear of return to Laos. Any attempt to force the return of Hmong refugees to Laos is strongly opposed.

United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund

The amended bill includes $25,000,000 for the United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund to prevent deploration of this emergency fund.

Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs

The amended bill includes $11,200,000 for Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs, which is $6,200,000 above the request.

Of these funds, $5,000,000 is for presidential protective service in Afghanistan, which is the same as the request.

Central America.—The amended bill also includes $6,200,000 for the Merida Initiative for the countries of Central America, which is $6,200,000 above the request. Although funding for the Merida Initiative is provided in the accounts from which such activities are traditionally funded, the amended bill provides funding for special investigations and equipment to strengthen the law enforcement and criminal justice institutions for the purpose of combating drug trafficking and related violent crime and increasing the capacity and professionalism of Central American police forces. The impunity within and between these countries is of concern, and their justice systems are corrupt and ineffective. There is a concern that United States assistance to these countries will not be spent in a transparent manner. The Department of State is directed to work with relevant Federal government agencies to ensure that assistance to the countries of Central America is used to bring them to justice. The Department of State should work with relevant Federal government agencies to ensure that assistance to the countries of Central America is used to bring them to justice. The Department of State should work with relevant Federal government agencies to ensure that assistance to the countries of Central America is used to bring them to justice.
which such activities are traditionally funded.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE
Funds Appropriated to the President
Foreign Military Financing Program
The amended bill includes $72,500,000 for Foreign Military Financing Program, which is $2,500,000 above the request.

Central America.—The amended bill includes $6,000,000 to augment the ongoing naval cooperation program and maritime security assistance of Operation Enduring Friendship. Funds are provided to strengthen the ability of the countries of Central America to secure their maritime domains, and complement existing regional systems and programs to improve maritime security and interdiction capabilities.

Military Assistance Program.—The amended bill includes $66,500,000 in support of a gradual strengthening of military-to-military cooperation between the United States and Mexico.

SUBCHAPTER B—Bridge Fund Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2009
The budget request totals $3,605,000,000 in emergency supplemental funds for fiscal year 2009. The amended bill provides a total of $3,600,000,000 for the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and related programs for fiscal year 2009 emergency supplemental requirements, which is $5,000,000 below the request.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Administration of Foreign Affairs
Diplomatic and Consular Programs
The amended bill includes $737,900,000 for Diplomatic and Consular Programs. Within this amount, $30,000,000 is available for worldwide security protection and not more than $381,500,000 is available as a bridge fund for Iraq operations.

To meet increased security and personnel requirements, the amended bill includes $91,400,000 for Afghanistan, $7,000,000 for Pakistan, $3,000,000 for Somalia, and $15,000,000 for Sudan. In addition, the amended bill includes $40,000,000 to continue the support of new positions to develop language and other critical skills of the diplomatic corps and for civilian post-conflict stabilization initiatives.

Office of Inspector General
(including transfer of funds)
The amended bill includes $57,000,000 for the Office of the Inspector General at the Department of State, of which $5,500,000 is for the USCG, and $5,000,000 for the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, for the Office of the Inspector General.

Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (SIGIR).—The amended bill includes $46,500,000 for the SIGIR for continued oversight of United States reconstruction programs in Iraq, as authorized by section 3001 of Public Law 108-182.

Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR).—The amended bill includes $5,000,000 for the SIGAR, for which no funds were requested, and which is authorized by section 1229 of Public Law 110-181. Such funds shall be used for oversight of United States reconstruction programs in Afghanistan. The funds shall be used to duplicate investigations that have been conducted or to support offices or systems of inspectors general at the Department of State, USCG, or other entities.

EMBASSY SECURITY, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE
The amended bill includes $41,300,000 for urgent embassy security, construction and maintenance costs. Funds should be used to construct safe and secure office space for the increasing number of diplomatic and development personnel living and working in Kabul, Afghanistan.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
Contributions to International Organizations
The amended bill includes $75,000,000 for Contributions to International Organizations.

Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities
The amended bill includes $150,500,000 for Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities to fund the Administration’s request for FY2009 to increase the United States’ assessed contribution to international peacekeeping.

RELATED AGENCIES
Broadcasting Board of Governors
International Broadcasting Operations
The amended bill includes $8,000,000 for International Broadcasting Operations.

Bilateral Economic Assistance
Funds Appropriated to the President
United States Agency for International Development
Global Health and Child Survival
The amended bill includes $75,000,000 for International Peacekeeping Activities to fund the Administration’s request for FY2009 to increase the United States’ assessed contribution to international peacekeeping.

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
Food Security Initiative.—The amended bill includes $200,000,000 for Development Assistance, which is for a new Food Security Initiative to support food security in countries affected by significant food shortages, including programs to assist farmers to increase crop yields. Of this amount, up to $50,000,000 should be used for local and regional purchase. The Secretary of State is directed to submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, and prior to the initial obligation of funds, on the proposed uses of funds to alleviate starvation, hunger, and malnutrition overseas, including a list of countries facing significant food shortages.

International Disaster Assistance
The amended bill includes $200,000,000 for International Disaster Assistance to meet urgent humanitarian requirements worldwide, including support for critical needs in Bangladesh. A portion of these funds should be used for assistance for internally displaced persons in Iraq and Afghanistan. In addition, funds are available under this heading to assist in the response to the international food crisis.

Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development
The amended bill includes $93,000,000 for Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development to address staffing, security, and operating needs.

Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General
The amended bill includes $1,500,000 for Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General.

Other Bilateral Economic Assistance
Economic Support Fund
The amended bill includes $1,417,300,000 for Economic Support Fund. The amended bill also includes $2,000,000 for economic, and security needs. These funds are to be allocated as follows:

*** ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND (in thousands) ***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country and region</th>
<th>Amended bill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bank</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,147,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funds made available for Burma should be used for humanitarian programs along the Thai-Burma border.

Department of State
International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement
The amended bill includes $204,500,000 for International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement activities in Iraq, Afghanistan, the West Bank, Mexico, and Africa.

Migration and Refugee Assistance
The amended bill includes $350,000,000 for Migration and Refugee Assistance. Funds are available to respond to urgent humanitarian and refugee admittance requirements, including those involving refugees from Iraq, Afghanistan, and central Africa.

Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs
The amended bill includes $4,500,000 for Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs, for humanitarian demining in Iraq.

Military Assistance
Funds Appropriated to the President
Foreign Military Financing Program
The amended bill includes $170,000,000 for the Foreign Military Financing Program, of which $100,000,000 is for assistance for Jordan and up to $50,000,000 is for assistance for Mexico.

Peacekeeping Operations
The amended bill includes $85,000,000 for Peacekeeping Operations for programs in Africa to address needs beyond those projected in the fiscal year 2009 budget request, including for Darfur.

SUBCHAPTER C—General Provisions
This Chapter
The amended bill includes the following general provisions for this chapter:

Extension of Authorities
Section 1401 extends certain authorities necessary to expand Department of State and foreign assistance funds.

Afghanistan
Section 1402 imposes certain conditions and limitations on assistance for Afghanistan and requires a report.

West Bank
Section 1403 directs the Department of State to provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, and 180 days thereafter, on the Palestinian security assistance program.

Mexico
Section 1404 sets a ceiling on funding for Mexico at $400,000,000 and provides funding in the accounts through which such activities are traditionally funded. The provision also provides a restriction on the use of funding for budget support or cash payments and includes a limitation of 25 percent of the funding provided under the headings “Foreign Aid—Economic, Military, and Other Assistance” and “Other Assistance” and specified Mexican programs.
Military Financing Program" and "International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement" to the armed forces and police until the Secretary of State certifies certain conditions have been met.

**CENTRAL AMERICA**

Section 1405 sets a floor of $61,500,000 on funding for the countries of Central America, Haiti and the Dominican Republic and provides a restriction on the use of funding for budgetary support payments. Additionally, the provision restricts obligation of 25 percent of the funding provided under the headings "Foreign Military Financing Program," "International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement" until certain conditions are met.

**BUYING POWER MAINTENANCE ACCOUNT**

Section 1406 provides authority to utilize $26,000,000 from appropriations for Diplomatic and Consular Programs from a prior Act and authority to transfer up to an additional $74,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act to the Buying Power Maintenance Account to manage exchange rate losses. The Department of State shall consult on any proposed transfers resulting from this authority. The Department of State estimates the impact of currency fluctuations to be at least $260,000,000 on United States diplomatic operations worldwide.

In addition, the provision recommends authority to transfer unbudgeted and expired balances after fiscal year 2008 into the Buying Power Maintenance Account to address future exchange rate losses.

**RESCISIONS**

Section 1407 rescinds prior year funds and makes them available for a contribution to the World Food Program and for programs in the INCLE account.

**ALLOCATIONS**

Section 1408 requires that funds in the specified accounts be allocated as indicated in the respective tables in this report. Any change to these allocations shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

**REPROGRAMMING AUTHORITY**

Section 1409 allows for reprogramming of funds made available in prior years to address critical food shortages, subject to prior consultation with the Committee on Appropriations. The regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations shall apply to funds appropriated by this chapter.

**TERMS AND CONDITIONS**

Section 1411 establishes that unless designated otherwise in this chapter, the terms and conditions contained within the State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-161) shall apply to funds appropriated by this chapter.

**TITLE II—DOMESTIC MATTERS**

**CHAPTER 1—COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND SCIENCE**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**BUREAU OF THE CENSUS**

**PERIODIC CENSUSES AND PROGRAMS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

The amended bill includes $210,000,000 for increased costs with the poor management of the 2010 Decennial Census. Within the funds provided, not less than $50,300,000 shall be used to restore funding associated with the approved FY 2008 reprogramming within the Bureau of Census. Funds transferred pursuant to the reprogramming to address immediate shortfalls within the 2010 Decennial Census Information Collection Authority from the American Community Survey, Census Coverage Measurement activities, and other Census activities may result in increased risk and other unintended consequences to other parts of the Census. The $50,300,000 shall be available solely to complete previously planned activities and address vacancies in the aforementioned areas in order to reduce risk and ensure a successful 2010 Decennial Census.

The Census Bureau shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, within 30 days of enactment of this Act, a detailed plan showing a timeline of milestones and expenditures for the Decennial Census, and shall include a quantitative assessment of the associated risk to the program as it is currently constituted. In addition, the Inspector General shall quarterly report to the Committees on Appropriations, until the conclusion of the 2010 Decennial Census, detailing the progress of the revised plan for completion of the 2010 Decennial Census and any unanticipated slippages from the revised 2010 milestones, as well as reassessing the associated risk to the program. The Census Bureau is directed to provide the Inspector General with any required information so that the quarterly reports can begin 60 days after submission of the plan. Because rising costs associated with the 2010 Decennial Census and the Department's and the Bureau's lack of contract oversight are causing increased costs, this bill includes not less than $5,000,000 for the Department's Office of the Inspector General for Census contract oversight activities and not less than $1,500,000 for a reimbursable agreement with the Defense Contract Management Agency to review and improve Census contract management.

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM**

**SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

The amended bill includes $178,000,000 for additional costs of the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) related to the custody and care of inmates and the maintenance and operation of correctional and detention facilities. The BOP has been chronically underfunded in recent budget requests, due to consistently underestimated growth in inmate populations and inadequate funding for medical expenses. As a result, BOP facilities face rising staff-to-inmate ratios, placing corrections officers and inmates at unacceptable risk of violence. The provision includes $385,000,000 for FCI Pollock activation costs and for inmate emergencies in order to provide continuity in appropriation to ensure the protection for the Lake Ponchartrain and Vicinity project. None of the funds provided shall be available until October 1, 2008.

**CONSTRUCTION**

The amended bill includes $2,835,000,000 for Construction. Within the recommended funds, $1,977,000,000 is provided to complete the 100-year storm protection for the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity project; $920,000,000 is provided to complete the 100-year storm protection for the West Bank and Vicinity project; and $388,000,000 is provided for elements of the Southeast Louisiana Urban Drainage project that are within the geographic perimeter of the West Bank and Vicinity projects and the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity project.

**FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES**

The amended bill includes $2,926,000,000 for completion of repair and restoration and accelerated work to authorized levels of protection in surrounding areas. The funding provides, at full Federal expense, the following amounts: $704,000,000 for pumps and closures at outfall canals; $90,000,000 to storm-proof pump stations; $459,000,000 to armor levees and floodwalls; and $55,000,000 to improve protection at the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal; $456,000,000 to complete work to incorporate non-Federal levees in Plaquemines Parish into the Federal system; $412,000,000 to reinforce or replace floodwalls on the Lake Ponchartrain and Vicinity and West Bank and Vicinity Projects; $393,000,000 to repair and restore authorized protections and floodwalls; and $359,000,000 to complete the authorized pump station program in the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity and West Bank and Vicinity Projects. The amended bill includes a provision authorizing a reallocation of funds when necessary to accomplish the authorized goals, subject to the approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.
The amended bill provides $110,000,000 for Unemployment Compensation State Operations to compensate the States for the administrative costs of processing the Unemployment Insurance (UI) claims workload for the balance of fiscal year 2008. New UI claims are increasing, reaching a level in March 2008 nearly 19 percent greater than the previous year. States are beginning to experience service degradation in the form of call center delays for claimants, waiting times for adjudication of disputed claims, and reductions in program integrity activities, tax collection, and tax audits. While funding in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 is sufficient to cover the costs of processing 2.4 million Average Weekly Insured Unemployment (AWIU) claims, they have already climbed above 2.8 million AWIU. The amount provided will compensate States for the claims workload managed by the Department of Labor up to the point where additional funds are released under a legislated trigger.

The amended bill provides the customary death gratuity to Annette Lantos, widow of Tom Lantos, late a Representative from the State of California.

Title III—Veterans Educational Assistance

Title III of the amended bill includes provisions designed to expand the educational benefits for men and women who have served in the armed forces since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. The provisions will closely resemble the educational benefits provided to veterans returning from World War II.

The benefits included in title III would apply to all members of the military who have served in the armed forces since the terrorist attacks. The amended bill provides for benefits to be paid in amounts linked to the amount of active duty service.

In addition to tuition and other established charges, the benefits include a monthly stipend for housing costs as well as tutorial assistance and licensure and certification tests.

The amended bill would provide a new program in which the government will agree to match, dollar for dollar, any voluntary additional contributions to veterans from institutions whose tuition is more expensive than the maximum educational assistance provided in the amended bill.

Finally, the amended bill provides for the veterans to have up to fifteen years after they leave active duty to use their educational assistance entitlement. Veterans would be barred from receiving concurrent assistance from this program and another similar program.

Title IV—Emergency Unemployment Compensation

The amended bill includes language providing a temporary extension of unemployment benefits to workers who have lost their jobs. The amended bill provides up to 13 weeks of extended unemployment benefits in every State to workers exhausting regular unemployment compensation. In States with higher levels of unemployment, defined as a seasonally-adjusted six percent total unemployment rate or a four percent insured unemployment rate, up to an additional 13 weeks would be available. The extended benefits program will terminate on March 31, 2009.

The percentage of workers exhausting unemployment benefits is currently 36 percent, which is higher than at the beginning of any of the past five recessions. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that 3.8 million workers will receive extended benefits under the program given the high rate of workers running out of regular unemployment benefits without finding work. Not only will these workers and their families benefit from extended benefits, providing this financial assistance also can reduce the severity and duration of an economic downturn. Experts agree that extending unemployment benefits is one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting forms of economic stimulus because workers who have lost their paychecks have little choice but to spend these benefits quickly.

Title V—Medicaid Provisions

Section 5001 of the amended bill includes language extending the current moratorium to April 2009 on four Medicaid regulations pertaining to: graduate medical education payments; limits on payments to government safety net providers; rehabilitation services; and school-based administrative and specialized medical transportation services for children. The amended bill also establishes a moratorium for the same period for three Medicaid regulations pertaining to: health care provider taxes; targeted case management; and hospital outpatient services. The cost of the moratoria is fully offset by provisions that extend an asset protection period, and provide for three Medicaid regulations pertaining to: graduate medical education programs; targeted case management; and hospital outpatient services. The surtax would start in 2009 and continue beyond $1 million, and 80 percent or more of their revenue from federal payments to disclose the salaries of their most highly-compensated officers.

Title VII—GI Bill Financing Provision

This title imposes a surtax of 0.47% on income beyond $1 million for those filing joint returns and beyond $500,000 for other filers. The surtax would start in 2009 and continue thereafter.

Title VIII—General Provisions

The amended bill includes the following general provisions:

Section 8001 establishes the period of availability for obligations for appropriations provided in this Act.

Section 8002 provides that, unless otherwise noted, all appropriations in this Act are designated as emergency requirements and necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21, the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 2008.

Section 8003 provides that this Act may be referred to as the “Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008.”
AMENDMENT TO THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TITLE I**

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND OTHER SECURITY-RELATED MATTERS

**CHAPTER 1**

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Foreign Agricultural Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Law 480 Title II Grants, FY 2008 (emergency)</th>
<th>350,000</th>
<th>850,000</th>
<th>+500,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Law 480 Title II Grants, FY 2009 (emergency)</td>
<td>395,000</td>
<td>395,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Chapter 1</td>
<td>745,000</td>
<td>1,245,000</td>
<td>+500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHAPTER 2**

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of Inspector General (emergency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Legal Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Attorneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Marshals Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses (emergency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Legal activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal Bureau of Investigation

| Salaries and expenses, FY 2008 (emergency) | 101,122 | 92,169 | -8,953 |
| Salaries and expenses, FY 2009 (emergency) | 39,062 | 92,169 | +53,107 |
| Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation | 140,184 | 174,769 | +34,585 |

Drug Enforcement Administration

| Salaries and expenses (emergency) | 8,468 | 12,166 | +3,698 |

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives

| Salaries and expenses (emergency) | 4,000 | 4,000 | --- |

Federal Prison System

| Salaries and expenses (emergency) | 9,100 | 9,100 | --- |
| Total, Chapter 2 | 185,766 | 229,304 | +43,538 |
AMENDMENT TO THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military construction, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>1,440,750</td>
<td>1,432,700</td>
<td>-8,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military construction, Navy and Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>237,505</td>
<td>423,357</td>
<td>+185,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military construction, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td>409,627</td>
<td>+104,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military construction, Defense-Wide (emergency)</td>
<td>27,600</td>
<td>1,009,600</td>
<td>+982,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Active Components</td>
<td>2,010,855</td>
<td>3,275,284</td>
<td>+1,264,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family housing construction, Navy and Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>11,766</td>
<td>11,766</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base realignment and closure account 2005 (emergency)</td>
<td>415,910</td>
<td>1,354,634</td>
<td>+938,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Department of Defense</td>
<td>2,438,531</td>
<td>4,641,684</td>
<td>+2,203,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Veterans Affairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General operating expenses (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>+100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>+20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Department of Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>+120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Chapter 3</td>
<td>2,438,531</td>
<td>4,761,684</td>
<td>+2,323,153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHAPTER 4**

**SUBCHAPTER A**

**SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008**

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

**Administration of Foreign Affairs**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic and consular programs (emergency)</td>
<td>1,708,008</td>
<td>1,606,808</td>
<td>-101,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide security protection</td>
<td>(162,400)</td>
<td>(210,508)</td>
<td>(+48,108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Inspector General (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>+7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy security, construction, and maintenance (emergency)</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>76,700</td>
<td>-83,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>1,868,008</td>
<td>1,691,008</td>
<td>-177,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**International Organizations**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to international organizations (emergency)</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year (emergency)</td>
<td>333,600</td>
<td>333,600</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, International Organizations</td>
<td>386,600</td>
<td>386,600</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Department of State</td>
<td>2,254,608</td>
<td>2,077,608</td>
<td>-177,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE**

**Funds Appropriated to the President**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International disaster assistance (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>+200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses of the U.S. Agency for International Development (emergency)</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>142,000</td>
<td>+101,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses of the US Agency for International Development, Office of Inspector General (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>+4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other Bilateral Economic Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic support fund (emergency)</td>
<td>2,009,000</td>
<td>1,747,000</td>
<td>-262,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy Fund (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>+75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International narcotics control and law enforcement (emergency)</td>
<td>734,000</td>
<td>419,300</td>
<td>-314,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration and refugee assistance (emergency)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>+270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>+25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs (emergency)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>+6,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Military Assistance

Funds Appropriated to the President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Military Financing Program (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>72,500</td>
<td>+72,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Subchapter A</td>
<td>5,073,608</td>
<td>5,073,608</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subchapter B

BRIDGE FUND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

#### Department of State

Administration of Foreign Affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic and consular programs (emergency)</td>
<td>1,064,450</td>
<td>737,900</td>
<td>-326,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide security protection</td>
<td>(45,800)</td>
<td>(78,400)</td>
<td>(+32,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Inspector General (emergency)</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>+40,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy security, construction, and maintenance (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>41,300</td>
<td>+41,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>1,081,250</td>
<td>836,200</td>
<td>-245,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to international organizations (emergency)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>+35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>150,500</td>
<td>+150,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, International Organizations</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>225,500</td>
<td>+185,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Department of State</td>
<td>1,121,200</td>
<td>1,061,700</td>
<td>-59,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Related Agencies

Broadcasting Board of Governors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International broadcasting operations (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>+8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AMENDMENT TO THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Funds Appropriated to the President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global health and child survival (emergency)</td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>+75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development assistance (emergency)</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>-10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International disaster assistance (emergency)</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>-70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses of the U.S. Agency for International Development</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>93,000</td>
<td>+33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses of the US Agency for International Development, Office of Inspector General (emergency)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>+1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Bilateral Economic Assistance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic support fund (emergency)</td>
<td>1,297,700</td>
<td>1,147,300</td>
<td>-150,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Department of State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International narcotics control and law enforcement (emergency)</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>204,500</td>
<td>-20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration and refugee assistance (emergency)</td>
<td>191,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>+159,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs (emergency)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>+4,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Funds Appropriated to the President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Military Financing Program (emergency)</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacekeeping operations (emergency)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>+25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Subchapter B**                                   3,604,950 | 3,600,000 | -4,950

### SUBCHAPTER C - GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 1407:

(a)(1) World Food Program                                           ---     | 20,000     | +20,000    |
(a)(2) Andean Counterdrug Initiative (rescission)                   ---     | -20,000    | -20,000    |
(b)(1) International narcotics control and law enforcement (Sudan) | ---     | 10,000      | +10,000    |
(b)(2) International narcotics control and law enforcement (prior-year rescission) | ---     | -10,000    | -10,000    |

**Total, Subchapter C**                                   ---     | ---         | ---         |

**Total, Chapter 4**                                  8,678,558 | 8,673,608 | -4,950

### GENERAL PROVISIONS

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

**Customs and Border Protection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses (rescission)</td>
<td>-50,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, General Provisions**                             -50,000 | ---         | +50,000    |

**Total, title I**                                    11,997,855 | 14,909,596 | +2,911,741
AMENDMENT TO THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642  
(Amounts in thousands)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOMESTIC MATTERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of the Census</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic censuses and programs (emergency).</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Prison System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses (emergency).</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>178,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Chapter 1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>388,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corps of Engineers - Civil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, FY 2009 (emergency).</td>
<td>5,761,000</td>
<td>2,835,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood control and coastal emergencies, FY 2009 (emerg.).</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2,926,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Chapter 2</td>
<td>5,761,000</td>
<td>5,761,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF LABOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Training Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State unemployment insurance and employment service operations (emergency).</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, title II</td>
<td>5,761,000</td>
<td>6,259,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERANS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans educational assistance, FY 2008 (emergency).</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans educational assistance, FY 2009 (emergency).</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>676,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, title III</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>716,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AMENDMENT TO THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H. R. 2642
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-State agreements, FY 2008 (emergency)</td>
<td>6,170,000</td>
<td>+6,170,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-State agreements, FY 2009 (emergency)</td>
<td>9,440,000</td>
<td>+9,440,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, title IV</strong></td>
<td>15,610,000</td>
<td>+15,610,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE V</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAID PROVISIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid moratorium, FY 2008 (emergency)</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>+450,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid moratorium, FY 2009 (emergency)</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>+1,150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, title V</strong></td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>+1,600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td>17,758,855</td>
<td>39,094,765</td>
<td>+21,335,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(30,169)</td>
<td>(+30,169)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations</td>
<td>(17,808,855)</td>
<td>(39,094,596)</td>
<td>(+21,285,741)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions</td>
<td>(-50,000)</td>
<td>(-30,000)</td>
<td>(+20,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, after five years, thousands of lives lost, and hundreds of billions of dollars spent and trillions to go, the amendments adopted today are the beginning of a solution in Iraq. These amendments mandate the beginning of withdrawal, setting us on a path out of Iraq, and support critical domestic and international priorities.

The language offers some of the same prescriptions in my own Iraq legislation, including a ban on permanent bases and an increase in education benefits in proportion to the economic return. Congress has passed other GI Bills, but over time, the value of the education benefit has declined. The current Montgomery GI Bill, for example, was designed for the Korean War era. I support provisions in this House’s approval in the 20th Century.

Since that time, Congress has passed other GI Bills, but over time, the value of the education benefit has declined. The current Montgomery GI Bill, for example, was designed for the Korean War era. I support provisions in this House’s approval in the 20th Century.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the three amendments before us today to H.R. 2642. Our troops have done incredible work in Iraq and Afghanistan, and it is critical that we provide them with the protective equipment, operating funds, and counterterrorism resources necessary to execute their missions. For this reason, I support the funding in this package for vital priorities like mine resistant ambush protected vehicles, IED jamming devices, military healthcare, traumatic resistant ambush protected vehicles, IED jamming devices, military healthcare, traumatic resistant ambush protected vehicles, IED jamming devices, military healthcare, traumatic resistant ambush protected vehicles, IED jamming devices, military healthcare, traumatic resistant ambush protected vehicles, IED jamming devices, military healthcare, traumatic resistant ambush protected vehicles, IED jamming devices, military healthcare, traumatic resistant ambush protected vehicles, IED jamming devices, military healthcare, traumatic resistant ambush protected vehicles, IED jamming devices, military healthcare, traumatic resistant ambush protected vehicles, IED jamming devices, military healthcare, traumatic resistant ambush protected vehicles, IED jamming devices, military healthcare, traumatic resistant ambush protected vehicles, IED jamming devices, military healthcare, traumatic resistant ambush protected vehicles, IED jamming devices, military healthcare, traumatic resistant ambush protected vehicles.
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support, contains funding for some very vital programs. For example, it includes $75 million in FY 2008 and $300 million in FY 2009 for traumatic brain injury care and research. In addition, the measure provides $95 million to address gaps identified by the President's Commission on Care for America's Returning Wounded Warriors. The funding is designed to improve case management, data sharing, and the disability evaluation system. These, among others, are very critical to our troops and their families. They deserved to be enacted, not held up for petty political reasons.

Certainly misused funds in Iraq and a change of strategy was long overdue. Now that the surge has been fully implemented and been given time to work, there is no doubt that the security environment in Iraq continues to improve. General Petraeus has said that security progress is still fragile and reversible. Much work still needs to be done, but progress on the ground is undeniable.

The question we must continually ask ourselves is what is the cost of withdrawing our troops? Should the U.S. immediately pull out of Iraq, have we undermined and potentially put more Americans at risk? Withdrawal needs to be based on events not policies. It is important to stress that an opened-ended American military commitment is both unwise and dangerous. Progress in Iraq must be measurable and based on more than just military progress.

Accordingly, Col. Christopher Hughes, who commanded the 2d Battalion of the 327th Inf. Regiment, 101st Airborne in Iraq, has identified a set of strategic benchmarks designed to ensure progress. Hughes has developed an event-driven sequence that leads to a legitimate withdrawal. His plan includes six phases and a number of different benchmarks that need to be met. I have attached this plan and make it part of my speech.

It's important to highlight that events, not an arbitrary timeline, needs to guide our strategy. Col. Hughes' milestones for an event-driven withdrawal are strategic, operational and tactical. Such benchmarks include, holding insurgent violence to near zero or lower, halting the 23d Coalition and Iraqi forces to the area of operation, and a complete withdrawal of Coalition forces. Col. Hughes' full strategy for leaving Iraq.

The amendment we have before us today does not take an event-driven approach, but sets an arbitrary deadline based on politics not the situation on the ground. I urge my colleagues to vote against the second amendment today.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to speak about a provision in the third amendment pertaining to the Montgomery GI Bill. As a veteran and a senior member of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, I understand the hardship and sacrifice of military service. I, along with many of my colleagues, have supported legislation to update and expand the GI Bill, and I am cosponsoring H.R. 5740, the legislation that this provision is based on. However, the House leadership decided to combine the updated GI Bill with a huge tax increase on many small businesses.

The Democrat tax increase would put a surcharge on the gross income for individuals earning more than $500,000 and couples with over $1 million. However, of taxpayers with $1 million or more in income, nearly 83% report that some or all of that is income from a small business. This is a massive tax increase on the gross income of small businessmen and women who operate as self-employed individuals. Women make up 21% of our military in the armed forces in our nation. Instead of raising taxes, Congress could fund the new GI Bill by reducing federal spending by a mere 0.1 percent over 10 years. I am certain that we can find one-tenth of one percent of wasteful federal spending to reduce the budget of our 21st century veterans.

In addition, the third amendment includes $5.8 billion in FY 2009 funds for levee rebuilding in Louisiana. This is in addition to the $7.1 billion the federal government has already promised to give the state and a handful have passed. Furthermore, $9.9 billion for foreign aid is included, which represents $500 million more than requested. These may very well be worthwhile programs but do they belong in an emergency, off budget spending package?

Lastly, I want to point out that the process of how this bill came to the floor today is not in keeping with the spirit and traditions of the House. As Speaker NANCY PELOSI stated in her 2006 document, A New Direction for Congress, "Congress should develop an event-driven sequence that grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute." Furthermore, according to The Politico newspaper, "There have been about three dozen emergency spending bills in the past 20 years and a handful have passed without input from the Appropriations Committee, including billions in Hurricane Katrina aid and post-Sept. 11 funds. But none of the Iraq war funding bills have bypassed the Appropriations panel."

Unfortunately, this supplemental bypassed the entire Appropriations Committee process altogether, and through the use of parliamentary gimmicks, avoids the input of both Demo- crat and Republican members who have real expertise in the subject areas involved, effec- tively shutting out the views of millions of these members constituents.

To have the Democrat leadership cut off the people's right to be heard by such crass par- liamentary maneuvers results in a great harm to the appropriations process and seriously under- mines the credibility of the House of Repre- sentatives.

Our brave troops and millions of veterans deserve better. They do not deserve to be treated as political tools. We pass a clean supplemental, devoid of any unrelated, and unnecessary spending, that gets necessary equipment to our troops on the battlefield im- mediately. We should also pass a GI Bill that does not unfairly tax small businesses. Unfortu- nately, the Democrat leadership decided to use politics, while our troops and veterans have to pay the price.

APPENDIX I: A STRATEGY FOR LEAVING IRAQ

DETAILS PER PHASE

This is not a timeline; it's an event-driven sequence of events that leads to a legitimate withdrawal of U.S. forces in order to return Iraq to the international community of nations.
Phase 1: The Iraqi Sovereignty Council (ISC) is responsible for the development of a prioritized list of reconstruction projects that will include government, health, education, judicial, border and military facilities in each of the provinces. Regional governmental leaders, sheiks, and other tribal leaders will vet the list and add or subtract items within their provinces to ensure equity and specificity for each population. Additionally, Islamic and other religious leaders will provide a list of religious, historic, and protective facilities that need assistance to ensure freedom of religion and access during the transition. During this process, the first step toward completion of this list, and the involvement of local, tribal, military and religious leaders is publicly discussed and debated on local and international media.

Phase 2: Once the ISC has compiled and publicly documented the list, it will present the plan to the Iraqi National Government (ING) for debate and approval. The public debate over this list is the main effort of this operation. The debate will include the conditions for implementing this list. Those conditions will include a mandate from the ING directed at the Coalition and the insurgency. The ING will place themselves between the perceived enemies of the Coalition (the insurgents) in their country and levy demands on each. These demands will include reconstruction funds from the Coalition, a cessation of hostilities from the insurgents, a phased withdrawal of Coalition forces, and a peaceful integration of remaining insurgent organizations into the Iraqi political process. This will likely result in unlikely to get insurgent groups to step forward and engage in the debate, the momentum of public opinion will begin to erode their legitimacy. This momentum will continue hostile action against the Iraqi people.

Phase 3: After approving the ISC plan, the ING will conduct a nationwide information campaign, targeting the Iraqi people and showing them the details of the plan. This quid pro quo will help the ING to assert sovereign control over and to further control the Coalition and the insurgency—in essence, speaking for the Iraqi people. This planned confrontation with the United States will help to distract from the fact that the ING is an American puppet, further legitimizing their authority when facing the insurgency and Arab community.

Phase 4: It is logical to assume that the insurgencies will remain silent during phases 1-3 to determine the ING’s true resolve and overall Coalition intent. It’s necessary for the Coalition to first step through phase four by executing a token withdrawal of forces from each of the primary provinces that have participated in the ISC planning process. These forces will withdraw from two or three cities as a show of good faith in support of the ISC plan and ING. Once these moves are complete, the ING will begin a weekly progress report for the project list and detailed report on the level of hostilities in country by province.

Phase 5: This phase will be a continual process of quid pro quo as the key ING milestone is met in accordance with the plan. Reduction in hostilities + completed projects = phased withdrawal of Coalition forces.

Phase 6: When the reconstruction projects list is complete, and insurgent hostilities have leveled at acceptable levels to the ING, the Coalition will administer their phased withdrawal.

PHASED WITHDRAWAL MILESTONES

Examples of possible withdrawal milestones.

Most of these have come to fruition and should be accomplished when the plan is first presented to the Iraqi people and the world.

Strategic National—Iraqi Embassy in Washington DC staffed and operational; American Embassy in Baghdad staffed and operational; United Nations Embassy operations have resumed and Safe Harbor Agreement creates first UN Security Council meeting and General Assembly.

Strategic Operational—2008 National Elections complete, and UN validation of National Elections.

Operational—500,000 National Police staffed, equipped, trained and deployed; 500,000 National Army Staffed, equipped, trained and deployed; 100,000 Border Police staffed and deployed; 76 oil refineries operational; 4.5 million barrels of oil produced per day; Infrastructure complete (list with specific facilities)—medical, education, power, religious, etc.; National Salary System operational with ten year phase out plan as country develops free economic systems; 12 radio stations operational and 4 TV stations.

Tactical—Insurgent violence less than or equal to one attack on Coalition and Iraqi forces per month; foreign fighters less than or equal to two attacks on Coalition and Iraqi forces per month; and zero attacks against Iraqi citizens and foreign nationals.

More importantly, the President has stubbornly adhered to a failed policy that does not serve the best interests of our military, our foreign policy, and our national security, we are no closer to a withdrawal—or a resolution to the conflicts that beset Iraq—than we were 5 years ago. This amendment will change that. This amendment will begin to bring our troops home, in an orderly and responsible fashion.

Some argue that conditions on the ground have improved since the beginning of the President’s surge strategy, and that advocates of a troop withdrawal are somehow blind to changed conditions. That is simply not the case.

We have watched conditions in Iraq closely, hoping for the kind of progress that would transform Iraq’s internal political dynamics, hoping for a turning point that might produce a lasting end to the violence. We have supported our troops as they have carried out their tactical military mission with remarkable skill and the credibility of our operations in Iraq has been eroded. Accountability has been undercut in combat zones in Iraq and Afghanistan—we will be held accountable under the law for misconduct, just like our troops. This legislation passed the House over seven months ago, and its enactment is long overdue.

My legislation will ensure that all Government personnel—military personnel, civilian employees, and contractors under any agency—will be accountable under U.S. Federal criminal jurisdiction through the Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act. Since the war in Iraq began, private contractor personnel have committed numerous abuses resulting in the deaths of dozens of Iraqis. Yet, many of these individuals have operated in a legal gray zone, immune from both Iraqi and U.S. law. As a result, accountability has been undercut and the credibility of our operations in Iraq has been seriously damaged.

One need only point to the events of September 17, 2007, to understand the consequences of such impunity. On that day, private contractor personnel—gunning a convoy through the streets of Baghdad opened fire in a downtown square, killing 17 civilians; 8 months later, no charges have been filed and none of the participants have been brought to justice.

We have forces in concert with the Administration to ensure that Government and contractor personnel who are carrying out their mission conscientiously and legally will not be made vulnerable under this law. Instead, this measure will give us the tools we need to ensure that those who run afoul of the law are brought to justice.

The measure before us is a major step forward toward a new approach to national security, one that will make our Nation safer and
restore our global moral leadership. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure and bringing an end to the war in Iraq.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our troops, and in support of a responsible U.S. policy in Iraq.

I have opposed the Iraq war from the very beginning.

Over 5 years later, this war has taken the lives of more than 4,000 of our brave troops. Our armed forces are incredibly strained, and our nation’s image tarnished in the wake of this foreign relations disaster.

I have opposed continued funding of this war in the past, and I will vote against Amendment No. 1, which gives the President another blank check.

Amendments No. 2 and No. 3 of this bill, however, are marked and deliberate shift away from the failed and short-sighted policies of President Bush.

And No. 2 requires that all troops be fully trained and equipped before deployment, and calls for a redeployment of U.S. troops from Iraq to begin in 30 days.

It also bans any permanent U.S. bases in Iraq and codifies contracting fraud as a criminal offense.

Amendment No. 3 will restore the education benefits under the GI bill to include a full, 4-year college education for veterans of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars.

Mr. Speaker, this war has taken an incredible toll on American troops, their families, and our entire country.

We cannot turn back the hands of time, but we can ensure our troops bring our troops home, end this war, and provide them with the tools they will need to continue their education.

As this New Direction Congress has done time and again, today we will tell the President that he is wrong.

Let us truly support the troops and vote to bring them home.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today the House is addressing two of the most important issues facing our Nation: The Iraq war and the poor economy. We have the opportunity to force a change in our Iraq strategy while providing much-needed assistance to returning troops and Americans struggling to make ends meet.

In October 2002, I voted against the resolution authorizing the use of force in Iraq, and more than 5 years later, it is abundantly clear that our Nation needs a new approach in Iraq so that we can bring our men and women in uniform home. I am extremely proud of the service and sacrifice of our troops and their families, and the best way to demonstrate our support is by welcoming them home with the services and resources they need. I strongly support the amendment before us today that requires U.S. forces to begin redeployment from Iraq within 30 days, with a goal of withdrawing nearly all troops by the end of 2009.

Recognizing the toll that extended deployments are having on our readiness, the amendment also requires the Department of Defense to adhere to its policy of providing sufficient rest and recuperation time for troops returning from combat. Repeated and unpredictable deployments have placed enormous stress on our troops and their families, and if we don’t make changes soon, we risk losing the men and women who have made our armed forces the best in the world.

Another amendment before us would recognize the service of our troops by establishing a new GI Bill of Rights. Under this plan, which is supported by a broad array of veterans groups, servicemembers returning from Iraq or Afghanistan would qualify for educational assistance based on time served.

Those serving three years on active duty would receive benefits to cover the costs of a 4-year education, based on the costs of the most expensive in-state public school. This new program will allow our military returning from combat to advance their careers and develop skills that will help improve our economy.

Finally, the measure recognizes the importance of providing assistance to our citizens struggling in the recent economic downturn. Congress has been working swiftly to address the housing crisis and the skyrocketing costs of food and energy, but we need to make sure that we help those who need it most. This legislation provides an additional 13 weeks of unemployment benefits to workers who have exhausted their regular 26 weeks of benefits—a provision that could help as many as 24,400 Rhode Islanders. Unemployed Americans want to get back to work, but in many places jobs are scarce. We must not punish them for the failures of Congress to address this emergency.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman O’BRYE for his leadership in crafting this bill and bringing it before the House. In brief, I wanted to let my colleagues know that the Select Intelligence Oversight Panel, which I chair, has been working diligently throughout this war. Our role has been to ensure that any intelligence programs included for funding in this supplemental package have been reviewed for their appropriateness and value to our troops in the field.

While the Department of the Defense is focused on Iraq and Afghanistan, the professionals in the Intelligence Community are focused on threats there and elsewhere around the world. A good intelligence system can save lives by preventing war, or, should war come, by helping to win the war as quickly as possible. We must ensure that the troops in combat get the best real-time intelligence and at the same time that policymakers get solid, independent, insightful intelligence about countries and potential terrorists that operate around the world. I look forward to providing another update on our work once the base DoD appropriations bill is completed later this spring.

Regarding Iraq, I recently returned from a trip to that deeply troubled country. American troops are performing superbly in Iraq under continually difficult conditions. While in Baghdad, I met with soldiers—including those from New Jersey—and told them they deserve not just our gratitude, but all of the support they need when they return to help them get on with their lives. The situation in Iraq, however, is not in the power of our soldiers to control, as events have repeatedly shown.

It is 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. The uneven performance of the Iraqi Security Forces (ISF) during the fighting with the Mahdi Army in late March 2008 has called into question the viability of the ISF as a national defense and police force, despite our having poured billions of dollars into the ISF.

Unfortunately, Iraq’s central government continues to lack legitimacy in the eyes of its people, as the recent spasms of violence in Basra, Baghdad, and other areas have shown. No amount of American lives and money can erase that legitimacy gap. It is clear that the Iraqi government is unwilling or unable to take the steps necessary to reach a political settlement that will end the violence, and that is why I supported the amendment to this supplemental spending bill that would set a start date for our withdrawal from Iraq.

It is important for us 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, instead of giving our resources on pressing domestic and international needs.

While we continue our efforts to extricate our troops from Iraq, we must also prepare to help them once they return home and begin transitioning to the civilian world. I strongly support the provision in this bill that expands the education benefits veterans receive under the GI bill to restore the promise of a full, 4-year college education, and make the veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan part of an American economic recovery, just like the veterans of World War II were.

This bill also contains provisions to help America’s most vulnerable citizens survive the current de facto recession our country is experiencing. The bill extends unemployment benefits for workers who have exhausted their benefits by up to 13 weeks in every State as well as additional 13 weeks for workers in States with high unemployment. Also included in this bill is the Protecting the Medicaid Safety Net Act of 2008 (H.R. 5613), which places a moratorium on seven Medicaid regulations that would cut services to seniors, families, and those with disabilities as well as cut payments to safety net providers. These are compassionate measures that are fully off-set, and I am glad they are in this bill.

However, I can’t help but observe, Mr. Speaker, that these needs would have been met long ago if our country had not been forced to waste billions of dollars on a war of choice that should never have been fought. I will continue to do all I can to help end our involvement in Iraq and redirect our Nation’s priorities and resources where they belong—on meeting the needs of our people.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express shock in the way this spending bill has been written and dumped into our laps, sight unseen, except by a few members of the Democratic Leadership.

This supplemental bill has been crafted without the input of rank and file members, completely circumventing the committee process.

There have been no hearings, no debates, no amendments allowed and about 18 hours to review this enormous bill.
We now have a few members of the house, substituting their judgement on serious wartime funding issues, for the other 430 Members of both parties.

Think about that for a minute. You and your colleagues have had no say in this bill—none. Again, I pledge to sit down with the Speaker; I had 18 hours to review this 250 billion dollar spending bill.

This is very troublesome to me as a member of the people’s house and I know, for a fact, that it’s troublesome to members from both sides of the aisle. Today, the 3 million citizens of my State of Iowa, and millions of other Americans—which, by the way, include soldiers serving overseas and their families waiting for their safe return—will have no say in how their tax dollars are being spent for our military.

Whatever your position is on the war, or any Federal spending in this bill, the Speaker has set a terrible precedent for this institution. To the extent that we value precedent around here, this is not the type of bad precedent we should be allowing.

Both democrats and republicans deserve better, and we deserve a voice.

The way this process has been handled also taints the legislative success of good bills based on good ideas. The case in point is the inclusion of legislation I fully support and of which I am an original co-sponsor—the post 9/11 Veterans’ Educational Assistance Act. This bi-partisan bill overhauls the G.I. bill education benefits and increases the benefits available to veterans.

This is a good bill dropped into an emergency spending bill that the Democrats know will not become law. The majority is using the G.I. bill for their political play book of attacks against Republicans in the upcoming elections—pure and simple.

This provision, as a standalone bill, has wide support from veterans groups and Republicans and Democrats in both the House and the Senate. But the American people have the right to have their Members of Congress debate and amend the bill.

I want to read a quote that is relevant to this sad situation. It comes from the Democrats’ “New Direction for America” agenda—“Bills should generally come to the floor under a closed rule, the case in point is the inclusion of legislation I fully support and of which I am an original co-sponsor—the post 9/11 Veterans’ Educational Assistance Act. This bi-partisan bill overhauls the G.I. bill education benefits and increases the benefits available to veterans.”

As a veteran of the U.S. Army myself, I strongly support our troops, our veterans and their families. Our troops have done everything they have been asked to do and done it exceptionally well. I am tremendously proud of all the troops from North Carolina and across America who have done their duty so admirably.

This bill will provide $162.5 billion for our troops to fight the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. It also includes provisions to make sure that our troops meet the Pentagon’s definition of “combat ready” before they are deployed to Iraq and prevents them from being deployed longer than Pentagon guidelines recommend.

As the representative of Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, I am a proud cosponsor of the Post-9/11 Veterans Education Assistance Act and am pleased that it is included in the Supplemental Appropriations bill. The original Montgomery G.I. Bill was a hugely successful initiative that provided hundreds of thousands of soldiers with new opportunities in education and business following World War II. We owe those same opportunities to the women and men of the Armed Forces and Afghani-stan, and currently serving around the globe. This initiative would give returning service members who have served on active duty in the Armed Forces or reserves after September 11, 2001, to receive educational assistance for up to 4 years, and can be used at any time within 15 years of discharge or release from active duty. The new GI bill is also fiscally responsible as it is paid for with an income tax surcharge of one-half of one percent on individuals with incomes above $500,000 and couples with incomes above $1 million. Educational Assistance Act. This bill education benefits and increases the benefits available to veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to work with my colleagues in Congress as well as the President and the Administration, to provide a new direction in Iraq and to meet the critical needs of the people of North Carolina’s Second Congressional District.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for these amendments today. Taken together, they provide necessary funding for our troops, set the stage for a responsible strategy of phased disengagement in Iraq, and address domestic concerns.

Thewar funding will pay for operations in Afghanistan and Iraq for the rest of this year and half of 2009. I support this because it will make it possible to provide the equipment, ammunition, fuel, and other supplies needed by our brave men and women serving in Iraq and Afghanistan who have shown such extraordinary skill, determination and endurance in answering their call to service.

I opposed the Bush Administration’s rush to war in Iraq, and voted against the resolution that authorized the President to send our armed forces into that country on the theory that this was necessary in order to deprive the Saddam Hussein regime of weapons of mass destruction. So, I understand why some of my constituents who also opposed the war want Congress to reject this funding measure.

And I could not agree more that the record of the current Administration demonstrates an enormous failure of leadership and that we desperately need new leadership that will bring to a close our open-ended military engagement in Iraq and will refocus on the very urgent tasks of reducing the terrorist threats in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

But I am convinced that denying our men and women fighting in uniform the opportunity to do their job is not the right way to bring about the change we need—especially because President Bush has shown he is prepared to veto funding for the troops rather than agree to change course.

Achieving the needed change in course is the point of the second amendment—the policy amendment—being considered today. It includes a range of provisions, including one that requires redeployment of our troops in Iraq to begin within 30 days and that states as a goal the completion of this withdrawal within 18 months.

As I’ve said before, I don’t think there is a sustainable role for large numbers of U.S. troops in Iraq. While this provision sends the right message—that our troops cannot remain in Iraq indefinitely—regrettably, it does not send it in the best way, because it will be supported almost exclusively by Democrats, and the president has already promised to veto any legislation that he says could tie his hands on Iraq.

What we need is consensus here at home on a path forward in Iraq. I still think the best way to achieve that consensus would be to focus on the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group. Those recommendations would be accomplished by legislation I introduced last year, which would support a course of escalating economic development, empowerment of local government, the provision of basic services, a ‘surge’ in regional and international diplomatic efforts, and lightening the American footprint in Iraq.

Today’s policy amendment does not include the specific provisions from my Iraq Study Group bill, but it does include other important provisions—prohibiting military units that are not determined to be “mission capable” from deploying; prohibiting deployment of U.S. forces that have not spent sufficient time at their home stations between tours of duty; prohibiting permanent bases in Iraq; requiring that reconstruction assistance to Iraq be provided in the form of a dollar-for-dollar match with the Iraqis; and cracking down on contractors engaged in fraud and profiteering, among other provisions.

These are things I think should be established policy, and I support them without hesitation.

Finally, the domestic and international assistance amendment provides increases for international food aid; rejects seven of the Administration’s Medicaid regulations that will increase the cost of healthcare; extends unemployment benefits; provides increases in funding for the Bureau of Prisons; and provides enhanced education benefits for veterans, among other provisions.

I support these provisions because I think they are good for the country as a whole.

Some are especially important for Colorado—for example, we have a direct interest.
in the funding increase staffing at federal prisons because our state has several such facilities and because recent events, including a riot that led to fatal shooting of inmates, have shown the need to increase those staffing levels.

And particularly important for America and the future of our society is the provision to improve veterans’ education benefits to more closely resemble the GI Bill of Rights that made it possible for so many World War II veterans to go to college. The GI Bill of Rights helped make possible the postwar growth of the middle class and was one of the greatest achievements of the Greatest Generation. Some have complained about the cost of providing similar benefits to those who are serving today. But to put those costs—estimated at $52 billion over the next 10 years—into perspective, we should remember that so far our spending for military activities in Afghanistan and Iraq have exceeded $800 billion.

However, I do have some reservations about the way the amendment proposes to finance these benefits. To offset the cost, the amendment would impose a surtax of a half a percentage point on incomes of about $500,000 for individuals and $1 million for couples. It is estimated that this would increase federal revenues by some $54 billion over 10 years, while the educational benefits are estimated at $252 billion over that period. So the amount of the tax increase is not excessive, and it is appropriate to target it in a way to apply to those best able to afford it. But I think there is validity to the concern that some small businesses—those whose profits are subject to both personal and corporate income taxes—will be disproportionately affected. I think this aspect can and should be reviewed as the legislative process continues, to see if appropriate adjustments should be made.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against war in Iraq because, as I said then, the Bush Administration was rushing to war without necessary international support or a clear plan to prevent the chaos that would follow after Saddam Hussein was overthrown. I was concerned a prolonged conflict would devolve into civil war. Since U.S. troops entered Iraq more than 5 years ago, we have lost thousands of our brave servicemen and women, seen tens of thousands more wounded, and spent half a trillion dollars in taxpayer money.

Yet the President’s mission is no clearer, he has still offered no exit strategy, our enemies in Afghanistan have regained their strength, and our armed forces have been stretched to the breaking point. Only Democrats and Republicans working together can find the path out of Iraq. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on further steps we can take to change our broader Iraq policy. But today, I will support these amendments providing funding for our troops in the field, assistance for Americans suffering through the current economic downturn and people around the world suffering from spiraling food costs, and important policy measures to take care of our troops and remind Iraq’s government that U.S. troops will not remain in Iraq indefinitely.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2642.

This bill calls for a responsible redeployment from Iraq; and forces the Administration to answer for its actions.

The cost of this war continues to devastate America. This bill includes $96.6 billion in funding, but not without accountability.

This bill includes funds to equip our troops. You would not have a surgeon perform a surgery with the wrong tools; we must not send our patriotic Americans to war without the proper equipment.

This bill will increase transparency in our relationship with Iraq, and redirects the voice of America back to Congress, not the Administration, and pass on the cost of future reconstruction of Iraq back to the hands of the Iraqi people.

I believe our troops and their families should be our first priority.

The cost of this war comes in many forms, including unexpected costs for our military families. Just like World War II veterans, our soldiers returning from overseas will now have a GI bill that keeps America’s promise of an education to them.

With the costs of the war rising, the costs of oil skyrocketing, and the number of foreign troops over levels, many working families are facing uphill battles. Congress must not just stand by and watch.

This bill includes emergency provisions for harmful Medicaid cuts and an extension on the devastated unemployment compensation program for a year.

From my District alone, this war has cut short the lives of 13 young men and has brought back hundreds of injured soldiers.

The cost of this war is too high both at home and overseas; our families are hanging on by a thread. I urge my colleagues to bring our troops home and support H.R. 2642.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the Gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA for his help on an important issue to me and the men and woman at Cannon Air Force Base in my district.

Since the early stages of this legislation, Mr. MURTHA has worked with me to include aircraft for SOCOM and AFOSOC, which has recently expanded to Cannon. Cannon is the new home to the 27th Fighter Wing, which is being stood up and is in need of aircraft appropriate to the specific job performed by these soldiers.

That is why I am pleased that the supplemental includes money for CV–22 and MC–130J aircrafts designated for AFOSOC. This will greatly assist in accelerating the capabilities of Cannon, and will give the men and women serving there the tools they need to help keep America safe. The CV–22s and MC–130Js are integral to the training and mission work done by the 27th.

I am fully committed to ensuring that our soldiers have the training and equipment they need to protect our nation, which is why I requested this funding. I would like to once again thank Mr. MURTHA demonstrating our shared commitment to our soldiers by including funding for these aircraft.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protest the Democrat Leadership’s dictatorial tactics. Our Founding Fathers, in their infinite wisdom, created a system of government by which the people’s voice would be heard in legislative decisions, especially those affecting the use of our hard earned taxpayer dollars. The House of Representatives has the awesome responsibility to represent the will of the people, and for that reason, under the Constitution of the United States, spending bills originate in this body. What we have here today, however, is the suppression of the people’s voice. This bill is brought to the floor without consideration by the committee of jurisdiction whose chairmen didn’t even have input and without true consideration by the full House with a lockdown rule that does not allow for consideration of amendments or a substitute bill. Democrat and Republican Members have been shut out of this process.

This bill contains funding for the men and women who protect this nation at home and abroad—and the defense subcommittee which represents the needs of our state has still offered no substitute bill. Democrats and Republicans working together can find the path out of Iraq.

Dedicated and working together on both sides of the aisle on further steps we can take to change our broader Iraq policy. But today, I will support these amendments providing funding for our troops in the field, assistance for Americans suffering through the current economic downturn and people around the world suffering from spiraling food costs, and important policy measures to take care of our troops and remind Iraq’s government that U.S. troops will not remain in Iraq indefinitely.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment to be voted on today which will provide another blank check for the war in Iraq:

I remain steadfast in my opposition to the Iraq war and its continued funding. Tens of thousands of our bravest sons and daughters have been wounded and over 4 thousand killed. We have spent hundreds of billions of dollars on this war, which has necessarily meant we have had fewer resources to deal with significant problems here at home.

Our continued military involvement in Iraq only prolongs the tragedy this war has been for our country and delays the inevitable time when Iraq will have to take responsibility for its own security. While my support for our heroic troops is unwavering, it is time to bring them home. These views are shared by the vast majority of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to stand up for their constituents and demand that we have a say. Vote against the bill and force the Democrat Leadership to bring this bill through regular order.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment to be voted on today which will provide another blank check for the war in Iraq:

I remain steadfast in my opposition to the Iraq war and its continued funding. Tens of thousands of our bravest sons and daughters have been wounded and over 4 thousand killed. We have spent hundreds of billions of dollars on this war, which has necessarily meant we have had fewer resources to deal with significant problems here at home.

Our continued military involvement in Iraq only prolongs the tragedy this war has been for our country and delays the inevitable time when Iraq will have to take responsibility for its own security. While my support for our heroic troops is unwavering, it is time to bring them home. These views are shared by the vast majority of the American people.
across the country and threaten the ability of certain health care providers, such as Denver Health in my district, to offer vital services. These three amendments on the floor today offer the Members of the House of Representatives a stark choice. They can choose to reject the Administration’s proposal and blindly follow the misguided policies of the Bush Administration. Or, they can choose to end this war, support our veterans, and help Americans struggling in these dark economic times. History will look most kindly on those who show the independent judgment and wisdom that such important decisions require.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Iraq War has now entered its sixth year. During this time more than 4,000 soldiers have died, almost 30,000 have been injured, and tens of thousands more will suffer mental scars for years to come. The stress of multiple deployments has strained our military, and our military families. Many of our brightest young officers are leaving the military for careers that allow them to have a family, something that is difficult if not impossible when they are being asked to serve in Iraq. In addition, the economic cost of this war has been nothing short of staggering. The United States has already spent more than five hundred billion dollars in Iraq, or about $5000 for every household in America. Our children and our grandchildren will be paying off this debt for years to come.

After all the lives lost and money spent, this President has still failed to articulate what our mission in Iraq is, and what strategic goals he still hopes to accomplish. That is why I have introduced legislation that would require the President to have our troops out of Iraq before he leaves office, and also why I do not support the Pentagon another $162 billion it can use to wage this war for another year after the next President is sworn in.

While I do not support further funding for this war beyond the President’s term in office, I do support the provisions that have been attached conditioning this funding to a timeline for withdrawal, prohibiting the use of torture, holding contractors operating in Iraq responsible for fraud and other criminal activity, stopping the construction of permanent military bases in Iraq, and requiring the President to submit any long term security agreement he reaches with the Government of Iraq to Congress for approval. For too long this President has been given a blank check with which to pursue his Iraq policies, and I am glad that the House of Representatives will once again attempt to hold him accountable for his mismanagement of this war.

It must be pointed out that this vote is not a vote against the troops. Those who are serving our country in Iraq are performing admirably under difficult circumstances. Congress has already provided funds for the Department of Defense and war operations for Fiscal Year 2008. This vote won’t endanger the troops’ safety in any way, but it does send a signal to the Administration that it should begin the process of bringing them home.

I also support the decision to include in this legislation funding for other important Democratic priorities that will help boost our economy. Overall, these measures make up only a small fraction of the total cost of the bill, but they are targeted to make a big impact here at home. Not only will they give much needed assistance to the unemployed, veterans, and other vulnerable people, but these provisions will play an important role in stimulating the lagging economy.

For example, the supplemental package includes a bill I introduced that will place a temporary moratorium on seven regulations recently issued by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). These regulations, if allowed to stay in place, would reduce or eliminate payments for services provided to vulnerable Americans and the institutions that serve them: children with disabilities, people with mental illness, those with multiple care needs, people attempting to transition from an institution to a community living environment, and people with disabilities who need these critical services, such as rehabilitation services and case management, in order to remain in their community. In Michigan, the rehabilitation rule would cut rehabilitation services for 15,000 children with special needs, eliminate habilitation services for another 29,000 developmentally disabled adults and children living in the community, and eliminate access to critical community services and resources for 23,600 veterans who are in supported independent living arrangements or group homes.

The supplemental will also contain legislation I cosponsored to extend Unemployment Compensation, a provision that will greatly help the residents of Michigan’s 15th Congressional District which I have the honor of serving. The National Employment Law Project projects that from May 2008 through March 2009, more than 162,000 workers will exhaust their benefits in Michigan, and that currently over 64,000 have already exhausted this benefit. By including this legislation in today’s supplemental package Congress will be helping 226,590 workers in Michigan who desperately need the extra boost, while also giving a much needed boost to the economy.

This bill will also provide expanded G.I. Benefits for Veterans Education, restoring the promise of a 4 year college education to those returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. As a veteran of World War II, I know how instrumental the original G.I. Bill was in expanding economic opportunity, growing the middle class, and creating a strong and vibrant post-war economy. The President and some of his Republican colleagues, including Senator McCAIN, are opposed to providing increased educational opportunities to today’s generation of veterans because they fear it will discourage men and women currently serving from reenlisting. I find it highly disturbing that the President and his colleagues would withhold these much needed benefits to those who have served our country so admirably, and I would remind them that the quickest way to fix our military’s retention problem would be to put an end to the misguided Iraq war that has so seriously damaged morale.

Another provision that I strongly support provides $675 million to assist refugees, with the bulk of that money going to address the growing humanitarian crisis in Iraq, I asked the President to include $1.5 billion in his budget for increased U.S. spending in the region, increased U.S. contributions to United Nations appeals for Iraqi refugees, and increased bilateral assistance for our allies, such as Jordan, that are dealing with the high numbers of Iraqi refugees within their borders. Unfortunately this request was denied, and I am very pleased that I was able to work with my Democratic colleagues to see to it that some of these funds were made available in the Supplemental.

No matter what we do here today, the President has made it clear that he intends to keep 160,000 troops in Iraq as long as he is in office. While I am disappointed that the President has no interest in ending the war on his watch, I am pleased the Democratic Congress has gone on record as being opposed to that plan, and has put in place the kind of timelines and restrictions required for us to begin to bring our troops home. I also think it wholly appropriate to be demanding for domestic priorities in an emergency supplemental spending bill. Just as the President’s mishandling of the Iraq war has caused a crisis in the Middle East, his mismanagement of the economy has created a crisis here at home for millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for a particular provision in the Supplemental Appropriations legislation, H.R. 2642.

Included in this bill is legislation that I introduced with Representative TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. The “Protecting the Medicaid Safety Net Act of 2008” is a simple, straightforward bill that would place a temporary moratorium on seven regulations recently issued by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS).

The Committee on Energy and Commerce recently reported the bill with unanimous support. The House then passed it with an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 349 to 62.

These Medicaid regulations have the potential, if allowed to stay in place, would reduce or eliminate payments for services provided to vulnerable Americans and the institutions that serve them. They would affect children with disabilities, people with mental illness, those with multiple care needs, people attempting to transition from an institution to a community living environment, and people with disabilities who need services, such as rehabilitation services and case management in order to remain in their community. The regulations would also eliminate funding for school-based community and enrollment services that helps safety net providers care for indigent and under-insured patients in our communities.

In my home State of Michigan, the rehabilitation rule would cut services for 15,000 children with special needs, eliminate services for another 29,000 developmentally disabled adults and children and eliminate access to critical community services and resources for 23,600 adults and 5,100 children who are in supported independent living arrangements or group homes.

The Administration’s arguments for supporting these regulations simply do not hold water. These regulations go beyond any justifiable point to curb abuses in the system. Rather, they represent a misguided effort to shift costs to States and prohibit Federal support for legitimate expenditures on behalf of Medicaid beneficiaries.

More than 2,000 organizations representing beneficiaries, providers, schools, and States have written to lend their support to this initiative, from “A,” such as the American Hospital Association and the American Academy of Pediatrics, to “Z,” the Zion Lutheran Elementary School in Nebraska. The chorus of support has been overwhelming.
I would also like to take a moment to commend Chairman PALLONE and Ranking Members BARTON and DEAL who worked to prepare the bill for rapid action in Committee and the House floor.

I also wish to thank Chairman OBEY for including the Medicaid legislation in the supplemental appropriations bill.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to continued war funding for Iraq.

I voted against the war and have never wavered in my opposition to the Administration’s misguided policies in Iraq. It has been a long and painful 5 year journey for the people of our country since the Administration acted preemptively and unilaterally to invade and occupy Iraq.

Military leaders, the best minds in foreign and economic policy, and the vast majority of the American people have been resoundingly clear: The Administration’s war-without-end policy is not a strategy for success.

As retired General William Odom, former Director of the National Security Agency under President Reagan and member of the National Security Council under President Carter stated, “Getting out of Iraq is the pre-condition for creating new strategic options.”

I cannot support war funding without a clear exit strategy in sight. It is bad for our troops, our country, and our standing in the world.

Mr. Speaker, support of today’s second amendment that includes a clear path out of Iraq, a plan that my constituents and the vast majority of Americans are demanding.

More than 5 years ago the President proclaimed “Mission Accomplished” in Iraq. Paradoxically, he insisted on a permanent U.S. presence there. And what exactly has this Administration “accomplished” in Iraq?

More than 4,000 U.S. soldiers have been killed and almost 30,000 injured; tens of thousands Iraqi civilian deaths; an emboldened Iran and new threats from Al Qaeda in the region; $519 billion taxpayer dollars spent and a future expenditure of some $3 trillion; a hobbled Iraqi government unable to provide clean water, medical care, jobs for its people, or pass critical oil sharing legislation; a U.S. military occupation of a country that is out of collapse and unable to press vigorously the critical fight in Afghanistan or respond to other crises in the world; and still no exit strategy.

With no end game in sight, the Administration and its supporters in Congress are complicit in a continuation of a failed policy which they insist on extending with a blank check policy to accompany it.

The President owes it to our brave men and women in Iraq and their families, he owes it to the American people, and he owes it to the citizens of Iraq not to leave this mess for the next President to finish.

This bill establishes a clear path out of Iraq.

The language requires the Administration to begin redeployment 30 days after enactment and requires Secretary Gates to submit to Congress within 90 days a report detailing plans to reduce and redeploy troops from Iraq. It prohibits sending troops to Iraq that are not assessed as “fully mission capable” of performing their assigned mission, and outlaw the presence of a permanent U.S. base there.

Additionally, this provision requires the Iraqi government to open 52,000 slots for every U.S. dollar spent for training and infrastructure construction and repair. Finally, it prohibits the intelligence community from subjecting detainees to interrogations not authorized by the U.S. Army Field Manual. This will essentially abolish the use of water torture and begin to restore America’s standing in the world community.

As a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence it is vital that we extend the ban on torture to the intelligence agencies. The President has said he will veto any ban on torture, clearly demonstrating his desire to reserve for himself the right to subject detainees to these horrendous techniques.

Congress has an obligation to make it clear that the American people do not believe in torture and will not allow it to continue. This amendment sets a decisive course out of Iraq, and begins to shift responsibilities to the Iraqi government. I urge my colleagues to heed the demands of the American people and support this strategy.

Mr. Speaker, I’m very pleased that the Appropriations Committee included two important provisions in today’s third amendment. First, it includes critical funding for Iraqi Christians and second, it modernizes and improves the G.I. bill.

I’m pleased that the amendment contains $10 million for vulnerable Iraqi minorities, including church dignitaries of Assyrians in Iraq could not be greater. A report produced by the Department of State on U.S. assistance to the Nineveh Plains in Iraq concluded that Christian minorities have experienced serious human rights abuses in the Nineveh Plains. The report also states that the region has absorbed a significant number of Christian internally displaced persons (IDPs) moving from the south, placing an economic burden in the area.

They are fleeing because they are being threatened and murdered in their home communities. Their priests are being executed, their churches burned, and their nuns threatened. In February of this year, Archbishop Paulos Rahho was abducted and murdered in Mosul.

While Assyrians only represented 5 percent of the total Iraqi population before the war, according to the United Nations today they comprise as much as 40 percent of the growing Iraqi refugees who have fled for their lives to Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey.

These families desperately need security, housing, jobs, schools and the chance to live in a sustainable community where they can openly practice their faith. This funding is essential to their survival.

Also included in this amendment is a modernization of the G.I. bill. The G.I. bill has been heralded as one of the most successful government programs in the history of our Nation. It gave millions of G.I.s the chance to go to college, many of whom were the first in their families to acquire a college education in their families. But the G.I. bill is over 54 years old and has not kept up with rising tuition costs.

According to a recent Department of Veterans Affairs (V.A.) survey, 18 percent of the veterans recently back from tours of duty are unemployed. Of those employed since leaving the military, 25 percent earn less than $21,840 a year. The survey also demonstrated that only 48.4 percent of the respondents took advantage of the G.I. bill and concluded that receiving the benefits of the current G.I. bill was not a strong predictor of successful employment outcomes.

This survey clearly demonstrates the need for this new G.I. bill. The amendment provides veterans with a maximum educational benefit equal to the highest tuition rate of a public college or university in their State, as well as a monthly stipend for housing. It also establishes a new program in which private educational institutions would make financial contributions toward veterans’ tuition, and the federal government would match those contributions.

When our veterans return from the battlefield, they should have every opportunity to enter the classroom and ultimately the civilian workforce. Our Nation needs these brave men and women to contribute to the growth and health of our economy and this new G.I. bill accomplishes this.

From development funding for Iraqi Christians to the creation of a new G.I. bill, this amendment addresses specific urgent needs for our Nation and world. The amendment is well crafted and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1197, the previous question is with the SPEAKER pro tempore.

The question of adoption of the motion is divided among the three proposed House amendments to the Senate amendment.

The first portion of the divided question is, Will the House concur in the amendment of the Senate with House amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110–636?

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.
Mr.メーカー, Speaker. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 328, I was in the well waving my "present" card. The Speaker clearly saw me and did not recognize me. Had I been recognized, I would have voted "present." So the first portion of the divided question was not adopted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

For: Mr. SALI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 328, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."
The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken; and the result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Chair will now put the question on the yeas and nays.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would have voted ‘aye’ on rollover 330. I was in a meeting and detained.
ounces; 20 inches long. I think she is the first Member of this House to leave an Armed Services markup to go into labor and deliver a child.

I send her good wishes from all of us.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

SECURITY ASSISTANCE AND ARMS EXPORT CONTROL REFORM ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2894, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTTIEREZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2894, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTH KOREAN HUMAN RIGHTS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5834, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5834, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, it’s my understanding we voice-voted the last vote while we were all talking, and therefore, there are no more votes for the day, and we are finished for the week. Have a good weekend.

There will be no votes on Monday, but there is business on Monday. If you have a suspension bill in which you are interested, you need to be here by 10 a.m. tomorrow. We have agreed that there would be no votes on Monday, but there will probably be 30 suspension bills considered on Monday. Whatever votes are asked for, we will roll until Tuesday. We will be meeting Tuesday at 10 o’clock.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 891 AND H. RES. 1131

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be removed as a cosponsor of both H.R. 891 and H. Res. 1131.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the request to the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow, and further, that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday, May 19, for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

ISRAEL’S 60th ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Israel on its 60th anniversary. While Israel is frequently cited as a model of democracy in the Middle East, I would like to focus on Israel’s advances in embryonic stem cell research.

The United States is still trying to fully harness the potential of this valuable research. We aim to cure debilitating diseases like Parkinson’s, diabetes, epilepsy, spinal injuries, and others. But for years at facilities like Hebrew University, Tel Aviv University, the Weizmann Institute, and many others, Israeli scientists have blazed a path for the rest of the world to follow. For 60 years, Americans and Israelis have built a friendship embracing all that we share, and as the United States works to unlock the promise of embryonic stem cell research, we find yet another reason our friend Israel is so special.

HONORING DALE JARRETT

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

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor NASCAR legend Dale Jarrett. This weekend marks the last race of NASCAR legend Dale Jarrett’s long career. May 17 at the All-Star race at Dover Motor Speedway will be his last time driving the UPS car.

Dale was born in Newton, North Carolina, my district, and got his start at the Hickory Motor Speedway, a track owned and operated by his father, another NASCAR legend, Ned Jarrett. Dale went on to compete in 668 races, winning 32 times with 260 top tens and 16 poles. What a career. And in 1999, he was a Winston Cup champ.

One of NASCAR’s greatest drivers is Dale Jarrett, and I’m proud to call him a constituent. My community is grateful for his service, honored by his presence, and again, grateful for his contribution in the charitable sector as well. NASCAR will miss him, but we’re still grateful to have him on TV. Here’s to Dale Jarrett.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I missed the vote on the Altamire amendment to the Waters housing bill last week. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMERICAN VOICES HAVE BEEN HEARD

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce to the American people that their voices have been heard.

Today, this House voted down the $180 billion war funding bill that the President requested. It is time now for Americans to be heard and for this Congress to move forward on the safe redeployment of our troops.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I offered amendments to declare the authorization of 2002 expired. I hope we will address that question and to announce or to establish a national day of honor in celebration to bring our troops home.

With the utilization of the $180 billion, we can begin an economic stimulus package that would include the work that the Congressional Black Caucus and Majority Whip CIRBY and myself have been supporting, and that is a two-year investment or $500 million for summer job programs.

This is an emergency. Our young people are finding the doors of opportunity
closed. Many of them support their families. They need money for books. We need a summer job program. With the defeat of this $180 billion spending program for the war, we can do better. The war should end. We’ve defeated the spending

WE NEED TO FIND SOLUTIONS TO OUR GROWING ENERGY NEEDS

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

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in the past few months, there’s been a lot of talk about high gasoline prices and talk about commonsense plans to lower these skyrocketing costs. Individuals and businesses across the Nation are suffering, Mr. Speaker, and there’s too much talk. Congress must take steps now to address our Nation’s energy needs. So today I’m proud to announce I’m an original cosponsor of H.R. 6001, the Main Street U.S.A. Energy Security Act of 2008.

This legislation is an action plan and our first step to energy independence. It will boost our national security by increasing domestic exploration, encouraging research in the area of alternative energy sources, and promoting clean nuclear energy.

Mr. Speaker, for decades the United States has not had a comprehensive energy policy. Now with gasoline prices eating up Americans’ paychecks, we need to find solutions to our growing energy needs. We have the resources and technology available to make energy independence a reality.

So no more talk, Mr. Speaker. It’s time to act and act today.

SUPPORT THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH IN EGYPT

(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, our government should fight for the release of a key prisoner of conscience, the first person in the Arab world convicted for what he peaceably wrote on his blog. This case has attracted strong international support and the personal interest of the President.

Last year, Egypt saw the deterioration of human rights and especially with regard to freedom of expression. Most troubling is the conviction and imprisonment of a young human rights activist and blogger, Abdel Kareem Nabil Soliman. Mr. Soliman, known for his Internet pen name Kareem Amer, was convicted for statements made on his personal Web log condemning Islamic extremism and the poor treatment of women and minorities. He was sentenced to 4 years in prison, and while we recognize what he said may have offended some, his conviction sets a dangerous precedent on the Internet.

On Saturday, the President will meet with President Mubarak. I urge Members to sign the letter to the President urging him to raise the case of Kareem Amer and to free this man, the first man in the Arab world convicted simply for what he said on his Internet Web log.

HONORING THE LIFE OF THOMAS BOGGS

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I was absent from this Chamber. Had I been here, I would have voted for Mr. FRANK’s bill and Ms. WATERS’ bill which dealt with the foreclosure crisis and the neighborhoods that have been affected thereby.

It was a difficult decision for me not to be here for I haven’t missed a day in my 2 years that I’ve been in the Congress, but a very dear friend of mine, Thomas Boggs, passed away, and I was asked to be a pallbearer at his funeral, which I was honored to do.

Thomas Boggs was one of the finest people that I’ve had the pleasure of knowing nearly 35 years. He was a leading citizen in Memphis, Tennessee, giving much to the community and charitable works to people, regardless of income, status or race. No matter where they came from, Thomas reached out to try to be good to them. He was very helpful with the Memphis Zoo, with raising money for the church health center that gives health care to people in need.

And his death was met with a lot of notice, notice that’s not normally reserved for an individual: above-the-fold first page of the Memphis Commercial Appeal, a lead editorial, and a cartoon.

He was a wonderful human being. He had a great sense of humor, and often he had many great friends. Even though we’re Congresspeople, we need to remember we’re citizens and humans and remember our friends on their last day.

DEMOCRATIC WIZARD BEHIND THE CURTAIN WAS REVEALED TODAY

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic wizard behind the curtain was revealed today.

Pulling open the curtain, they brought forward their proposal as to dealing with our troops. After being kept out of consideration of that which was being brought to the floor, Republicans decided to leave the Democrats to their own devices.

Left to their own devices, what do we have? No money for our troops, a cut-and-run policy, and extraneous funding being put on the bill. That’s the Democratic approach to our war and fighting those who would kill us in places overseas. No funds for the troops, a cut-and-run policy, and extraneous funding placed on it.

The wizard has been seen.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER, THE HONORABLE ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERLMUTTER) laid before the House the following communication from Katie Malone, Office of the Honorable ELLIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Member of Congress:


Hon. Nancy Pelosi,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a criminal trial subpoena for testimony issued by the District Court of Maryland for Baltimore County.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

KATIE MALONE.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

(Mr. ALLEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WINTER SOLDIER

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, earlier today the Congressional Progressive Caucus held an event called “Winter Soldier” where we honored our men and women in uniform who have returned as veterans. And then this afternoon, we were given another bite at the so-called apple, as if we were continuing the honor of these winter soldiers.

What happened this afternoon, what happened less than an hour ago was an amendment on the House floor to fund the Iraq-Afghanistan war until June of 2009 failed. It did not pass. It failed. Now, that is the way to honor our soldiers: stop paying for the President’s debacle, for the failed international policy, for the damages that
are being caused to our soldiers across the waters. That is the way to make up and honor winter soldiers.

So what is a Winter Soldier? In 1991, a courageous group of veterans of the Vietnam War took their cause to Washington. In an event called “Winter Soldier,” today, we honored that tradition, and we looked at a new generation of veterans and a new warfront, Iraq.

The event, which was organized with the Iraq Veterans Against the War, got to the heart of the issue: how this endless occupation is affecting our men and women in uniform and the Iraqi people themselves.

In recent months, we have heard from General David Petraeus, we have heard from Ambassador David Crocker, and we’ve heard a lot from the administration, all armed with PowerPoint presentations and colorful posters attempting to convince us that after 5 years we are finally making progress in Iraq.

That’s what made this morning so unique. This was an opportunity to hear from military brass but directly from the very soldiers who put their lives on the line to carry out the administration’s policies.

Today’s event was a continuation of Winter Soldier hearings that were organized earlier this year at the National Labor College in Silver Spring, Maryland. Over 3 days, dozens of veterans shared their personal stories and testified about their own experiences on the ground in combat in Iraq and Afghanistan.

These weren’t pundits or analysts talking about the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in the abstract. These were the stories, these were the testimonies of the men and women who had experienced the horrors of war up close and personal.

As I listened to the testimony this morning, I was struck that while each witness brought a unique and very personal perspective toward the occupation of Iraq, there was one consistent thread that connected each and every testimony: that the valor and sacrifice of our troops, and at almost every level, the administration’s strategy in Iraq has failed and continues to fail.

What a great response to these wonderful soldiers because today’s vote says exactly what we need to say: put an end to this war, reject a blank check to extend this occupation into another year, concentrate on funding the redeployment of our troops and the redeployment of our contractors.

We owe nothing less than that to those brave men and women in uniform and those who have been there before them, and we also owe nothing less than that to the Iraqi people.

ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, this evening I’m here to address the House and take a moment to talk about something that’s on my constituents’ minds and my mind and that’s energy policy. We have a real need for a strong energy policy in America. Actually, to go further, we need not just one energy policy in America, and we’ve not seen leadership out of Washington on this issue. Period.

In 2005, we had an energy act that was passed out of this Chamber, enacted into law, that said we need one energy policy in America, and we’ve not seen leadership out of Washington on this issue. Period.

Earlier this week, this House passed by a wide margin, thankfully, a bipartisan majority that I was happy to vote in favor of, to suspend the addition of more oil in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Now, this, according to most economists and folks that look at oil and energy production, according to them, it would reduce gas prices just a little bit. Well, the reason why it would reduce it just a little bit is because it would take less demand off the marketplace, thereby keeping the same supply that we have but reducing demand, and as such, as most people know with economics, when that happens prices fall.

I think we have to go one step further, and that one step further is increasing capacity. That means we have to have American energy production. That means off the deep waters of our coasts, we need to find oil and natural gas. In remote areas of Alaska, we need to harness the oil that is there. Whether it’s oil shale in the Rocky Mountain West or energy production and drilling in the Dakotas, I think these are the things we have to talk about, and Congress must put forward a bold initiative to do that.

And that’s the legislation that I have cosponsored here in this Chamber, to increase capacity and production.

But beyond that, I think most Americans know that simply getting more American oil is not enough. Getting more American natural gas is not enough. Increasing refineries here in the United States is not enough. It’s a start, but long term we have to have a massive investment, a 21st century Manhattan Project that harnesses our power and ingenuity here in the United States to end our reliance on foreign oil, and go one step further than that, end our reliance on oil. That should be a national priority.

Kennedy demanded that we put a man on the Moon before the end of the 1960s, and we did it. In a dire time, with the greatest war the world has ever known, we developed the Manhattan Project to produce a devastating weapon that would hopefully end all wars. That didn’t happen in terms of ending the war, but we did produce nuclear power and a nuclear weapon in a few short years.

We must have that same priority here in the United States and demand energy independence from the rest of the world by embracing our alternatives that we have here domestically, embracing our ingenuity, and going that final step to true energy independence. That’s what we should be about.

This should not be a partisan issue. We should have a bipartisan majority that says, yes, we will do these things, and we will do these things in a short period of time because that’s what the American people deserve.

My constituents are hurting. They have to drive automobiles. We don’t have mass transit in my district of any substantive form, really. So my constituents are hurting. And it’s a question about being able to take your kids to the beach this summer. Beyond that, many families are struggling just to buy food, keep shelter. I think we have to be very sensitive to the demands of our constituents and realize that they’re hurting. And energy and gas prices are the central reason why they’re hurting.

We have to get serious about this, put politics aside, and do what’s right for our American people. It’s the right thing for our American people. It’s the right thing for our economy. It’s the right thing for our future in the United States.

I look forward to us working together in a bipartisan way for true energy independence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Poe) is recognized for 5 minutes. (Mr. Poe addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ISRAEL’S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Israel’s 60th anniversary.

My first visit to Israel was in 1965. It was during the time of the Ethiopian airlift, before the first Intifada, before the second Intifada, and a decade before the tragic assassination of Prime Minister Rabin.

I can remember feeling deeply moved by the powerful mix of history, culture and religion, the sheer humanity that pulsed through the tiny nation of Israel and those charged with its stewardship. I riveted, too, that America’s stake in the existence and preservation of Israel was nearly as fundamental as the stake of Israel’s own citizens, not
just because of Israel's role as a stra-
tegic military ally in what is a notori-
ously unstable part of the world, al-
though that alone would justify the
maintenance of strong aid and assis-
tance to Israel, not just because of
Israel's status as the only true democ-
ry in the Middle East, although that,
too, would call upon the United States
to give its unwavering support. Beyond
those things, for many Americans
there is a deeper, usually unspoken
reason that the United States must
never depart from its staunch support
for the State of Israel. In the wake of
World War II and its tragic legacy for
the Jewish people, the existence of
Israel will always be a profound moral
and spiritual imperative for the United
States.

On a return trip just 2 years ago, I
had the opportunity to witness the
growth and change that has occurred
in Israel since my first visit a genera-
tion earlier. From the technology
being developed in the "Silicon Wadi"
to the advances in health care and
preservation of the ecosystem, Israel is
a model for other industrialized na-
tions.

Mr. Speaker, in the last 60 years,
Israel has demonstrated time and time
again its value to the world, not just in
global terms, but in what its peo-
ple have given us in ingenuity, innova-
tion and expression. This anniversary
offers us an occasion to thank the peo-
ple of Israel for their strength, their
courage, and their enormous contribu-
tions to our global community.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a
previous order of the House, the gen-
tleman from North Carolina (Mr. JON-
ES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(MR. JONES of North Carolina ad-
dressed the House. His remarks will ap-
pear in greater detail in the Extentions of
Remarks.)

OUTLAW BIRTHRIGHT CITIZENSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a
previous order of the House, the gen-
tleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO)
is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, CBS
News recently ran an expose on the
growing phenomenon of illegal aliens
entering the United States in order to
give birth to a child. The segment shed
some light on what has become an in-
creasingly costly burden to the United
States taxpayer.

An estimated 300,000 children of ille-
gal aliens are born in this country
every year, largely because of a mis-
guided policy of so-called "birthright
citizenship." This peculiar policy con-
fers U.S. citizenship on any child born
here regardless of what country their
parents are from or whether those par-
ents are legal in the United States al-
ready. We are one of few—in fact, we
may be the only country now that still
provides for this particular kind of citi-
zenship.

And it's based on a very strange sort
of interpretation of the 14th amend-
ment, one part of the 14th amendment
in particular. We all recognize of
that when the 14th amendment was
written there was no such thing as
illegal immigration. Certainly, there
would have been no reference to it in
the amendment itself. And what we
need to do, frankly, is to pass legisla-
tion in this House and in the Senate,
and the President needs to sign it, out-
lawing this practice and this habit,
really, that we have gotten into, which
is more than anything else a phe-
nomenon of custom more than it is of
actual law or analysis of the legal sys-
tem or the Constitution of the United
States. We should pass legislation to
outlaw it and let it be tested at the Su-
preme Court. It results not just in the
benefit for a child who is born as a U.S.
citizen, it also makes it easier for the
parent of that anchor baby or the ille-
gal alien to become a U.S. citizen
through that child.

The story on CBS focused on one
woman who had crossed over the Rio
Grande with her husband and two other
citizens to give birth in the United
States. She gave birth to a healthy 8-
pound baby just after American doctors performed a C-sec-
tion, a procedure that carries a price
tag of nearly $5,000, a bill that was sent
to the American taxpayer.

Joe Riley, the Mayor of the McAllen
Texas Medical Center near the Texas-
Mexico border, said this sort of thing is
quite typical. He told CBS News that he
had seen "mothers about to give birth
that walk up to the hospital still wet
from swimming across the river in ac-
tual labor, dirty, wet, cold, here to
have a child in the United States."

Mr. Riley's hospital alone is forced to
provide uncompensated care worth
more than $200 million each to cover
the cost of illegal alien
births that take place there annually.
Even more startling, that equates to
about 50 percent of all the births in
that hospital, meaning doctors are de-
ivering almost as many children for il-
egal aliens as they are for American
mothers. In California, alone, by the
way, the cost for illegal alien health
care, not just for the births of illegal
alien children, but the cost of health
care for illegal aliens is over $1 billi-
on a year; one State, over $1 billion a
year.

With statistics like that, Mr. Speak-
er, it should come as no surprise that
many American hospitals are on the
verge of collapse—some, in fact, have
gone that way—and that billions of
taxpayer dollars are being squandered
on illegal aliens that are taking advan-
tage of the health care program.

It's time we yank back the illegal
alien welcome mat, eliminate perverse
benefits for illegal immigration like
birth right citizenship and taxpayer
services for illegal aliens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a
previous order of the House, the gen-
tleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLI-
SON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(MR. ELLISON addressed the House.
His remarks will appear hereafter in
the Extentions of Remarks.)

TIME FOR AN OIL CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a
previous order of the House, the gentle-
woman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is rec-
ognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, tomor-
row, Friday, President Bush will visit
Saudi Arabia to meet with King
Abdullah and other key Saudi leaders.
According to the White House, the
President's visit will commemorate the
75th anniversary of the formal estab-
lishment of U.S.-Saudi relations.

Of course the underlying reason for
the trip to Riyadh is to beg the Saudis
to produce more oil. Faced with $4 a
gallon gasoline—it was $3.99 this
week in Ohio, and already over $4 in
many parts of our country—a pros-
pect which the President recently ques-
tioned would even happen, now the
President is reduced to begging the
Sauids, who literally have us over a
barrel.

Record-high gasoline prices are hurt-
ing American families, American
truckers and American businesses. The
average price of gasoline has more than
doubled since this President was placed
in office. Fuel costs now account for 40
percent of the average family's budget.
It is especially hard for people who
have to drive to work, such as people in
rural areas. It's hard for farmers and
truckers who have seen diesel prices
spiral way out of control.

And still we have no real leadership
on a new energy policy from this White
House, no policy for making our great
Nation less dependent on undemocratic
theocracies such as Saudi Arabia, and
no policy to move away from the car-
based economy and ease the pres-
sure on our fragile planet. Under
George W. Bush, America has gone
backwards.

Last year, the United States im-
ported 1.45 million barrels of crude oil
from Saudi Arabia every single day of
the year. Can you imagine that? 530
million barrels in 1 year. In fact, since
this President has taken office, we, as
a country, are importing a billion more
barrels a year, a billion more barrels a
year. Less independent, more depend-
ent.

It just so happens America is the
world's number one importer of crude
and Saudi Arabia is the world's number
one exporter. Fourteen percent of our
Nation's oil addiction is supplied just
by dealers in Saudi Arabia. That
doesn't count Kuwait and all the sur-
rounding countries, like Bahrain, et
cetera.

Last year, we imported $237 billion
worth of oil from the Middle East. That's
when the average price per barrel was
$64. This year, that number will probably top $300 billion, and rising.
For the first 3 months of this year, our crude oil imports totaled $76 billion, which is 63 percent above where it was a year ago. How much longer can this continue? I think the American people know how to answer that question: No more. They're saying no more.

This week, we will see another episode of this pitiful drama of the vice-grip relationship between Saudi Arabia and the United States. The House of Bush, represented by our President, will beg the House of Saud, represented by King Abdullah, to increase production as a short-term fix for America's growing energy deficit.

We ought to be bringing those dollars back here at home and have the same kind of commitment as we did when we landed a man on the Moon. We can do this as a country, we just need better leadership.

At every step, this Democratic Congress has tried to make a difference. In the Price Gouging Prevention Act, the Renewable Energy Act, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve Suspension Act, the Consumer Protection Act, and of course H.R. 6, to try to help launch energy independence for this country.

But yesterday, our House passed a farm bill with a billion dollar title to bring in bioenergy as an important part of the solution for the future.

As this lame duck Presidency fades, hopefully the next President of the United States will negotiate in earnest and help America develop an agenda for our oil independence, not continued subservience to human rights violators and undemocratic nations like Saudi Arabia.

This country is long overdue for a change, and it's definitely due for an oil change.

**SUNSET MEMORIAL**

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

Mr. FRANCIS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker I stand once again before this House with yet another Sunset Memorial.

It is May 15, 2008, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and before the sun set today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children were killed by abortion on demand. That's just today, Mr. Speaker. That's more than the number of innocent lives lost on September 11 in this country, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 12,897 days since the tragedy called Roe v. Wade was first handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 50 million of its own children. Some of them, Mr. Speaker, died and screamed as they did so, but because it was amniotic fluid passing over the vocal cords instead of air, no one could hear them.

And all of them had at least four things in common. First, they were each just little babies who had done nothing wrong to anyone, and each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each one of their mothers, whether she realizes it or not, will never be quite the same. And all the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever. Yet even in the glare of such tragedy, this generation still clings to a blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims, those yet unborn.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it's time for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves of why we are really all here. Thomas Jefferson said, "The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction, is the first and only object of good government." The phrase in the 14th Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution, it says, "No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of our innocent citizens and their constitutional rights is why we are all here.

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is the clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Everyone could hear the once and perhaps forever silenced voice of a baby when the truth that abortion really does kill little babies that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express.

And yet today another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We have failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American babies who died today without the protection we should have given them.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude in the hope that perhaps someone new who heard this Sunset Memorial tonight will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies; that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express. After that 12,897 days spent killing nearly 50 million unborn children in America is enough; and that the America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust is still courageous and compassionate enough to find a better way for mothers and their unborn babies than abortion on demand.

So tonight, Mr. Speaker, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are also numbered and that all too soon each one of us will walk from these Chambers for the very last time.

And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day to come, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries of innocent unborn children. May that be the day when we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our human and our constitutional duty to protect these, the least of our tiny, little American brothers and sisters from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

It is May 15, 2008, 12,897 days since Roe versus Wade first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children, this in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

A CLEAN SUPPLEMENTAL TO FUND OUR TROOPS

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon an extraordinary thing did happen when we had a vote on a supplemental with all kinds of strings attached to it to fund our troops in harm's way.

The Democrats have the majority. They have the ability to pass that funding without a bit of help from the Republicans.

Many of us on the Republican side of the aisle were quite concerned, however, with the strings, with the linkages that were made to this bill to help our troops do their job. One, for example, was that in the second amendment, which we knew would pass, provisions there existed to create hard and fast deadlines for pulling our troops out of Iraq.

We all want to see our troops home. We all want to see our troops back with us. And those of us who go over to Iraq and see them in harm's way, we long for the time of having them home completely. But the vast majority of those guys in record numbers re-enlist because they know they're doing good. They know they are making a difference. And when you go over there, you see it. I was in Kurdistan in December, in the northern area of Iraq. Construction booming, things going well.

We have made a difference with the surge. It is a profound difference. We have al Qaeda on the run. They're making last-ditch efforts to try to stop us. We're going on. We've got more people that are there working for themselves, more soldiers, more police trained than ever. There are really good things going on. And were we to pass a supplemental that was linked to that second amendment with the time deadlines, the message would be a message of hope for all those who hate us and want to destroy us. And that is: "If you will just hold on a little bit longer, we will have the Americans put their heads between the teeth and cowing away, as they did from Vietnam."

We could have won Vietnam; we can succeed in Iraq.

The great state of Iraq is so close to governing itself. Just like John Adams wrote to Abigail, what people have only dreamed of, governing themselves is so close, within our reach. We can't give it up now. It's so close. Iraq is there. We cannot hand our enemies and the Iraqi enemies and the enemies of liberty, this kind of win.

So we voted "present." If the Democrats had had enough votes, then they would have passed the supplemental by itself and it would have been linked to the second amendment that we go have required the time deadlines for withdrawal and would have given hope. As it was, we couldn't vote against our troops, many of us, but we voted "present." The first amendment that we took up this afternoon failed; so now we have got to come back with a clean supplemental to help our troops. And the
crud in there about the $52 billion tax hike at a time when the economy certainly can’t afford that, let’s get the linkage out to admitting and saying we are defeated, we can’t win, giving our enemies a victory, get all of that stuff out of here. No more linkages like that. No more tax hikes. Just a clean supplemental to give our troops the wherewithal to do what they need to succeed. That’s the message we needed coming out of today. And that’s why so many of us voted as we did. We voted for victory for our troops.

And I will never forget the words of Travis Buford’s mother. Travis was killed over in Iraq. And as I stood near his coffin with his mother, it was an emotional time, and I said, “Is there anything I can do?”

She gritted her teeth and she said, “Tell the Congress to shut up and let the military do their job.”

That’s what we need to do. Let the military have the wherewithal to succeed, without the linkages to fail so that we can keep our head held high and, what’s more, perhaps go 7 more years without being attacked here.

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

(Mr. McDermott addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FIVE REASONS WHY THE AIR FORCE’S DECISION TO AWARD AIRBUS A CONTRACT DOES NOT ADD UP

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

Mr. Inslee. Mr. Speaker, before I start, I want to express my honor for the gentleman from Colorado in the chair today, who did extraordinary work in leading the Congress to green building standards and the introduction of a bill today, and I appreciate his leadership on this. Thank you for leading on this issue.

I come to the floor today to address my concerns about this misbegotten decision by the U.S. Air Force to ignore great work by Americans with a conscience, including the Boeing 767 aerial refueling tanker, in fact, sending American tax dollars and American jobs out to Europe. And I want to express the five reasons why this decision does not add up.

There is a particular odor about this decision. It needs to be revisited one way or another. We need to have an American tanker built by American workers to be fair to American service personnel and taxpayers both, and I want to go through the five reasons why this decision does not add up.

Reason number one: There is no sense on this green Earth why the American Government has sued the Airbus Government, asserting that they have violated international trade laws because they received illegal billion dollar subsidies, and at the same time another agency of the Federal Government, the Air Force, turns its back on American industry. It’s clear that same corporation that our own government has declared is acting illegally contrary to international and American law—turns around and gives them a $40 billion contract. It is not fortunate that at least one congressman in the other Chamber specifically said that we can’t take into consideration these subsidies. It is absolutely ludicrous for the American Government to sue this company in one court, saying they violated law, and then turn around and give them $40 billion. That’s exactly what has happened here. It makes no sense. This does not add up.

Reason number two: Boeing has been building these tankers successfully, hundreds of tanker new builds built in factories that do not exist, in multiple countries with a supply chain that has never been proven. We cannot and should not tolerate that risk of this risky decision.

Reason number three: What it this does not add up: It does not add up because all estimates have concluded that the Boeing 767 is 24 percent more fuel efficient overall, looking at all the emission statements, 24 percent more fuel efficient. Well, for anyone who has gone to the pump recently, let me suggest that it doesn’t make sense to be buying a product that is a gas guzzler when we know that fuel prices are going only in one direction. A study by the Air Transport Association—Decker analyst company concluded that by going with Boeing instead of this Airbus monstrosity, we would save the American taxpayers $30 billion in fuel costs. At the same time when we’re trying to wring efficiencies to deal with global warming and reduce fuel costs, this decision is buying the gas guzzler rather than the fuel-efficient aircraft. This does not add up.

Reason number four: The Air Force basically decided better. Bigger is not always better. They said they told Boeing and Airbus that they wanted a medium-size plane. Boeing provided them a medium-size plane. In the middle of this process, they decided they wanted a bigger plane. Bigger is not always better, and I will tell you why. It’s going to cost the American taxpayers over $2 billion to remodel all of these hangars all across America to try to fit this large airplane in. This is real money from real taxpayers that was not included in the lifecycle costs. It does not add up.

And the fifth reason is lifecycle costs. The Air Force, what they did was they looked at original acquisition costs and downplayed the lifecycle costs associated with fuel costs, maintenance costs, hangar remodeling, and all the other things associated with these airplanes. When you make an acquisition for the American taxpayers, you need to look at the entire lifecycle costs, not just the upfront acquisition costs. It does not add up.

So here are five reasons that this Congress ought to get up on our hind legs and blow the whistle on this mistake. We need to change this decision. We need to change this decision.

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.)

MARRIAGE

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

Mr. Broun. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the California Supreme Court threw aside the voice and the express will of millions of California voters by overturning California’s State law that banned same-sex marriage. This effectively this ruling allows same-sex couples in our Nation’s most populous State the right to marry and affords them all the privileges that go along with this sacred union. And I say that rulings like this are one of the reasons why the institution of marriage is crumbling before our very eyes. And I, for one, am very sad to see this happen.

The main issue is whether the status of marriage will be determined by justice or by the ballot box. I am extremely concerned about how activists use the courts to legislate on something that has been settled in American law for more than 200 years. Furthermore, the people of California made it abundantly clear back in 2000 that they reject same-sex marriage.

Then comes along four judges who apparently believe that they’re wiser than over 4/5 million voters in their State. Proposition 22 got over 61 percent of the vote; yet it was dismissed by four lone dictators. I condemn this ruling in the strongest possible way. I condemn it because the court is legislating from the bench. I condemn it because it is a reprehensible action that is not consistent with history or with common sense.

This lunacy is precisely the reason why a Federal constitutional amendment is needed to protect traditional marriage. This decision will undoubtedly become the platform for spreading the unfounded ruling across the Nation. On the Federal stage, there’s a constitutional remedy for Federal judges...
that are involved in this type of activist behavior and legislating from the bench. Every single Federal judge takes an oath to uphold the Constitution. When they fail to do so and let their own whims and ideological positions interfere with applying the Constitution, not interpreting but applying, these judges have failed to fulfill their term of good behavior, and they should be fired by impeachment.

Likewise Californians that are outraged, like I am, should be up in arms and should take action to initiate a referendum to pass a State constitutional amendment to enforce their will and overturn these judges’ despicable opinions, and these judges deserve to be censured or sent home for bad behavior.

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

(Mr. HOLZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SUBSIDIARITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak about the role of government in our collective political lives and of the relationship between such government and civil society.

It has been 219 years since this new constitutional republic formally entered the international stage. In 2008 I am privileged to stand in this historic Chamber of the United States House of Representatives in the second session of the 110th Congress. We should, representative and citizen alike, take great pride in our collective perseverance. Our longevity and survival as the numerically and geographically largest and most prosperous republican form of government in recorded human history is a testimony to the strength of this polity.

An important part of that proud history has been our commitment to seriously debating the contours of any entity which we constitute to exercise power over the source and content of self-government: that is, “We the People.” In other words, we must continue to ask ourselves, what is the proper scope and role of governmental powers in and around our liberty should be.

Subsidiarity. It has been defined as the belief that “a community of a higher order should not interfere with the life of a community of a lower order, thereby taking over its function.” Subsidiarity holds that nothing should be done by a larger and more complex organization which can be done as well by a smaller and simpler organization. In other words, any activity which can be performed by a more decentralized body should be.

This principle is a bulwark of limited government and personal freedom.” Other intellectual and philosophic traditions have spoken of sphere sovereignty, principle pluralism and federalism. But behind these complex-sounding terms is a simple fact, understandable by each of us, that there should be a proportional relation between the proximity of an individual and the amount of power of any governmental entity, be it local, county, State or Federal, may possess in relation to them.

In other words, that government which is closest to us is usually the best government for which we should give function. Let me give the analogy of a human body. If you would say the body politic is like a human body, we would say that a healthier body politic is one which, like the human body, is infused with activity, or energy. In other words, if you had a human body, and you had oxygenated blood that only went to 90 percent of it, that 10 percent might very well die and be considered unhealthy.

If you would have 100 percent of the oxygenated blood go to the brain, the rest of the body would therefore die. Similarly, with the body politic, if all the power and all the energy is visited here in Washington, D.C., the rest of the body politic tends to wither. It loses its energy. It loses its enthusiasm. And ultimately, it withers and dies.

Thus, as citizens, we do not, or should not, think it wise nor reasonable to immediately ask the Federal Government, the unit of government that is most distant from our lives, to advance the general welfare, including preeminently, protecting people’s fundamental rights and basic liberties.

At first blush, this classic formulation, or combination of classic formulations, seems to grant vast and sweeping powers to public authority. Yet, in truth, the general welfare, the common good, requires that government be limited. Government’s responsibility is...
primary when the questions involving defending the Nation from attack and subversion, protecting people from physical assaults and various other forms of depredation, and maintaining public order. In other words, however, its role is subsidiarity. To support the work of the families, religious communities, and other institutions of civil society that shoulder the primary burden of forming upright and decent citizens, caring for those in need, encouraging people to meet their responsibilities to one another while also discouraging them from harming themselves or others.

Subsidiarity, then, is formed upon a commitment to the rule of law so that in our various spheres of societal life, anarchy and normlessness do not start to behave as if they have defined the rules of engagement in the fields of activity once and for all.

The commitment to the rule of law makes plain why an appropriate understanding of the limited judicial function is so important in democratic self-government. As Judge Andrew Kleinfeld of the 9th Circuit has written, "a question is important does not imply that it is constitutional. The Founding Fathers did not establish the United States as a democratic republic so that elected officials would decide trivia, while all great questions would be decided by the judiciary. That an issue is important does not mean that the people, through their democratically elected representatives, do not have the power to decide it. One might suppose that all general rules in a democratic republic would be the opposite, with a few exceptions."

Thus, when I hear that my friends on the other side of the aisle asked the Supreme Court Justice nominees whether, in the course of their tenure, they are going to "expand freedom" or constrict freedom, and when I hear current declamations that nominees need to understand it is their duty, their job, their purpose, as judges to "stand up for economic and social justice," I am incredulous as to what these words and terms mean. Freedom for whom? Freedom to do what? To whom? Whose interpretation of economic justice should be "stood up?" Whose interpretation of social justice? How do these ends relate to the role of a judge, which is to rule on specific cases, not engage in abstract, roving, philosophic speculations?

The need for a constitutional framework, and an appreciation for the complexity of society, which genuine subsidiarity inherently takes for granted, demand better.

While what I have outlined provides the legal framework and structural timber for the division of power and cultivation of society, we the citizens are nevertheless the most important factors in such a commitment to subsidiarity. Subsidiarity requires a commitment by the citizens of the republic to comport themselves with self-restraint, with virtue and with respect for one's fellow citizens.

As the father of our Constitution, James Madison, exclaimed, "to suppose that any form of government will secure liberty and happiness without virtue in the people is a chimerical idea. We do not depend on or put confidence in our rulers, but in the people who are to choose them."

M. Stanton Evans points out that "the reasoning of the Founders in this area was identical to that provided for Edmund Burke contemporaneously in England. A government required of the populace the prerequisite of respect for others, restraint upon the passions. Virtue was thus a necessary precondition to a regime of freedom, and a Nation that lost its religious moralities was considered ripe for tyranny. Conversely, since religious belief and ethical conduct were matters of volition, the Founders also believed that liberty was integral to ideas of virtue."

Thus, in order for subsidiarity to remain viable, we, as citizens, must work to cultivate the proper virtues within ourselves as well as strive to be meaningful in the lives of those around us, usually starting with our families, our friends, our community, neighbors and our fellow employees.

On the other hand, society would not endure were each citizen to take upon himself or herself the maximum amount of criminal activity possible. Rampant and widespread destruction would lead to nihilistic physical and cultural chaos. Greater resources would then be needed to attempt to contain and mitigate such behavior. The people's health, safety and likelihood of perpetuating society by bringing future generations into life would become severely constricted and diminished.

George Will in his masterful work "Statecraft As Soulcraft" explained, it is obvious that the restraining strength of individual religious and social conventions must be inversely proportional to the strength of restraints enforced by law."

In addition to these individual consequences, the collective consequence of our view of government as one people would be tarnished. As Will again tells us, "regardless of democratic forms, when people are taught by philosophy and the social climate that they need not govern their actions by calculations, they will come to blame all social shortcomings on the agency of collective considerations, the government, and will absolve themselves."

Now in stark contrast, subsidiarity not only respects the various institutions and complexities laden throughout collective society, it also allows time for proper and respective maturations to take place. As George Will writes in regard on the bloodshed of mid-18th century America, "that the Nation was not at Lincoln’s lifetime was that the social cohesion which proceeds from shared adherence to a public philosophy and shared emulation of exemplary behavior and values is not the result of spontaneous combustion. It takes work. But by whom? And with what? Such work is done with laws and other institutions. It is a citizenry working on itself, on its self, collectively; on its selves, individually. It is applied political philosophy.

It is important to re-emphasize here that subsidiarity offers no congratulatory pat-on-the-back for its citizens. As genuine humility and an honest appraisal of humanity attest, we are all flawed works in progress. Aristotle observed that man "is the best of all animals when perfected, so he is the worst of all when sundered from law and justice because man is born possessing weapons for the use of wisdom and virtue, which it is possible to employ entirely for the opposite sends ends."

The dry wit of that great English parliamentarian and political philosopher Edmund Burke is instructive when he notes that "the effect of liberty is that individuals may do what they please; we ought to see what it will please them to do, before we risk congratulations."

As Madison and Lincoln, two of our most prescient American statesmen might explain, because men are not angels, government is necessary, yet we must constantly appeal to the better angels of our nature, for failure to do so would result in the crushing of our intrinsic nature and the invaluable and incomparable dignity of our fellow man.

My friends, subsidiarity is an important, and some would say indispensable, philosophy not only for the reasons I already cited, but also because of the flexibility it allows the leaders, the statesmen, of such a multifaceted republic. Such statesmen do understand the nature of law. We know that law is much more than a mere necessary evil or a clever contrivance or potent pay-back mechanism for partisan gains. No, Law is nurturing. Law is conforming. Law is inculcating.

As genuine humility and an honest appreciation of the nature of law. We know that law is incomparable dignity of our fellow angels when perfected, so he is the worst of all when sundered from law and justice because man is born possessing weapons for the use of wisdom and virtue, which it is possible to employ entirely for the opposite sends ends."

As the father of our Constitution, James Madison, exclaimed, “to suppose that any form of government will secure liberty and happiness without virtue in the people is a chimerical idea. We do not depend on or put confidence in our rulers, but in the people who are to choose them.”

M. Stanton Evans points out that “the reasoning of the Founders in this area was identical to that provided for Edmund Burke contemporaneously in England. A government required of the populace the prerequisite of respect for others, restraint upon the passions. Virtue was thus a necessary precondition to a regime of freedom, and a Nation that lost its religious moralities was considered ripe for tyranny. Conversely, since religious belief and ethical conduct were matters of volition, the Founders also believed that liberty was integral to ideas of virtue.”

Thus, in order for subsidiarity to remain viable, we, as citizens, must work to cultivate the proper virtues within ourselves as well as strive to be meaningful in the lives of those around us, usually starting with our families, our friends, our community, neighbors and our fellow employees.

On the other hand, society would not endure were each citizen to take upon himself or herself the maximum amount of criminal activity possible. Rampant and widespread destruction would lead to nihilistic physical and cultural chaos. Greater resources would then be needed to attempt to contain and mitigate such behavior. The people’s health, safety and likelihood of perpetuating society by bringing future generations into life would become severely constricted and diminished.

George Will in his masterful work “Statecraft As Soulcraft” explained, it is obvious that the restraining strength of individual religious and social conventions must be inversely proportional to the strength of restraints enforced by law.”

In addition to these individual consequences, the collective consequence of our view of government as one people would be tarnished. As Will again tells us, “regardless of democratic forms, when people are taught by philosophy and the social climate that they need not govern their actions by calculations, they will come to blame all social shortcomings on the agency of collective considerations, the government, and will absolve themselves.”

Now in stark contrast, subsidiarity not only respects the various institutions and complexities laden throughout collective society, it also allows time for proper and respective maturations to take place. As George Will writes in regard on the bloodshed of mid-18th century America, “that the Nation was not at Lincoln’s lifetime was that the social cohesion which proceeds from shared adherence to a public philosophy and shared emulation of exemplary behavior and values is not the result of spontaneous combustion. It takes work. But by whom? And with what? Such work is done with laws and other institutions. It is a citizenry working on itself, on its self, collectively; on its selves, individually. It is applied political philosophy.”

It is important to re-emphasize here that subsidiarity offers no congratulatory pat-on-the-back for its citizens. As genuine humility and an honest appraisal of humanity attest, we are all flawed works in progress. Aristotle observed that man “is the best of all animals when perfected, so he is the worst of all when sundered from law and justice because man is born possessing weapons for the use of wisdom and virtue, which it is possible to employ entirely for the opposite sends ends.”

The dry wit of that great English parliamentarian and political philosopher Edmund Burke is instructive when he notes that “the effect of liberty is that individuals may do what they please; we ought to see what it will please them to do, before we risk congratulations.”

As Madison and Lincoln, two of our most prescient American statesmen might explain, because men are not angels, government is necessary, yet we must constantly appeal to the better angels of our nature, for failure to do so would result in the crushing of our intrinsic nature and the invaluable and incomparable dignity of our fellow man.

My friends, subsidiarity is an important, and some would say indispensable, philosophy not only for the reasons I already cited, but also because of the flexibility it allows the leaders, the statesmen, of such a multifaceted republic. Such statesmen do understand the nature of law. We know that law is much more than a mere necessary evil or a clever contrivance or potent pay-back mechanism for partisan gains. No, Law is nurturing. Law is conforming. Law is inculcating.

As J. Budziszewski has written, “we know at least that the law cannot be neutral. Everything a government does it founded on some understanding of what is good. Moreover, no law that has effect at all can fail to have effect on character.”

Furthermore, true statesmen and women and leaders are discerning, wise and prudent. Again, George Will has observed that statesmen who are uninterested in the ideas that shape the expectations and tolerances of the citizenry, are statesmen governed by forces they cannot comprehend.
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Such statesmen are apt to think they have more range for effective action than they actually have, and they are apt to have less than they would were they more aware of the connections between the life of the mind and the life of society.
Twenty-seven years ago, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan wrote that he had served in the cabinet or subcabinet of four presidents. He said, “I do not believe I have ever heard at a cabinet meeting a serious discussion of political ideas. I do not think there is much concern within the cabinet for the way men, rather than markets, behave. These are the necessary first questions of government. The Constitution of the United States is an immensely intricate judgment as to how man will be...”

The principle of subsidiarity helps such intermediate organizations and individuals make such determinations and meet such needs. Economically, subsidiarity encourages us to reaffirm the time-tested virtue of the long-run exchange of goods and services, known from market capitalism, as well as the virtues of the industrious employee and diligent citizen. Subsidiarity requires us to not immediately seek a Federal solution to every local, county or State problem. It teaches us to be cognizant of the fact that the laws of economics. The laws of supply and demand cannot be suspended.

Subsidiary reminds us life is not easy, and affluence is not as abundant as the air we breathe, that each of us, as many of our forefathers and ancestors did, must sacrifice, strive, delay gratifying our immediate wants and desires, and develop our skills and attributes, which most enable us to provide a valuable service or good to the rest of society in return for appropriate compensation.

Subsidiary reminds us life is not easy, and affluence is not as abundant as the air we breathe, that each of us, as many of our forefathers and ancestors did, must sacrifice, strive, delay gratifying our immediate wants and desires, and develop our skills and attributes, which most enable us to provide a valuable service or good to the rest of society in return for appropriate compensation.

We, the people, have the capacity to deny or control these destructive tendencies. Properly considered, subsidiarity teaches us to probe for ways to provide the time and capital needed for creative inventions and products to germinate. It teaches us to strive to provide for the needs of our own respective and concentric circles of responsibility. While adjusting to ever-changing demand and supply chains.

These lessons are especially apt today as ideas and energy have replaced capital and labor as the central pillars of economic thought and comparative advantage. If our children and grandchildren are to compete successfully in this new world, we must aggressively seek innovative ways to attract investors and manufacturers.

Yet rather than harnessing the great potential, it seems that some believe that businesses, markets and profits are, by nature, evils unto themselves. Recently we had a candidate for the President of the United States threaten to take profits from private industry.

To the contrary, it has become an almost universal judgment that on the level of individual nations’ international relations, the free market is the least efficient instrument for utilizing sources and effectively responding to needs. We all recognize, says Father Richard John Neuhaus has written, that the State has an important ancillary role in providing a framework of law and order in which people can attend to the business that is properly theirs, but note the word “ancillary,” not “primary.” It is thus an affront to human dignity to repress the humankind that brings excitement, as much as fear and adversity or anxiety. The principle of subsidiarity helps us to appreciate this as the first word, as if it represented a perversive combination of a belief in unicorns with a draconianism of State-funded medieval indulgences have ridiculed this endeavor as a corruptly—oh—divine, power grab given patronage and power to theocratic institutions in our society, but nothing is further from the truth.

The faith-based initiative is merely an endeavor to treat faith-based charitable entities within the faith-based initiative, some belonging on the first word, as if it represented a perversive combination of a belief in unicorns with a draconianism of State-funded medieval indulgences have ridiculed this endeavor as a corruptly—oh—divine, power grab given patronage and power to theocratic institutions in our society, but nothing is further from the truth.

A true appreciation for subsidiarity may encourage parishes and such situated to kindly and gently admonish and encourage our various theological traditions and establishments to meet the humanitarian and simple life needs of their fellow men and women. Perhaps larger and more elaborate parking lots, gymnasiums, multimedia screens are not only for the homeless, those without clothing, the hungry, the starving or the repentant prisoner about to enter society.
committed and exclusive love of their parents for each other. Anyone who believes in limited government should strongly back government support for the family. Does this sound paradoxical? In the face of a strong marriage culture, families fail to form, and when they do form, they are often unstable. Absentee fathers become a serious problem, out-of-wedlock births are common and a train of social pathologies ensue. With families failing to perform their health, education and welfare functions, the demand for government grows, whether in the form of greater policing, or as a provider of other social services. Bureaucracies must be created and they inexorably expand. Indeed, they become powerful lobbyists for their own preservation and expansion.

Everyone suffers with the poorest and most vulnerable suffering the most. That’s why I have advocated a constitutional amendment on the Federal level to enshrine the historic complimentary definition of marriage.

All citizens must be afforded their civil rights and equal treatment under the law. That should be and are avenues whereby privileges, including visitation, inheritance and other rights can be extended to any individuals seeking to live together either through familiar or necessary bonds of friendship. How those extensions should never be based on or related to sexual behavior, for to do so would thereby change our definition of what marriage is, simultaneously turning the children of parents in this society as a means to their own gratification is the epitome of entitlements from their government, in which its citizens are merely consuming how much of their earned income they do not give to such policymakers, is a republic with a troubling future.

To abide by this commitment we must understand that limited government does not mean inactive government, does not mean simply passive reactive government, does not even, given certain circumstances, have to mean small government. Let us face the fact our justly used military was exponentially higher than other times of nonwaffe spending.

We must understand that limited government means a commitment to the role of law, not the rule of man. We must understand that a communitarianism that ascertains its supposed community and communal aspects from what is dictated and forced through Federal bonds and through independence on the Federal Treasury, is no authentic communitarianism at all.

We must understand that each of us lose the sense of confiscation which occurs daily in our Tax Code when costs are disbursed. There are few centers here and a few dollars there are ignored, and, thus, all eyes turn to our Nation’s Capital as if it were some giant piggy bank or money tree continuously sprouting new currency bills, dropping seeds of capital and supplying jobs, as if such things were not the exchanges of goods and services we make of citizens but, no, easily dispensed commodities which exist in some filled-to-the-brim barrel labeled “jobs” in the center of Capitol or the White House.

We must understand that it cannot be more efficient to send all of our tax dollars to Washington D.C., only to turn right back through a maze of confusion and delay to meet the need that could have been met earlier and within closer and, thus, more efficient proximity. We must understand the republic in which we policymakers demonstrate our purported passion for constituents by promising to meet all the needs of each of them, while the constituents demonstrate their compassion by being声明 their earned income they do not give to such policymakers, is a republic with a troubling future.

We must understand that a republic in which its citizens are merely content to receive regular disbursements of entitlements from their government and no longer strive to meet those same needs of their fellow citizens, is a republic in need of renewal.

We must understand that there are some things the Federal Government should be and should do. Providing for the public safety and protecting the homeland are vital for nation-states whose existence would be pointless were there boundaries and territorial integrity to be compromised and ignored.

We must understand that a republic in which the Federal entity confiscates more and more income from its citizens so that they can no longer freely give to their houses of worship, to their favored charitable organizations, to their family and friends in need, to the strangers and persons in close proximity to them who can most rapidly assist, is a republic in need of renewal.

We must understand that when any meager attempt to limit or scale back Federal budget now totaling at trillion and an administrative state which has proven virtually impossible to shrink is met with accusations of cruelty, disdain, and charges of callousness, we are on an unsustainable course.

We must understand that we are not atomistic individuals utterly without need of social capital. We are not “uncumbered selves.” As men and women, mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, friends and acquaintances, we know that families and communities should receive priority over large and ever more removed entities. We know that the economic, political, and cultural aspects of society cannot be separated into distinct and separate spheres. They are intertwined. Proper economic activity presupposes certain cultural assumptions. Political activity can enshrine the necessary and proper economic fundamentals of a capitalistic system.

We must understand that local, State and Federal Governments are not omniscient repositories of unassailable wisdom all of the time. That’s why the voluntary and intermediate associations of society are so important: the places of worship which also do so many acts of compassion, the charitable organizations, the community organizations, the “little platoons of society” assisting, nurturing, training, developing, and shaping the individuals of this land.
Unfortunately, some view all “government” as oppression. Possibly necessary oppression, but oppression none-theless. This too is mistaken. A commitment to subsidiarity provides a useful antidote to such fundamentally flawed, pessimistic and cynical thinking.

We as Representatives and we as citizens should live in a polity which is constantly probing, analyzing, imagining, how to conserve what is good about the past and present while making the future a better, more fulfilling place for those that come before us.

Mr. Speaker, the Preamble to our Constitution states: “We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”

Establish justice. Insure domestic tranquility. Provide for the common defense. Promote the general welfare. Secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

It is so much more. How are we then to govern ourselves spread across this vast, spacious, and diverse republic? It would do no harm to renew our commitment and endeavor to further understand the dimensions of subsidiarity.

As Michael Sandel has reminded us in great detail, this self-governing Republic has constantly been asking itself what the good life, the good society, and the good citizen is, should be, and can be, since its founding—a time before automobiles, telephones, televisions or the Internet. Let us never lose this perspective. After all, commonsense and reason adamently demonstrate that unlimited vice and unfindable virtue will lead to greater resources being needed, greater unsustainable commitments being made, and greater constrictions being placed on our individual liberty. The strengthening of, and a reapprciation for, subsidiarity will help us all avoid such a fate.

Mr. Speaker, you and others may have seen a great and inspiring movie which had the simple title “Amazing Grace.” William Wilberforce, who lived from 1759 to 1833 and was the great English abolitionist protagonist in that fine and very moving film, not only helped end the African slave trade in this country, but he was part of 69 various societal groups as part of his effort at a societal-wide “reformation of manners and morals” in England. It later became known as the Victorian Period, but he saw 13 and 14-year-old prostitutes on the streets of London, and most of society walking by and saying that is the way it has been, and that’s the way it is going to be. But, that way, we can change it. When he did that, he engaged these nongovernmental entities in his effort to make those changes because he understood the principle of subsidiarity as it existed and worked well in so many different organizations, and understood that if he was going to change the government, he had to change the culture. He had to change the people’s hearts and minds, and that you just couldn’t do it with government, you had to do it in fact with all of these organizations, from the families all of the way up to government.

So let us today, in a different century and in a different country, nonetheless think anew how to encourage all citizens to view ourselves as not just cogs in a Federal wheel but as vibrant members, as “little platoons” ourselves, of our respective spheres of life, wherever we find us.

As Americans, Mr. Speaker, we have much of which to be proud. It was recently written that “the United States is creating the first universal nation, made up of all colors, races, and creeds, living and working together in considerable harmony.” Let us hope that is true. Let us always be committed to “living and working together in considerable harmony.” If we are concerned about liberty, justice, social or otherwise, and the good life, we do it with government, you had to do it in fact with all of these organizations, from the families all the way up to government.

It is not an easy task for we are Representatives at the Federal level, but I think if we exercised humility and a proper understanding of the organization of our stupendous capacity of individuals to do good when properly directed, and properly self-directed, then we can rise to that challenge.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CUMMINGS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today from 12 p.m. until 2 p.m.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today. (The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. McHENRY, for 5 minutes, May 22.
Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SABRANES, for 5 minutes, today.

(These Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:) Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes.
Mr. TANCHERO, for 5 minutes.
Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes.
Mr. BROWN of Georgia, for 5 minutes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Ms. Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6022. An act to suspend the acquisition of petroleum for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o’clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 16, 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:

6624. A letter from the President and CEO, Bay Area Council Economic Institute, transmitting the Council’s report entitled, “A Human Capital in the Bay Area: Why an Educated, Flexible Workforce is Vital to Our Economic Future?”; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

6625. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a copy of proposed legislation to amend Section 145 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (AEA) to ensure that in national security or public health and safety emergency situations the Department of Energy (DOE) has the authority to share Restricted Data with persons not in possession of a DOE “Q” or “L” security clearance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6626. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s Report to Congress on Postmarket Surveillance of Medical
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pursuant to Public Law 101-162, section 609(b); jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 5860. A bill to direct the Election Assistance Commission to establish a program to make grants to participating States and units of local government to administer a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2008 for carrying out a program to make backup paper ballots available in the case of the failure of a voting system or voting equipment in the election or some other emergency situation, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-657). Referred to the committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3819. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to reimburse veterans receiving emergency treatment in non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities for such treatment until such veterans are transferred to Department facilities, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 5554. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand and improve health care services available to veterans from the Department of Veterans Affairs for substance use disorders, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110-650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 5554. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a longitudinal study of the vocational rehabilitation programs administered by the Secretary; with an amendment (Rept. 110-640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 5664. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to update at least once every 5 years the plans and specifications for specially adapted housing furnished to veterans by the Secretary; with an amendment (Rept. 11-641). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2790. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the transparency and accountability of Federal advisory committees, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110-650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 5867. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Reform Act to increase the transparency and accountability of Federal advisory committees, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110-650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 5876. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance authorities with regard to real property that has yet to be reported excess, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110-649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WATERs (for himself, Mr. GUTIERREz, Mr. WATT, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts): H.R. 6062. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit the use of consumer reports and consumer information in making any contract concerning personal lines of insurance with respect to a consumer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. BARTLETT of Nevada (for himself, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. FERENcy): H.R. 6063. A bill to authorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. DOCHERTY, Mr. REICHER, Ms. CORCORAN Brown of Florida, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON-Lee of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. MOORE of Virginia, Mr. Pomroy, Mr. POw of Nevada, Mr. T. SÁNCHEz of California, Mr. SCHARKOWSKY, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCHWARTZ, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. GONZALEz):

H.R. 6064. A bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Silver Alert plans throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GUTIERREz of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 6065. A bill to promote green schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. WATT, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 6066. A bill to require, for the benefit of shareholders, the disclosure of payments to foreign governments for the extraction of natural resources, to allow such shareholders more appropriately to determine associated risks; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LAMPSOn (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SHAYs, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. CRAWFORD of Kentucky, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. HILL, Mr. GIFFORDS, Mr. BOsWELL, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of North Carolina, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. KAGEN, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 6067. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to help reduce the oil prices to consumers to reduce the cost of petroleum acquisition for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, to better match the composition of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to refinery requirements for the United States, to fund energy research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, 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. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MATSU, and Mr. JEFFERSON):

H.R. 6068. A bill to establish a grant program to assist States in inspecting hotel rooms for bed bugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. GUTIERREz, Mr. WATT, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts): H.R. 6062. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit the use of consumer reports and consumer information in making any contract concerning personal lines of insurance with respect to a consumer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. FERENcy):
By Mr. CAMPBELL of California: H. Res. 6069. A bill to provide additional emergency and enhanced enforcement authority to the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DEKLE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. THORNBERY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. MCCLUSKEY, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. DENT, Mr. HECHT, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. LATTA, Mr. DEKLE of South Carolina, Mr. TERRY, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. GINGERLY, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SUESS, Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. FREDERICK, Mr. BOHRER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. NOGERSBAUER, Mrs. BLACKBURNE, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CURIEL, Mr. PORRINO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MOSBEY, Mr. DAVID of Tennessee, Mr. GALLAGHY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MICA, Mr. DRAL of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. COOLEY, Ms. POXX, Mr. TUENIEN, Mr. PROSHING, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MCCaul of Texas, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mrs. MYRICK:

H. Res. 6070. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to guarantee the residency of spouses of military personnel; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself and Mrs. BOYD of Kansas):

H. Res. 6071. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require reinstatement upon payment of all premiums due of group or individual health insurance coverage terminated by reason of nonpayment of premiums; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FORBES:

H. Res. 6072. A bill to establish a Commission to examine the long-term global challenges facing the United States and develop legislative and administrative proposals to improve international cooperation on Global Warming, Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POXX:

H. Res. 6073. A bill to provide that Federal employees receiving their pay by electronic transfer be given the option of receiving paid time-off electronically; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KAGEN (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HODES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CARSON, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. REILLEY of Wisconsin, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. KIRK, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. McNULTY):

H. Res. 1201. A resolution expressing the grave concern of the House of Representatives for Hezbollah, Syria, and Iran’s continued actions to undermine the legitimate Lebanese Government of Prime Minister Fuad Siniora, and their systematic violation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1559, 1660, 1701, and 1747; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. DICKS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WATT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H. Res. 1202. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a National Guard Youth Challenge Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Mr. ALLEN):

H. Res. 1203. A resolution expressing support for surplus oil reserves, and requesting the Government of Iraq to dedicate $1 billion to address the needs of Iraqi refugees and internally displaced persons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELAHUNT (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Ms. DELAURER, Mr. SHAYA, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. HARTINGS of Florida):

H. Res. 1205. A resolution noting that the Government of Iraq will likely enjoy $32 billion in surplus oil reserves, and requesting the Speaker of the House of Representatives to convene the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, 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.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

280. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the State of the State of Wisconsin, relative to Resolution No. 7 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the Employee Free Choice Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

281. Also, a memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to create an Office of the National Nurse; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

282. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 134 memorializing the Congress of
the United States and the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to establish stricter standards for the drug approval process; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Georgia, relative to a Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to withdraw the United States from the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America and from any other bilateral or multilateral activity that seeks the economic domination of the United States and any other country, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 154: Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Abercrombie, Mr. Terry, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Nadler, Ms. Lee, Mr. DeFazio, and Mr. Scott of Virginia.

H.R. 158: Mrs. Capito.

H.R. 303: Mr. Mack.

H.R. 471: Mr. Price of North Carolina.

H.R. 526: Ms. Woolsey.

H.R. 555: Mr. Wu.

H.R. 631: Mr. McCutter.

H.R. 643: Mr. Steny.

H.R. 769: Mr. Heller.

H.R. 1078: Mrs. McCarthy of New York.

H.R. 1120: Mr. Hunter.

H.R. 1194: Ms. Ros-Lehtinen, Mr. Davis of Illinois, and Mr. LoBiondo.

H.R. 1286: Mr. Sestak and Mr. Wittman of Virginia.

H.R. 1359: Mr. Sensenbrenner.

H.R. 1483: Mr. Chandler.

H.R. 1493: Mr. Rampstad.

H.R. 1475: Mr. Speier.

H.R. 1584: Ms. Giffords.

H.R. 1589: Mr. Wittman of Virginia.

H.R. 1610: Mr. Wu and Mr. Mollohan.

H.R. 1655: Mr. Al Green of Texas, Mr. Westmoreland, Mr. Larsen of Washington, and Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California.

H.R. 1738: Mr. Kuhl of New York and Mr. Hinchey.

H.R. 1783: Mr. Bilbray.

H.R. 1792: Mr. Whitfield of Kentucky.

H.R. 1956: Mr. Patrick Murphy of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2026: Mr. LoBiondo.

H.R. 2060: Mr. Latham.

H.R. 2132: Ms. Berkley.

H.R. 2138: Mr. Walden of Virginia.

H.R. 2188: Ms. Pryce of Ohio and Mr. McGovern.

H.R. 2231: Mr. Pickering.

H.R. 2248: Mr. Coleman.

H.R. 2368: Mr. Gordon, Mr. Salz, and Mr. Engel.

H.R. 2339: Mr. Filner, Mr. Moran of Kansas, Mr. Scott of California.

H.R. 2331: Mr. Space.

H.R. 2472: Mr. King of New York, Mrs. McCarthy of New York, Mr. Klein of Florida, and Mr. Young of Florida.

H.R. 2606: Mr. Davis of Alabama.

H.R. 2609: Mr. Carson and Mr. Turner.


H.R. 2748: Mr. Wittman of Virginia.

H.R. 2790: Mr. Buyer.

H.R. 2851: Mr. Abercrombie.

H.R. 2894: Mr. Dicks.

H.R. 3186: Mr. Young of Florida and Mr. Lampson.

H.R. 3187: Mr. English of Pennsylvania, Mr. Jackson-Lee of Texas, and Mr. Young of Florida.

H.R. 3237: Mr. Price of North Carolina.
H. Con. Res. 299: Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. KAGEN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. Berman, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H. Con. Res. 315: Mr. ROSKAM.

H. Con. Res. 329: Mr. REHBERG.

H. Con. Res. 333: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MCCCERRY, and Mr. WALE of Minnesota.

H. Con. Res. 334: Mr. JORDAN.

H. Con. Res. 341: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. CAM of Michigan.

H. Res. 18: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.

H. Res. 111: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.

H. Res. 166: Mr. WEINER.

H. Res. 208: Ms. BALDWIN and Ms. LEE.

H. Res. 348: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FORU'TO, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. PATTAH, and Ms. CLARKE.

H. Res. 349: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.

H. Res. 529: Ms. CASTOR, Ms. SHEA-PORTE, Mr. LOEBRACK, and Mr. COOPER.

H. Res. 881: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. LAMBOHN.

H. Res. 1016: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MORGAN of Kansas, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H. Res. 1022: Ms. PELOSI.

H. Res. 1108: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. WALSH of New York.

H. Res. 1127: Mr. CANTOR, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. KIRK.

H. Res. 1128: Mr. TANNER and Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Res. 1143: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H. Res. 1153: Mr. RUSH, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 1172: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 1183: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. COBBLE.

H. Res. 1191: Mr. MARK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LAMBOHN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. HODES, Ms. ZOR LOFORE of California, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. ROYAL-HALLARD, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. FARR, Mr. SHRES, Mr. RACA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ORTH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ROTHINAN, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HINCHEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. CROWLEY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H. R. 891: Mr. CONAWAY.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk’s desk and referred as follows:

237. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the California State Lands Commission, relative to a Resolution encouraging the Federal Government to adopt policies that address climate change and allow California to impose strict greenhouse gas emission standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

238. Also, a petition of the Caribbean and North American Area Council, relative to a Resolution calling on the Congress of the United States to lift the embargo and normalize relations between the two countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

239. Also, a petition of the Lawrence County Board of Commissioners, South Dakota, relative to Resolution No. 2008-15 urging the Congress of the United States to support the fair and equitable resolution of R.S. 2477 rights-of-way by enacting R.S. 2477, Rights-of-Way Recognition Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

240. Also, a petition of the City Council of Yerington, Nevada, relative to Resolution No. 08-62 opposing the proposed Wilderness Area in Lyon County, Nevada; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

241. Also, a petition of the Board of Commissioners of Ashe County, North Carolina, relative to a Resolution in support of the Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D) Program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.
The Senate met at 9:31 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable Mark L. Pryor, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER
The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our judge and redeemer, who orders our steps and directs our paths, use our Senators today as instruments of Your will. Commission them to meet the perils and possibilities of our times, humbly and courageously. Lord, deliver them from insulating privilege that obscures humanity’s needs, as You keep them from pride that scorns to do the servant’s task. Make them Your agents to restore those who are broken in body and spirit. Empower them to be messengers of hope to those from whom hope is gone. Use our lawmakers to bring a new day of justice and peace to our nation and world.

We pray in Your omnipotent Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The Honorable Mark L. Pryor 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE
The PRESIDING OFFICER, the clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. Byrd).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable Mark L. Pryor, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD
President pro tempore.

Mr. Pryor thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The Acting President pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE
Mr. Reid. Mr. President, following leader time, the Senate will resume consideration of the conference report to accompany the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act, H.R. 2419. There will be 90 minutes for debate on the conference report.

I might add in passing that Senators worked until about 11 o’clock last night on this important piece of legislation.

The Senate will vote on any motions relating to the conference report prior to a vote on its adoption. Senators should expect the first vote of the day to begin about 11:05, 11:10, depending on how long Senator McConnell and I take. Upon disposition of the conference report, we expect to begin the process of appointing conferees to the budget resolution conference. Senators should expect rollcall votes to occur throughout the day.

I would note that there is a 1 p.m. filing deadline for first-degree amendments to the collective bargaining legislation, H.R. 980.

As I mentioned last night, when we finish adoption of the conference report, it will be up to Senators Judd Gregg and Kent Conrad to determine how many motions will be filed to instruct conferees. Other Senators can do that, of course, but it would have to be through the two managers. There is a total of 10 hours on that. We would hope that time could be shortened significantly. We are going to finish that tonight, the appointing of conferees.

I have spoken to Senator Dorgan. We have the media cross-ownership matter that he has proceeded forward with under a statute Senator Nickles and I passed in the early 1990s. The statutory time limit on that is 10 hours. Senator Dorgan told me last night that he would take 1 hour. I would hope others wouldn’t take much more time than that. That being the case, there is an opportunity to finish that tonight. I hope that is the case. Otherwise, we would finish that tomorrow.

Tomorrow, we have scheduled now a cloture vote on the collective bargaining matter we worked on this week. As I indicated last night, we are going to see if Senators Kennedy and Gregg can work something out on that, along with the comanager of the bill, Senator Enzi. If they can give us some way to proceed to complete that, maybe we can work out a unanimous consent that we wouldn’t have to do the cloture vote. I think the ability to do that is somewhat slim, but I never give up hope. It might be possible.

The point being, we have a lot to do. We are going to work late tonight unless there is some agreement that shortens the time significantly on the appointing of conferees and the cross-ownership issue dealing with the Dorgan proposal. I think that is what we have ahead of us.

The reason I am making sure we complete everything this week, the House is going to pass, sometime today, the supplemental. We have no votes on Monday. I would hope we could start maybe on that issue on Monday because we would like to do some other things next week. But that is a big issue to deal with. The House can jam things through, as we all know, because they have different rules than we do. But over here we have to follow our rules, which are not the
House rules. So one of the first things we will do when we see what the House finally does, because we don’t know yet, is I will sit down and talk to the Republican leader and find out if there is a way we can proceed to allow people to do that. I would like to have the bill brought to the floor so it is more understandable and we are not here this coming Friday, a week from tomorrow, 8, 9 o’clock at night, still trying to figure out what we are going to do on that. As contentious as this matter was on the Senate floor, we will make a orderly process on which to move forward.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I think one of the items the majority leader mentioned we should be able to move to completion on. There remains a good deal of concern on this side about the way in which procedurally we are going to go forward on supplemental appropriations. But having said that, it certainly is an important piece of legislation. I am sure we will get to the end of the process at some point next week.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

CORPORAL JOSEPH H. CANTRELL IV

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the undaunted courage and fighting spirit of one soldier from the Commonwealth of Kentucky. CPL Joseph H. Cantrell IV was killed in Iraq, August 10, 2007, in Taji, Iraq, when an improvised explosive device detonated near his vehicle during combat operations. The Westwood, KY, native was 23 years old.

For his valor in uniform, Corporal Cantrell received several awards, medals and decorations, including the National Defense Service Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, the Bronze Star Medal, and the Purple Heart.

After Corporal Cantrell was gone, his mother, Sondra Adkins, met a woman at a hospital who said that her nephew was also a soldier. He had been wounded and then saved by an Army medic, and now was going to name his son after the medic who had treated him.

That medic’s name was Joe. Joe Cantrell.

“My son saved her nephew’s life,” Sondra reveals.

Those who knew Joey growing up in Boyd County, in northeastern Kentucky, were not surprised at the impact the young man could have on others. Sondra remembers when an excited Joey called her to say “there is nothing more beautiful than bringing a baby into the world.”

“By chance, he got to deliver a baby during his Army training,” Sondra says. “He was high on life that day. That wasn’t a planned event. He called and said, ‘You’re not going to believe this . . . I got to deliver a baby.’”

Joey was an Army medic who saved lives in Iraq. He brought the same enthusiasm to his job that he once had as a child who would dress up in camouflage and green paint on Halloween and go out as “G.I. Joey.”

At Westwood High School, Joey was a member of Who’s Who and the National Honors Society, and played football and ran track.

“I didn’t want him to run track because he was so short,” Sondra recalls. “The hurdles came up to his hipbone. But he could clear those hurdles and come out . . . as the best hurdle jumper. . . . Track was his calling. He could flat-out fly.”

Joey’s dad, Joe Cantrell, remembers eating lunch with his son just before a pregnant baby passed near the meal course. “We want to eat and eat and eat,” Joey told me, ‘Dad, I’m going to win this because they don’t think I can,’” Joe says. “When the gun went off, all they saw was his back end. When he’d get his confidence built up, he was fun to watch in track.”

“Joey had the perfect life in high school,” Sondra adds. “Dating the head cheerleader, excelling on the football team. He was very outgoing.”

Joey graduated from Fairview in 2002, and attended Ashland Community College. One day he came to his mother and said, “Mom, I have something to prove.”

“I said, ‘You don’t have anything to prove to anybody,’” Sondra says. “He replied, ‘You’re right, I have to prove this to myself.’ I was prepared for my son to move out, but I wasn’t prepared for my son to live halfway around the world.”

Joey enlisted in the U.S. Army on March 31, 2005. “I joined the Army to see how high he could fly without someone to catch him,” his father, Joe, says. “There was no quit in him.”

Joey was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 8th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 1st Cavalry Division, based out of Fort Hood, TX, and in October 2006, he was deployed to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. One day he called his mom from Iraq after saving a fellow soldier’s life. “Mary, the thing the soldier was worried about was if he would be able to walk again and continue serving his country,” he told her.

“He loved his job,” Sondra adds. “They’re out there to do a job just like all of us—but theirs is the most dangerous of all.”

Joe says that Joey eventually wanted to study sports medicine. Sondra recalls Joey wanting to be a doctor, perhaps an obstetrician. On the day of Joey’s funeral, students from the local schools lined up alongside the road holding flags to watch the procession drive by. “I couldn’t believe the turnout from the community,” Sondra says. The city of Westwood dedicated Main Street in Joey’s memory.

Mr. President, our prayers are with the Cantrell family after their tragic loss. We are thinking of Joey’s mother, Sondra; his father, Joe Cantrell; his brother, Chase Adkins; his stepfather, Bryan Adkins; his grandmother, Pehylien Mullins; his aunts Anita Hollo, Jeannie Mullins, Elisa Lambert, and Janie Hill; and other beloved family members and friends.

Mr. President, Leadingham Patton started “Project Joey.” Mary Beth Leadingham Patton started “Project Joey.” Mary Beth is an old friend of Joe’s mother, Sondra.

“She was one of the first visitors to come to my house to see my Joey when he was born,” Sondra recalls.

Project Joey is simple: When Mary Beth’s kids pass someone in uniform, they stop and say thank you.

Those young men and those young women—we truly do not know what they’ve had to see in their lives,” Sondra says. “We should always be mindful that we are so thankful that the young men and women who’ve gone that extra mile for all of us.”

Sondra, of course, does know some of what our men and women in uniform have seen, as she watched her little Joey grow into a man, a patriot and a dedicated soldier.

And although he is gone, it is not too late to thank CPL Joseph H. Cantrell IV. This United States Senate is honored to pay tribute to his life of service, and we pause with reverence for the sacrifice he made on his Nation’s behalf.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

FOOD, CONSERVATION, AND ENERGY ACT OF 2008—CONFERENCE REPORT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the conference report accompanying H.R. 2419, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: Conference report to accompany H.R. 2419, a bill to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.
Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, as I understand it, there will be 3 hours evenly divided.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety minutes, evenly divided.

Mr. HARKIN. I am sorry, an hour and a half minutes on each side—and then we will proceed to start voting on the farm bill.

We had a great debate last night. I appreciate all the Senators who came over and spoke so forcefully and favorably for this bill. There are a few more speakers who want to speak this morning, and then we will have a little bit of a wrap-up again.

Mr. President, I yield the floor for others who want to start speaking on the farm bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I again thank Senator Harkin for his leadership on this issue. We did have a good debate last night, and a number of folks had an opportunity to come over and voice their opinion about the bill. We look forward to wrapping this up this morning and having a vote, hopefully, around 11:15, 11:30.

I urge those folks who want to speak—we have had a number who have indicated they wish some time. Obvi-

ously, we are pretty squeezed with a compacted morning this morning, so folks need to make their wishes known and be ready to speak.

I wish to start off by recognizing the Senator from Idaho, who has been a critical asset to us with respect par-
ticularly to the specialty crop section in this farm bill. I ask the Chair to rec-

ognize Senator Craig for 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to come to the floor in the final hours of the debate over ag-

ricultural policy in this country and to, first and foremost, thank the two principals, who are here on the floor, the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Ag Committee. They have done yeoman work in a very difficult process—15 titles and 673 pages of pol-

icy—in what is, without question, one of the most complicated efforts at put-
ting public policy and interest groups within the agricultural community to-

gether in some degree of harmony. I thank my colleagues for the work they have done.

Mr. President, I will be brief, as I have already come to the floor several times to discuss the valuable programs included in this bill. But I would be re-

miss not to take the opportunity to thank my colleagues—and this Con-
grress—for producing a good product for the American people.

We have been “tangled in inaction” on so many issues. The American peo-

ple want a functional Congress.

The 2008 farm bill conference report represents a monumental feat for the U.S. Congress. Every 5 years, we underta-
take the task of reauthorizing our farm policy. This version includes 15 titles; 673 pages.

Though some who have not yet served on an agriculture committee during the reauthorization of a farm bill may disagree, let me assure you that this bill is the result of the most complicated pieces of legislation considered by Con-
gress, and it is also one of the most im-

portant.

In an age of skyrocketing energy prices, economic uncertainty, and, now, global food crisis, there is at least one thing we should be able to be cer-
tain of: our Nation’s food security. We cannot take for granted our ability to feed ourselves, lest we become depend-
ent on other countries for our food in addition to our oil.

How do we achieve food security? Here are a few key principles.

First and foremost, we enact policy designed to keep our food producers productive and profitable, and ensure access to those foods for all Americans. This includes things such as a safety net to protect farmers from volatile price swings; and nutrition programs that give access to fresh fruits and vegetables in schools.

We enact policy that incentivizes state-of-the-art conservation practices to encourage the best possible steward-

ship of our agricultural lands. This will ensure these lands stay productive and profitable for future generations. And we enact policy that helps American agriculture continue to diversify—including becoming a larger player not only in our food security, but also in our energy security.

This bill does just that. This bipar-
tisan work product—aptly named the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008—sets a strong and secure direction for our food, conservation and energy future.

The bill has broad support from vir-
tually every corner of my State of Idaho, and every corner of the Nation.

Congress has heard from rural farm-

ers to urban consumers, from consumers and producers, and this just touches the sur-

face of both our current production and our potential to continue to diversify.

Now, it should be noted that this is only one part of the effort to ensure the competitiveness of our specialty crop industry. The next step is to en-

sure that we have an adequate work-

force to conduct the labor in which the average American refuses to partici-

pate. The harvesting of those healthy fruits and vegetables—this, I contend, is as important, or more important, than these “competitiveness” prior-

ities that we have finally set aside and other priorities; $59 million for trade assistance and market promotion to maintain and grow our international markets; and many other programs.

The bill earnestlyunauxious of our burge-

oning table grape and wine grape in-

dustry, our apples and onions and car-

rots and nursery and ornamental crops—and this just touches the sur-

face of both our current production and our potential to continue to diversify.

And I could go on for a great deal of time, talking about: the commodity programs that ensure the subsidy for corn-based ethanol; the energy programs that will help us reach the 36 billion gallon RFS by cre-

ating new incentives for cellulosic eth-

anol; the agricultural research and develop-

ment that will lead to new, better crops and avert yellow rust; providing the credit, disaster programs.

We began several years ago to ensure that specialty crops were adequately recognized in this new farm bill. We now have a new title devoted to horti-
cultural and organic agriculture. It dedicates approximately $3 billion for Specialty Crop Research Grants to support local efforts to enhance competitiveness of local pro-
ducts; $1 billion to expand the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Snack Program to all 50 States—which will help our school children develop healthy eating habits; $377 million for a pest and dis-

ease program to combat costly damage to crops such as our famous potatoes; $230 million for the Specialty Crop Re-

search Initiative to address food safety, and this just touches the sur-

face of both our current production and our potential to continue to diversify.

The bill dedicates approximately $3 billion for Specialty Crop Research Grants to support local efforts to enhance competitiveness of local products; $1 billion to expand the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Snack Program to all 50 States—which will help our school children develop healthy eating habits; $377 million for a pest and disease program to combat costly damage to crops such as our famous potatoes; $230 million for the Specialty Crop Research Initiative to address food safety, and this just touches the surface of both our current production and our potential to continue to diversify.

Now, it should be noted that this is only one part of the effort to ensure the competitiveness of our specialty crop industry. The next step is to ensure that we have an adequate work-

force to conduct the labor in which the average American refuses to partici-

pate. The harvesting of those healthy fruits and vegetables—this, I contend, is as important, or more important, than these “competitiveness” prior-

ities that we have finally set aside and other priorities; $59 million for trade assistance and market promotion to maintain and grow our international markets; and many other programs.

The bill earnestly

Two new programs, for brief, as I have already come to the floor several times to discuss the valuable programs included in this bill. But I would be re-

miss not to take the opportunity to thank my colleagues—and this Con-
grress—for producing a good product for the American people.

We have been “tangled in inaction” on so many issues. The American peo-

ple want a functional Congress.

The 2008 farm bill conference report represents a monumental feat for the U.S. Congress. Every 5 years, we under-
take the task of reauthorizing our farm policy. This version includes 15 titles; 673 pages.

Though some who have not yet served on an agriculture committee during the reauthorization of a farm bill may disagree, let me assure you that this bill is the result of the most complicated pieces of legislation considered by Con-
gress, and it is also one of the most im-

portant.

In an age of skyrocketing energy prices, economic uncertainty, and, now, global food crisis, there is at least one thing we should be able to be cer-
tain of: our Nation’s food security. We cannot take for granted our ability to feed ourselves, lest we become depend-
ent on other countries for our food in addition to our oil.

How do we achieve food security? Here are a few key principles.

First and foremost, we enact policy designed to keep our food producers productive and profitable, and ensure access to those foods for all Americans. This includes things such as a safety net to protect farmers from volatile price swings; and nutrition programs that give access to fresh fruits and vegetables in schools.

We enact policy that incentivizes state-of-the-art conservation practices to encourage the best possible steward-

ship of our agricultural lands. This will ensure these lands stay productive and profitable for future generations. And we enact policy that helps American agriculture continue to diversify—including becoming a larger player not only in our food security, but also in our energy security.

This bill does just that. This bipar-
tisan work product—aptly named the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008—sets a strong and secure direction for our food, conservation and energy future.

The bill has broad support from vir-
tually every corner of my State of Idaho, and every corner of the Nation.

Congress has heard from rural farm-

ers to urban consumers, from consumers and producers, and this just touches the sur-

face of both our current production and our potential to continue to diversify.

And I could go on for a great deal of time, talking about: the commodity programs that ensure the subsidy for corn-based ethanol; the energy programs that will help us reach the 36 billion gallon RFS by cre-

ating new incentives for cellulosic eth-

anol; the agricultural research and develop-

ment that will lead to new, better crops and avert yellow rust; providing the credit, disaster programs.
I thank my colleagues once again, and urge support for this vital piece of legislation. I will now speak, again, specifically to Idaho and to the specialty crops provision that Senator Saxby Chambliss spoke to. It is now very important part of agricultural policy.

We know specialty crops are about 51 percent of the gross revenue of American agriculture, and yet they were never mentioned in agricultural policy from a Federal level. Oh, yes, we had research and experimental programs, and we targeted money into the specialty crop area, but the program crops—those kinds of base crops we think about, be it cotton, soybeans, corn, wheat—all of those were the staples, if you will, of American agriculture, while today they do not represent the majority of the portfolio.

That is why several years ago I thought it was critically important we begin to work to include a specialty crop title in the bill. Today, we have completed that effort with the help of these two Senators and a broad-based coalition to now have a title devoted to horticulture and organic agriculture.

In my State of Idaho, specialty crops are a big deal. Many people have heard about potatoes and Idaho. It is almost synonymous in the minds of the average American. Yet, by definition, that is a specialty crop. Is this a loan guarantee—no, I do not guarantee it. It is an effort to advance specialty crops in a variety of ways: specialty crop grants to enhance competitive local markets; expanding the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Snack Program in our high schools and grade schools in all 50 States; pest and disease management control; research programs in these areas; initiatives for food safety, mechanization, plant breeding and priorities to keep our edge, if you will, our world-class status in an area of specialty crops; along with trade assistance and market promotion.

That is a full title. Not only did these two Senators—our chairman and ranking member—who led the effort for us, get this in the bill, they also got money behind it. Frankly, I thought maybe we would have to go the first 5 years simply authorizing the program and then begin to fund it. But there is now substantial money behind it. It will go a long way toward helping the small areas and organic agriculture in the kind of farming many of our agricultural areas are moving into.

When you get at the edge of urbanization and agriculture and agriculture, food farming, small specialty crop farming, this often times becomes the transitional form of agriculture. To keep it profitable on the land, so we can keep the land in agricultural production, is very important, and I think that is offered in all of this.

I also thank my Idaho colleague, Mike Crapo, who has worked a long while on making the Endangered Species Act and those private properties that care for endangered habitat—to have a relationship, to have an advantage, to incentivize landowners to appreciate the reality of having an endangered species on their property. He was instrumental in getting this issue at the forefront; he has been recognized. It is very important we do that.

I could go on a great deal more about the programs that are there: the commodity programs that create a vital income floor for potatoes, barley, peas, lentils, chickpeas, oil seeds, sugar, wool products, and so on; conservation programs that are adjusted and important.

A great deal of effort has been focused on energy over the last several years and agriculture’s role in that. It is not by accident that this bill has a title that recognizes energy, and that being a part of—a very valuable part of—American agriculture. To transform this corn-based ethanol into cellulosics is a major step and a correct step in the right direction.

My time is up, but I want to thank my colleagues for the effort at hand. We had a roll call vote out of the House last night. I think we are going to have a strong vote in the Senate today on this conference report.

Let me say in closing, to the White House and to our President: Mr. President, you and your people have been at the table working on this program with us for well over a year. It is time you recognize the value of this program, what has been put into new agricultural policy, and support us in that effort.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The Acting President pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes—and maybe more if he needs it—to the Senator from North Dakota, who has been so instrumental in getting us to this point.

The Acting President pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the Acting President pro tempore, and I especially thank the chairman of this committee, Senator Harkin. I said last night that without his vision, we would not have a vehicle of this quality that is this forward looking. I think now of the future as the father of a new conservation movement in this country because it was the steady pressure from the chairman of the committee that has pushed us in a new direction for farm policy, one far more oriented toward conservation. I believe in future years Chairman Harkin will be looked upon as somebody who led a fundamental reorientation of agriculture policy, and he will be recognized as someone who broke the path for this new direction, and he deserves enormous credit for it.

I also again thank the ranking member, Senator Chambliss, who is a pro’s pro. If ever you were to want a partner in a very complicated endeavor, one in which trust among colleagues was absolutely essential to an outcome, you would want Senator Chambliss involved because his word is like gold. All of us who have dealt in difficult negotiations know how critically important that is.

I also salute his superb staff: Martha Scott Poinexter, and Vernie Hubert, who played such a critical role in advancing this legislation. At the same time, I want to recognize the staff of the chairman: Mark Halverson, who I said last night has actually gone gray in this exercise—that is how much he has put into it—and Susan Keith, who has played a central role in the developing of the policy, deserves our credit as well.

I also recognize Senator Baucus, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and especially in his dealings he has made throughout. He has provided the kind of leadership you would hope for in an endeavor of this complexity, and I will be forever in his debt for what he has done for not only production agriculture but he did to construct the financing of this bill that made it possible to achieve widespread bipartisan support.

Certainly I thank my ranking member, Senator Grassley, who played such a critical role as well.

I conclude my thank-yous by again thanking my staff: Tom Mahr, my legislative director, who is exceptional and extraordinary and whose intellectual and good judgment made such an important contribution to this result; and certainly to my lead negotiator, Jim Miller, who, as I said last night, is encyclopedic in his knowledge, but also wise in his construct of agreements with people, including me. Jim, I deeply appreciate the extraordinary sacrifices you and your family have made to help us write this bill. And finally, I thank Scott Stofferahn, my other lead negotiator, who also brought the knowledge of farm policy, and who played such a key role in the disaster provisions that themselves represent significant reform.

Let me conclude by saying: Why a bill at all? Well, because our major competitors have much more ambitious support for their producers than we have for ours. This is a fact. The Europeans are providing more than three times as much support to their producers than we provide to ours. If we pulled the rug out from under our producers, it would be a calamity for farmers and ranchers in this country. Where does the money go? Well, this legislation to me it think as well as any could. Two-thirds of the money in this bill goes for nutrition. This is misnamed when we call it a farm bill. This is a food bill. This is an energy bill because it helps reduce our dependence on foreign energy, a critically important priority for our country. It is a conservation bill. Conservation of our natural resources is critically important to the future.
The other point I wished to make in conclusion is that this bill is paid for. It is pay-go-compliant. These are not my estimates; these are not the Agriculture Committee’s estimates, these are the professional estimates of the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation, which show this budget saves $67 million—not a lot of money, but nonetheless it does not add to the deficit; in fact, it slightly reduces it. It saves $67 million over 5 years, and it saves $110 million over 10 years. It is completely paid for with no tax increase.

Final point: I received last night from the IRS what I think is a very interesting set of facts. We have seen reported in the mass media that a couple could earn $2.5 million and still get benefits. Well, that is akin to the chance of getting struck by lightning because it turns out there are no tax returns in the entire country between $1 million and $1.250 million that would have farmed income below $750,000 and nonfarm income below $500,000. Zero. So all these press reports they have written about how millionaires are going to be able to qualify, they are wrong because there are no people in those categories. You would have had to have $750,000 of farm income and $500,000 of nonfarm income and both husband and wife would have to be in precisely those categories. Do you know what the problem with all those stories is? There are no people in those categories. It is my understanding that is the report from the Internal Revenue Service.

Again, I wish to close by thanking those who have provided such extraordinary leadership, and I would be remiss in not mentioning HARRY REID, who played behind the scenes a very quiet but strong leadership role in helping us bring together all the people necessary to get this bill done. We should also thank the Speaker of the House, JOHN BOEHNER, and deputy chairman, CHAIRMAN PETERSON, who gave blood, sweat, and tears to this effort, and our own Congressman EARL POMEROY, the only Member serving on both the Ways and Means Committee and the Agriculture Committee, who made an important contribution to helping us get a breakthrough in the Ways and Means Committee on the financing.

This is good legislation. It is good for the country and certainly good for my State but also fair to the taxpayers of this country because it is paid for, and it represents the most dramatic reform since the 1949 act itself. That is a fact.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota, Senator COLEMAN, who also has played a very valuable role in crafting this bill. He has been a strong member of the Senate Agriculture Committee and a great advocate for not just the farmers and ranchers in Minnesota but farmers and ranchers all across America.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Georgia. Along with all the thanks that have been set forth by the Senator from North Dakota, I wish to thank the Senator from North Dakota, who gave blood, sweat, and tears to this effort.

I went to Lake Bronson in northwest Minnesota in 2005, and the room was filled with family farmers who were talking about disaster assistance. We work on farms — the way we are at a time when commodity prices are high. Folks look at that and say: Why do we need a safety net? Why do we need a farm bill? Two years ago, I had people who were struggling. The pain and fear on their faces was something I wished I had a picture of that I could show you.

My colleague from North Dakota has been a champion—a champion—for ensuring that there is a safety net, particularly regarding disaster assistance. With all the partisan divide we have in this body, here we have an example where it is not about partisan politics; it is about doing the right thing. Folks have dirt under their fingernails who are helping provide the safest, most affordable, and supply in the world, and we are talking about a safety net. My colleague from North Dakota has been a tremendous champion, and I wish to express my thanks.

Also, I see the chair of the Finance Committee Senator BAucus, who has also been involved in providing the kind of safety net that when bad things happen, we are going to be proud of this bill; we will be proud. So I wish to express my deep appreciation for the continuous effort that finally has yielded some fruit right here. It will be a shame if we don’t make sure this becomes law.

These are tough times right now. Folks are worried about their jobs, they are worried about the cost of food, they are worried about the cost of energy. I don’t need an economist to tell me whether we are in a recession or talk to Minnesota families and business owners to know folks are worried out loud. We need something that promotes job growth.

I come to the floor to ask my colleagues to work with me to pass one of the most critical economic stimulus packages this body will have a chance to vote on. The farm bill is a balanced proposal, both ensuring the viability of a key economic sector—agriculture— and helping the many Americans who are struggling to put food on the table. It is a farm bill that we will soon vote to send to the President. At only 1.9 percent of the Federal budget, this farm bill will have enormous impact— providing, as I said, a safety net for American agriculture that in turn employs one out of five Americans and contributes roughly $3.5 trillion a year to the U.S. economy. In the State of Minnesota, agriculture generates $55 billion in economic activity and underpins 367,000 jobs.

We labeled this bill, as folks have said, a farm bill, when in reality it is a food bill, a nutrition bill. Over 66 percent goes to the nutrition safety net. We have all seen the rise in foreclosures and the impact of food prices depleting our food shelters. Families around our country are struggling right now. This farm bill helps meet the increased needs. It provides an additional $10 billion above baseline to nutrition.

As the ranking member of the Nutrition Subcommittee, I would like to see that nutrition programs—and the Emergency Food Assistance Program, EFAP, in particular—saw substantial increased funding. Well, we got it. The farm bill conference agreement will provide an additional $3.5 billion for our food banks. I have been to Second Harvest and Heartland in St. Paul. The needs are great, and we are meeting those needs today.

The Food Stamp Program receives an almost $8 billion boost in this bill. Our food banks lend a helping hand when it is needed.

Despite the importance of the farm bill safety net for hungry families, most of the attention is centered on the commodity programs. Commodity prices are high, critics say, but farmers are doing well. Why should they get a safety net? The reality is the critics don’t understand agriculture. They don’t understand that although the importance of agriculture to our economy, the individual farm families is not. Once again, the farm bill supports a sector of the American economy that provides millions of jobs, and it is insulting to farmers who put their necks on the line every year to wake up with the Sun and work all day to say they should be able to farm without a safety net.

I urge my colleagues to step into the shoes of one of my Minnesota farmers for a moment. We see high prices in the world market today, no way of knowing whether the drought in Australia is going to continue or whether the consumption habits in countries on the other side of the world will change. Input costs for diesel and fertilizer are going through the roof. Meanwhile, depending on where your farm lies, Minnesota weather has kept you off the tractor, threatening your yields, and not knowing whether you will even have a product to sell for those high prices.

What price is too high for a safety net that keeps farmers, such as those in Minnesota, farming, despite all the uncertainty that allows the agricultural economic engine to continue generating trillions of dollars? How about a 27 percent of the Federal budget? That is what this bill’s commodity title costs. By the way, this bill’s safety net is based on the structure of the 2002 farm bill that costs $20 billion less than expected.

We labeled this bill, as folks have said, a farm bill, when in reality it is a food bill, a nutrition bill. Over 66 percent goes to the nutrition safety net. We have all seen the rise in foreclosures and the impact of food prices depleting our food shelters. Families around our country are struggling right now. This farm bill helps meet the increased needs. It provides an additional $10 billion above baseline to nutrition.
eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse in farm programs and try to get the Ted Turners of the world out of the commodity payment business. At the end of the day, no bill is perfect, but this bill is something we can be proud of. This bill will prevent payments from going to nonfarmers with an adjusted gross income over $500,000, an 80-per-cent reduction from current law; repeal the triple-entity rule, reducing titles I benefits for some producers. We require direct attribution of all benefits to natural persons so we know exactly where it is going—100 percent transparency. We explicitly prevent farm benefits from ever going to a deceased person. There are other reforms. I could go on and on. I read a headline the other day: “Fiscal Hawks Eye Farm Bill.” They should, because this is a fiscally responsible piece of legislation that delivers big savings for the buck.

When I talked with my farmers, again, they told me the 2002 farm bill had the right safety net, it just needed to be improved. And in this conference report, that is what we do. Building from the existing safety net, the bill updates target prices and marketing loan rates for key Minnesota commodities such as wheat, barley, and soybeans. For sugar beet farmers who have been waiting 15 years for updated loan rates, there will finally be an increase. Minnesota’s dairy farmers will be relieved to hear the payment rate for the MILC Program will return to 45 percent. I have appreciated Senator LEAHY’s leadership on this issue.

In addition to tweaking the current safety net, this farm bill also creates entirely new programs that American farmers desperately need. One I have talked about: permanent agriculture disaster assistance. The other is about sugar to ethanol. I take great pride in the sugar-to-ethanol provision in this bill. This was a proposal that was once withering on the vine, but has come back, largely as a result of the producer payments Brazil was achieving with oil independence. This made it possible to take excess sugar production and put it into the ethanol and biodiesel business. At the end of the day, no bill is perfect, but this bill has been a pleasure to sit across from the senior Senator from Minnesota, Senator HARKIN, Senator CONRAD, and Senator BAUCUS for the effort and the work of the chair. The other is the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore, The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am going to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Montana, Senator BAUCUS. Before I do, let me publicly thank Senator BAUCUS, the chairman of the Finance Committee, who is also a very valuable member of our Agriculture Committee, for all his help on this farm bill. He, frankly, the way we would not be here today had it not been for the effort and the work of Senator BAUCUS and of course his ranking member, my colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, to come up with the funds we needed by raising taxes but by closing loopholes and thereby saving some money that they were able to give us so we could meet our needs in this farm bill. Senator BAUCUS and I came to Congress together in 1974. We were classmates. We have been friends throughout these years.

I thank Senator BAUCUS for all of his diligence also in attending all of the meetings of our conferences which went on and on for hours at a time. He was always there as a valuable member giving his input into getting us to this point. The farmers and ranchers of Montana and the people who live in rural communities in Montana have no stronger voice, no better champion for them than the senior Senator from Montana. I publicly thank him for all of his help on this bill.

I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Montana.
producers in America remain family farms and ranches not corporations and conglomerates. In fact, only 22 percent of farms are nonfamily farms.

Negative articles frequently refer to “protectionist” policies intended to shield farmers and ranchers from competition and lower consumer prices.

One group recently stated that we should simply ignore all the subsidies and trade barriers of other countries. Unilaterally disarm our own farmers and ranchers. And then sit back and enjoy the benefits of cheaper imported food.

This makes zero sense. American consumers today spend a lower percentage of their disposable income on food than consumers anywhere else around the world. In fact, American families are the only families in the world who spend less than 10 percent of their disposable income on food.

Agriculture is also important to our economy, as became apparent earlier this week when farmers and ranchers helped get the country through a manufacturing crisis.

Our farmers and ranchers managed this even as the average foreign tariff rate on agriculture products was and remains far lower, while the United States average tariff is only around 12 percent.

President John F. Kennedy once said “the Farmer is the only man in our economy who buys everything at retail, and sells at wholesale, and pays the freight both ways.” That is true.

Farmers and ranchers are—and in my memory always have been—in the middle of a never-ending cost squeeze. For too many years we have asked our farmers and ranchers to do more and more and always with less.

So while all the negative news articles focus on the symptoms, they never seem to get around to identifying and discussing the real problems that plague our farmers and ranchers: skyrocketing costs and stagnant returns.

The next generation of farmers and ranchers, growing up all across rural America, has a more accurate view of what farming and ranching life is really about than do urban newspapers and think tanks.

They see long days in the fields, unpredictability caused by droughts, hail storms, hurricanes and floods and a low payoff at the end of the day. Too frequently, they decide it is not worth the effort to come back to the family farm.

That is one reason I was proud to champion the dependable, reliable disaster program that is included in the farm bill. It is wrong when our farmers and ranchers are forced to wait up to 3 years for a disaster payment. We can do better for our farmers, and we can do better for our taxpayers.

Farmers deserve a program and provides suitable relief when disaster strikes. Taxpayers deserve a program that requires farmers to manage their risk through crop insurance. We have done both.

As we finish debate on this farm bill, I am proud to say that my goal has been, and will always be, to increase the net income of America’s farmers and ranchers. I want a strong agricultural economy in this country. I want a strong, homegrown source of safe, affordable food and fiber.

I believe this farm bill will strengthen our farm economy. I want to mention a couple provisions in the farm bill that will increase producer’s bottom line as well as strengthen rural America’s agricultural economy.

One of the biggest reforms in this farm bill is the country-of-origin labeling compromise. The conference report simplifies COOL and makes it workable for both our ranchers and our packers. These changes are a major step forward and will help as we undergo the transition this fall to mandatory COOL. I call this COOL reform.

Another major reform we have fought for since the 1980s is allowing State-inspected packers to market their high quality meat nationwide. This is a huge win for ranchers, packers and rural America.

Whether it’s a dependable disaster program, COOL reform, interstate shipment, a $10 billion bump to our nutrition program or increase to our working-land conservation programs, there is a lot to be proud of in this farm bill.

While the urban media creates visions of agriculture producers lining up for Government payments, I am more worried about our next generation of producers lining up to leave those family farms and ranches. It’s so hard and such a tough life.

The great irony in the debate that swirls around this farm policy today is that it is getting so much criticism from so many different quarters and yet it remains one of the truly great success stories in the world.

As with anything else, there is always room for improvement. And I believe we have made improvements in this farm bill. But, every now and again, especially in an age of such cynicism, I know my Montana farmers and ranchers would like to open their packs, tune in to television or radio, and just hear a simple thank you.

We really appreciate what you do to keep us clothed and fed like nobody else in the world has ever been before.

Mr. President, Emerson wrote:

What is a farm but a mute gospel? The clock and the oven, the $6,000 acres and plants, the bright, light, insects, sun—it is a sacred emblem from the first furrow of spring to the last stack which the snow of winter over-takes in the fields.

The farm bill conference report before us today is a tribute to that sacred emblem, that mute gospel, the farm. This bill will help to address some of the challenges facing the farmer and rural America.

The conference report provides permanent disaster assistance for farmers and ranchers. And the conference report also includes farm tax reforms that fund farm tax relief as well as agricultural and trade measures.

The tax package in the conference report will help farmers to preserve land and to protect endangered species. It will provide tax relief for farmers and ranchers, and it will help America find low-cost, clean energy independence.

The trade-related measures in the conference report accomplish a number of vital purposes for this agriculture legislation. Trade provisions help to fund the farm bill’s provisions. And trade provisions level the trade playing field for softwood lumber producers.

The new program in this conference report for relief from agricultural disasters is a notable achievement. Currently, Congress addresses agricultural disasters through ad hoc bills. Ad hoc disaster bills are not dependable. They are never timely. And they are often unfair.

After a disaster strikes, farmers and ranchers often have to wait years to receive any disaster assistance. We need a permanent disaster relief program for our farmers and ranchers. We need a program that is dependable, timely, and equitable. The new program in this conference agreement will provide this relief.

Many Americans—including many leaders in Congress—say that America’s farm policy is ripe for reform. The farm bill conference report includes important farm tax reforms.

The conference report will prevent the use of farm losses as a tax shelter by limiting the amount of farming losses that a taxpayer may use on non-agricultural business income. It will ensure that farmers know their tax obligations by requiring the Farm Credit Corporation to always provide the IRS and the farmer with information returns when the farmer repays a CCC market assistance loan. It will allow farmers to pay additional self-employment taxes to qualify for Social Security.

Taken together with a slight decrease in the ethanol tax credit and other offsets, these reforms fully offset the tax and trade package in this conference report.

American farmers and ranchers want to be responsible stewards of their land. But the financial pressure to sell to developers can be extreme. The farm bill conference report includes tax incentives to encourage and enable private landowners to promote conservation on their land.

The conference report provides conservation tax relief for retired and disabled farmers. It would exempt CRP payments to these individuals from self-employment taxes. And it would keep these payments from reducing their Social Security or disability payments.
Nearly two-thirds of endangered and threatened species are found on private lands. So the conference report establishes a tax deduction for the cost of landowners’ actions to implement recovery plans under the Endangered Species Act.

More than 10 million acres of conservation easements are held by land trusts nationwide, many of them donated. The enhanced charitable tax deduction for conservation easements has proven to be a valuable incentive for making these kinds of gifts. So the conference report extends the enhanced deduction for conservation easements.

The conference report includes important provisions to protect American timber jobs and American lands. This conference report will help the American timber industry to remain globally competitive. And it will help to keep timber land from being sold for development.

America’s farming families sacrifice a lot to feed this country. The farm bill conference report includes a number of tax relief provisions to help them to start farming, help them to stay financially afloat, and help to make the Tax Code fairer for those who make a living working the land.

The conference report improves “Aggie Bonds.” These are tax-exempt bonds that provide low-interest loans for first-time farmers and ranchers.

Agricultural chemicals and pesticides purchased for legitimate uses are increasingly vulnerable to theft because of the drug trade and national security. The conference report provides support for agricultural businesses by providing a credit for the costs of protecting these agricultural chemicals and pesticides.

Some State water rules keep farmers and ranchers from selling their land when they need to or want to. The conference report will allow the tax-free exchange of stock that represents a holding of water rights. This will allow this land to be used for ranching, working the land, and helping the farmer and rural America. And let us pass this much-needed conference report.

I have never been more proud of what you all do in helping to provide food and fiber for America.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana, my good friend for all these years. We first came to the Senate in 1974. I thank him for working the land. I thank him for working diligently to make sure we had funding for this bill and some tax provisions we had in this bill that help correct inequities we did in the past. I thank the Senator. I will have more to say.

I have other speakers we need to recognize. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. I will start by congratulating Senator HARKIN and Senator CHAMBLISS for their good work on this legislation, and also Senator BAUCUS. I know Senator CONRAD also had a very important role in completing this legislation. This is a good bill for New Mexico, a good bill for the Nation. I plan to vote for the conference report.

Mr. President, I am pleased with the numerous provisions in this bill that help promote specialty crops like chile and pecans, conserve natural resources, invest in food and nutrition for children, increase production of advanced biofuels, promote broadband service in rural areas and provide fresh fruits and vegetables for schools. The bill includes the consensus language I support on country-of-origin labeling of meat and vegetables.

I also appreciate the conference including a provision authorizing a new Southwest Border Regional Commission. I originally introduced the Southwest Border Authority bill, which created this Commission, in 2002. I have been working since then with Senators BOXER, FEINSTEIN, and HUTCHISON toward its passage. I would also like to commend the work of Congressman SILVESTRE REYES, who championed the bill in the House. The new commission will give the Southwest border region the ability to coordinate economic activity and innovation. There can be no question that the Southwest border is an area of tremendous promise and economic activity. Unfortunately, this region has long suffered from a lack of coordinated effort among our trading partners on both sides of the border and in the region. The Southwest Border Regional Commission will, for the first time, provide the tools and personnel necessary to harness the opportunity in the area and create a dynamic economy that will benefit the entire Nation.

Nevertheless, there are provisions in this bill that cause me concern. The dairy industry is New Mexico’s single most important agricultural commodity. My State is currently the Nation’s ninth largest dairy State and sixth in total cheese production. Dairy producers in my State see little in the bill to help them deal with today’s high production costs and believe this bill will hurt them. It is unfortunate that the bill extends and expands a subsidy program called the milk income loss contract at a cost of $1.6 billion over 5 years. I led the opposition to the MILC subsidy in the 2002 farm bill and voted against the extension of it in 2006. I do believe that the provision favors producers in only a few States and is not a good use of taxpayers’ money.

I am also disappointed that the conference did not include my bipartisan provision that promoted water conservation for producers in the Ogallala aquifer. The Ogallala aquifer is a critical source of groundwater for agricultural and municipal uses. My voluntary program would have helped slow the rapid depletion of this vital resource. In place of my provision, the bill has a new Agriculture Water Enhancement Program. I intend to work with USDA to ensure that priority is given to States and agricultural producers in the Ogallala region to coordinate Federal assistance with State programs and to encourage cooperation among States in implementing conservation programs and efficient use of water.

Let me conclude my statement by spending a minute or two talking about the provision in this bill to expand trade preferences for Haiti, and the situation in Haiti more broadly.

Haiti is the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere. According to United Nations Development Program data, approximately 76 percent of Haiti’s population subsists on under $2 per day and 55 percent on under $1 per day. As much as three-fifths of the population is unemployed or underemployed. One in five Haitian children is malnourished.

Since late 2006, President Préval, in conjunction with the United Nations
Mission for the Stabilization of Haiti, or MINUSTAH, has made real progress in reclaiming the streets from the toughest gangs in Cité Soleil and other Port-au-Prince slums. Last month’s food riots—and the dismissal of Prime Minister Jean-Bertrand Aristide by the Haitian parliament’s rejection of Éric Picard, the Inter-American Development Bank official nominated to replace him—now threaten to reverse these hard-won gains.

On balance, though, for the first time in many years, Haiti has a real opportunity to build a future. And we owe it to the Haitian people to help them in this task—partly for reasons of preserving stability in the Caribbean, and partly to provide an alternative to those who are immigrating to the U.S., but mostly because it is the right thing to do.

As part of this ongoing commitment, we must take two immediate actions to consolidate stability by fostering economic growth in Haiti. I am pleased that one of these steps is taken by this farm bill.

The HOPE-II Act contained in this conference report has significant potential to create jobs in Haiti. As a member of the committee, a Senator who has had an awful lot of input into this bill, both policywise and otherwise, Senator Thune of South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, for their extraordinary leadership on this bill and for the imposing staff work that was involved in bringing this to conclusion. At long last we are going to have a farm bill.

This farm bill is important for a lot of reasons. I don’t have time to get into all the details of why I think this bill is important, but it does preserve a strong safety net to provide a permanent disaster title, which is something many of us have sought to achieve for some time, and fought long and hard for. It has conservation provisions that increase funding for certain conservation programs.

On balance, this farm bill is indicative of all the needs, the desires, the priorities of the Members—not only of the Agriculture Committee but also of this Congress. I think it will move agriculture forward in a positive direction. I commend the committee and those who have been involved all through this process for their hard work in bringing us to where we are today.

I want to make one point, though, because I think if there is anything in this bill as important as any of it, it is the energy title in this farm bill. The reason for that is we have an energy crisis in this country. You cannot go anywhere in my State of South Dakota, I dare say anywhere in this country, without hearing people talk about the high cost of gasoline. There is one thing we have done that is positive in terms of reducing the cost of oil, reducing the cost of gasoline in this country, and that is biofuels, bioenergy.

There is a lot of debate. I want to set one thing straight for the record because there has been a lot of criticism lately of corn-based ethanol and we talk about this whole food versus fuel debate. It is not so important today. So people know what the facts are, here are the facts. In 2002, the United States grew 9 billion bushels of corn. Of that, we turned 1.1 billion bushels into 3 billion gallons of ethanol.

In 2007, farmers grew 13.1 billion bushels of corn and turned 3 billion bushels of it into 8 billion gallons of ethanol, leaving 10.1 billion bushels for food, more than the 7.9 billion bushels in 2002.

If you do the math, despite a nearly threefold increase—growth—in the corn ethanol industry, the net corn food and feed product of the United States increased 34 percent since 2002.

Even though we dramatically increased the amount of ethanol we are producing in this country, we still, because of the great hard work of our farmers in this country and the productivity and increases in technology, produce more corn than we ever have in the history of our nation, so that we have 34 percent more corn in 2007 than we did in 2002, notwithstanding the threefold increase in renewable fuels.

I say all that to set the record straight because there is a real debate going on in this country about whether ethanol is to be blamed for higher food prices. Frankly, oil has way more to do with the cost of food and everything else we purchase in this country than does ethanol. But that is not enough. We can do a lot more. The reason the energy title in this bill is so important is because it moves us in a new direction. The next generation of biofuels is what we call cellulosic ethanol, made from biomass, made from wood chips, made from switchgrass and other types of grasses that are grown in abundance on the prairies of South Dakota and other places across this country.

We have an enormous opportunity here to not shrink the amount of biofuels we have in this country, but to grow the amount of biofuels because it is the one thing that is keeping gas prices under control. According to an analysis that was done by Merrill Lynch that was reported upon in the Wall Street Journal a couple of weeks back, if it were not for ethanol, gas prices and oil prices in this country would be 15 percent higher than they are today. That is about 50 cents a gallon for gasoline. We do not need less volume of biofuels, we need more volume of biofuels. That is why the energy title in this farm bill is so important, because it provides important incentives for the next generation of biofuels, cellulosic ethanol, to encourage farmers to grow energy-dedicated crops that can be converted into cellulosic ethanol. As we transition from corn-based ethanol to cellulosic ethanol, we have an incredible opportunity for this country to become less dependent upon foreign sources of energy, to grow our domestic supply of energy in this country in a way that is environmentally clean, in a way that helps support the economy of the United States of America and does not ship billions and billions of dollars every single year outside the United States to purchase imported oil.

This is an important farm bill for a lot of reasons, but the energy title is critical and I hope my colleagues here in the Senate, if for no other reason, will support it because of its energy provisions.

I see my time has expired, so I yield the remainder of my time and yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Washington State, Senator MURRAY.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time remains?

Mr. SALAZAR. The Senator from Georgia has 28 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. At this time I yield 5 minutes to another very valuable member of the committee, a Senator who has had an awful lot of input into this bill, both policywise and otherwise, Senator Thune of South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, for their extraordinary leadership on this bill and for the imposing staff work that was involved in bringing this to conclusion. At long last we are going to have a farm bill.

This farm bill is important for a lot of reasons. I don’t have time to get into all the details of why I think this bill is important, but it does preserve a strong safety net to provide a permanent disaster title, which is something many of us have sought to achieve for some time, and fought long and hard for. It has conservation provisions that increase funding for certain conservation programs.

On balance, this farm bill that is reflective of all the needs, the desires, the priorities of the Members—not only of the Agriculture Committee but also of this Congress. I think it will move agriculture forward in a positive direction. I commend the committee and those who have been involved all through this process for their hard work in bringing us to where we are today.

I want to make one point, though, because I think if there is anything in this bill as important as any of it, it is the energy title in this farm bill. The reason for that is we have an energy crisis in this country. You cannot go anywhere in my State of South Dakota, I dare say anywhere in this country, without hearing people talk about the high cost of gasoline. There is one thing we have done that is positive in terms of reducing the cost of oil, reducing the cost of gasoline in this country, and that is biofuels, bioenergy.

There is a lot of debate. I want to set one thing straight for the record because there has been a lot of criticism lately of corn-based ethanol and we talk about this whole food versus fuel debate. It is not so important today. So people know what the facts are, here are the facts. In 2002, the United States grew 9 billion bushels of corn. Of that, we turned 1.1 billion bushels into 3 billion gallons of ethanol.

In 2007, farmers grew 13.1 billion bushels of corn and turned 3 billion bushels of it into 8 billion gallons of ethanol, leaving 10.1 billion bushels for food, more than the 7.9 billion bushels in 2002.

If you do the math, despite a nearly threefold increase—growth—in the corn ethanol industry, the net corn food and feed product of the United States increased 34 percent since 2002.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, farming is a critical part of the economy in my home state of Washington. Many people don’t know it, but Washington is the largest farm State. And we are the third-largest producer of fruits and vegetables—which are also known around here as specialty crops.

So the farm bill we are considering today will help keep my state healthy and strong. It will help farmers in my State and elsewhere, by providing comprehensive provisions addressing the needs of specialty crop farmers. This legislation will really help our farmers by carrying out programs that I have been pushing for over the last several years with wheat farmers in Washington State to improve the countercyclical payment program to really help them turn in the economy.

As I said from the beginning, this bill isn’t perfect. I wish that we were able to lift income limits to the safety net that is so critical to our wheat farmers. I have been working for several years with wheat farmers in Washington State to improve the countercyclical payment program to really help them turn in the economy.

And finally, this bill will be a lifeline for food banks and other emergency food providers, which have struggled with rising food prices and the downturn in the economy.

Mr. President, we have got to get beyond politics on this. Making sure that farmers, who are struggling as gas prices soar and foreign competition threatens their livelihoods. And it helps millions of low-income families, who are struggling just to put food on the table.

Mr. President, we have got to get beyond politics on this. Making sure that farmers and our kids both benefit from investments in the programs in this bill is absolutely critical. We are not just talking about numbers. These programs can make or break people’s livelihoods. And I urge my colleagues to support them by approving this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I receive 4 minutes of the time of the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon the House of Representatives passed the farm bill conference report by a vote of 318 to 106. The Senate will vote in a few minutes and we expect to have an overwhelming majority. I thank Senator HARKIN for his great leadership, and Senator CHAMBLISS—it was a bipartisan effort—as well as Senator CONRAD and Senator BAUCUS, all the members of the committee, and I want to take special note of my good friend Representative COLLIN PETERSON from the State of Minnesota who showed such leadership in the House.

Almost 75 years later the reasons for maintaining that strong safety net are still there. The weather is still volatile, as we have seen this year. Crops are still subject to blight and disease. Farming is still a very risk-intensive business. We have seen prices going up and down—recently down in Asia—as we have seen investment and speculation in the farm market. I think it is very important that we have a safety net as we look at our food security so people don’t get in the same place as we are with our lack of energy security.

I want to mention a few important things to my State in this bill—the sugar program, the dairy program, and the conservation program. I know we have a dairy farmer here in attendance from Pheasants Forever. The conservation groups worked very hard on this—the nutrition assistance. But I especially wanted to mention the part of the bill that I worked on, the cellulosic piece, which looks to the next generation of biofuels—looking at prairie grass, switchgrass, other forms of biomass. As we look to, say, the country of Brazil, which is energy efficient—energy independent, based on sugarcane—we can do it in this country.

I believe we have to go beyond our crop-based ethanol and look at these other forms of ethanol and this bill creates the incentives so we can use energy crops such as switchgrass and prairie grass and do it in a way that is consistent with conservation, which is why I am so proud we have the support of the conservation groups that are with us today.

I was a strong proponent for reform in this bill. It didn’t have everything I asked for, as Senator MURRAY was discussing; no bill is perfect. But we had significant problems in the last few years with a small number of people—real estate developers from Florida, art which looked to the next generation of biofuels—looking at prairie grass, switchgrass, other forms of biomass. As we look to, say, the country of Brazil, which is energy efficient—energy independent, based on sugarcane—we can do it in this country.
The 2002 farm bill spurred rural development by allowing farmers in Minnesota and across the country to take risks to expand production. Because of productivity gains and innovation, including advances in renewable energy, the farm support programs in the 2002 farm bill actually came in $17 billion under budget.

As the Senate considers the conference report, it is important not to underestimate the value of a strong bill for states such as Minnesota where agriculture is so vital to our economy and way of life.

That is why, as a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I support the new farm bill. It includes an increased focus on cellulosic-based ethanol, continued support for a strong commodity safety net and a permanent program of disaster assistance.

And, of particular importance is that we have balanced our budget in this farm bill, with every dollar of new spending fully offset.

Traveling around the state during the campaign I was visiting all 87 counties this year, so I have had a good opportunity to talk to farmers around our State. They have told me that the 2002 farm bill worked for them, and they wanted to see that continued.

I am very pleased that this bill continues the same basic structure of the three-part safety net—direct payments, countercyclical payments and marketing loans—and I am especially pleased that we have succeeded in rebalancing the commodity programs to be more equitable to northern crops—corn, soybeans and—canola, beginning in 2010.

Another top priority for Minnesota farmers was creating a permanent program of disaster assistance for farmers. I would like to thank Senators CONRAD and BAUCUS for their efforts to see this program for farmers are a part of the 2008 farm bill for them, and they wanted to see that continued.

Minnesota has been hit with drought, flooding and everything in between over the several years, and they have had to wait years on end for Congress to pass adhoc disaster relief bills.

The permanent program of disaster relief in this farm bill will give farmers security moving forward, and quick relief when they need it.

This is another big piece of good news for Minnesota’s dairy farmers—we were able to restore the MILC payment rate that had been cut to 34 percent, back to 45 percent. We also added a feed cost adjuster to the MILC program, which means that when the price of feed goes up, the payment rate will also go up. This is really going to help dairy farmers cope with the high cost of feed and energy.

The new farm bill is also going to work for Minnesota’s sugar beet growers. They raise the sugar loan rate by ¾ of a cent—it may sound small to you and me, but it’s a big deal to the farmers in the Red River Valley.

We have language in the bill that will give U.S. sugar producers the right to supply 85 percent of the domestic market each year before USDA can allow additional sugar imports. And it creates a new sucrose-to-ethanol program to give us a new source of energy, and it’s making North Dakota a laboratory for potential increases in imports as a result of this administration’s trade policies.

One of my major goals for this farm bill was to include a strong cellulosic ethanol program. Farmers can and should play a bigger part in the future of this country’s energy security.

Instead of investing in oilfields of the Mideast, we should be investing in the farmers and workers of the Midwest.

Our corn-based ethanol and soybean-based biodiesel have taken off in Minnesota, and we are ready to expand to the next generation of biofuels: energy from native, perennial crops like switchgrass and prairie grass that require less fertilizer, yield more energy, and protect the air and water that we all depend on.

I was proud to draft first-of-its-kind legislation to provide farmers with an incentive to grow cellulosic energy crops, and I would like to thank Chairman HARKIN and Chairman PETERSON for working with me to include many of my provisions in the farm bill.

Energy crops like switchgrass and prairie grass hold great promise for farmers because they can be grown on marginal land that can’t produce a high yield of corn or soybeans, and they restore the land while they’re growing. Their deep root systems sequester carbon and put organic material back in the soil.

Native grasses can also save fuel and fertilizer because they don’t require lots of passes with farm equipment or heavy fertilizer applications.

The fact that these crops put carbon back in the soil and take less fossil fuel to produce offers us the promise of producing fuel for any other use that we need in this country, which would be a huge advance in the fight against global warming.

In short, the Biomass Energy Reserve Program is going to allow us to expand upon corn ethanol and soy diesel to a new generation of farm-based energy, and greater freedom from imported oil.

I am also pleased that the committee has prioritized beginning farmers and ranchers in the credit title. There are many small and part-time farmers, especially in growing areas like organic farming and energy production. But beginning farmers also face big obstacles, including limited access to credit and technical assistance, and the high price of land.

The beginning farmer and rancher programs in this farm bill provide mentoring and outreach for new farmers, and training in business planning and credit-building—the skills they need to succeed and stay on the land.

So there are a lot of good things for Minnesota and the country in this farm bill. There is, however, one critical area where I fought for more reform, and that was in stopping urban millionaires from pocketing farm subsidies intended for hard-working farmers.

This kind of reform is in the best interests of Minnesota farmers. Here are the facts.

Sixty farmers collected more than $1 million each under the 2002 farm bill, but none of them have been Minnesotans, even though Minnesota is the fifth-largest agricultural State. The average income of Minnesota farms, after expenses, is $54,000. But under the current system, a part-time farmer can have an income as high as $2.5 million from outside sources and still qualify for Federal benefits.

It made no sense to hand out payments to multimillionaires when this money should have been targeted to family farmers.

And what we saw so clearly in the media coverage of this farm bill was that big payments to big-city investors were undermining public support for the entire bill, even though commodity payments account for just 16 percent of funding in this bill.

But this bill is going to do better for our farmers by closing loopholes and tightening income eligibility standards.

First, the new farm bill eliminates the “three-entity rule.” This will cut down on abuse by applying payment limits strictly to individuals—and married couples—and ending the practice of dividing farms into multiple corporations to multiply payments.

Second, I am pleased to report that the conferees have included substantial income limits for those who participate in the commodity programs, which is an area where I fought hard for reform. What the bill says is, if you earn more than $500,000 in nonfarm income—so if you have a high-paying job off the farm, or income from investments or any other source of income—off the farm in excess of $50,000— you cannot participate in the commodity programs.

This makes good sense to me. This will take care of multimillionaires, like David Letterman and Paul Allen of Microsoft, or Maurice Wilder, the real-estate developer in Florida, getting farm payments intended for family farmers.

The bill also says that if you have more than $750,000 in farm-related income, you lose your direct payments. I think this also makes sense. I would venture to say that any farm bringing in that much money after expenses is of a size and scope that they no longer need the support of taxpayers.

So the reform in this bill is not perfect, but it is a lot better then where we were before. And I thank the conferees for taking these important steps in the bill.

In conclusion, there are a lot of important changes in this bill, and there is a lot that is good for rural America, and the safety net is vital for farmers. We have made important advances in
conservation, and made much-needed improvements to our nutrition programs. Perhaps most importantly, this bill lays the groundwork for farmers to play an even greater role in our country's energy security and will advance us to the next generation of biofuels. For all of these reasons, I want to vote for this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. At this time I wish to yield up to 10 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. DeMINT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. DeMINT. Mr. President, I do not like to be the one to rain on a parade, but I am rising today to speak against the farm bill. I wish to do it in the context of thanking the chairman and the ranking member for their work. I think if we look at our job to manage the farming industry in this country, they had very little choice but to do what they have done and try to go through all aspects of farming and include it in this bill. That took over 2 hours to print out. It came out less than 3,000 pages long and we are getting ready to vote on it. Not one Member of the Senate has read probably even part of it—certainly not the whole bill. Yet I think everyone, or at least a large number of Senators, want to leave here today saying they voted for the farm bill.

I realize nothing I can say that is wrong with the bill—whether it violates budgets or even our own Senate rules, as far as what we are supposed to do in conference—is going to make that much difference. I wish to express some concerns—maybe, before I talk specifically about the farm bill, some broader concerns.

I heard one of my colleagues yesterday say it was a pretty good way: The Congress is comfortably sitting on a raft floating down a slow, deep river. But some of us hear the waterfall around the corner, and it is the waterfall I wish to talk a little bit about today.

We all need to remember our oath of office. I don’t want to be preaching to my more veteran colleagues, but our oath of office is simply to protect and defend the Constitution. The whole point of the Constitution is to control the scope of what we are supposed to do at the Federal level. It keeps us from getting involved in all aspects of American business and social life. It limits us so that we can, in effect, keep America free. In as we all know, we have continued to expand the size of the Federal Government, essentially making a mockery of our oath of office now to the point where we are trying to manage the education system in America and we are trying to manage the health care system in America.

This week, we are trying to tell local and State governments how they are to deal with their public safety officers. We are trying to manage the farming industry in this country, which is very complex. I cannot pretend to understand it or to tell any other Member of the Senate how we are to manage it. But the fact is, we no longer limit the scope of what we do at the Federal level. It is going to go across our country or around the world that this body would not take up, and we seldom even talk about any restrictions the Constitution might have on what we do.

We also do not limit how much we can spend. We have no requirement that we balance our budget year to year. So we don’t have to select priorities and cut programs when we add programs. So we continue to grow our budget, approaching now $10 trillion in debt as a Nation and adding to that every year. Here we are at a time of war and economic downturn, and there is nothing that is too much for us to spend. The President has proposed $50 billion of AIDS support to Africa. That is wonderful, but there is enough human need around the world to bankrupt this country 100 times.

This farm bill expands spending. It does not modernize the program in any way that does more to make the free market work better, or to make us deeper and deeper into managing an aspect of the private economy, as we have done with health care and education, and every year we get deeper into trying to manage the private sector. One could be forced to make the private sector work better, to make freedom work for everyone and not to use problems as an excuse to replace freedom and the private market with more Government. That is essentially what we are doing.

I am not just jumping on the farm bill and those who have worked on it. We know we continue to subsidize some millionaires, and we eliminate some key payment limits. I can go through the list, and there is no end of what is wrong with the bill. As I said before, I realize there are provisions that solve problems throughout, that there are constituencies for little aspects of this bill throughout. We pulled it together, and we are going to present it now to our country. What is wrong with the bill, frankly, has very little relevance today.

I appeal to my colleagues, I know we are not going to stop this bill, but we can consider the cost of production. I want to help so many of our farmers in their home State of Iowa and across the country. We are grateful for his help.

Also, I wish to mention Senator Chambliss’s work and Senator Conrad, Senator Baucus, and so many others.

Chairman Harkin was so patient with me when I kept coming to talk about dairy farmers over and over again, as he listened and worked so hard to help so many of our farmers in his home State of Iowa and across the country. We are grateful for his help.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, first of all, I thank Chairman Harkin for his great work and Ranking Member Chambliss for their leadership on this bill, a very difficult piece of legislation.

Chairman Harkin was so patient with me when I kept coming to talk about dairy farmers over and over again, as he listened and worked so hard to help so many of our farmers in this bill. He is wonderful, but there is enough human need around the world to bankrupt this country 100 times.
State of Pennsylvania has been very concerned about our dairy farmers as well over many years. Senator LEAHY worked hard on this issue in conference. I appreciate his work.

I am also very pleased that some of the amendments I worked on in committee—such as the mandatory daily price reporting for dairy products, the feed and fuel cost being part of the so-called make allowances which are very important to balance between what happens to our farmers and what happens to processors.

Specialty crops were mentioned before. In our State, fruits, vegetables, and other specialty crops have never had the kind of focus this bill provides.

International food aid is part of this bill. I don’t have time to go into that, but everyone knows that prices have enveloped the world. Almost one-fifth of the nations of the world are having problems that relate to food and security. States such as Pennsylvania have been underserved by the Federal Crop Insurance Program for many years. This bill includes reforms that help producers in these States to increase the number of acres they have enrolled in the coverage program.

The reform overall in this bill is very significant. There is $300 million in cuts to direct payments, reforms in the marketing loan program, it closes loopholes, reduces program abuses, on and on. These are changes that are made in this bill.

In terms of conservation, the Chesapeake Bay will be provided dollars to restore this tremendous natural resource.

The Conservation Farmland Protection Program is helped enormously. I conclude with the nutrition program. This farm bill makes substantial investments in domestic food assistance programs and improves the Food Stamp Program for our families. Mr. President, 1 in 10 Pennsylvanians is currently receiving food stamps, and we have tremendous help for those families in this bill.

This is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to adopt the conference report, and if the President vetoes it, we will override his veto.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BILIBLIS. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. VITTER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I stand in strong support of this consensus, bipartisan farm bill, and I encourage all of my colleagues, Democratic and Republican, to show strong bipartisan support.

I support this bill fundamentally for three reasons: First, as the last farm bill did, it provides a stable environment for our farmers, a stable environment so they can plan and prosper in the future. Second, it does that in a fiscally responsible way—no tax increases, payment limit reform, and other reforms—to move us down the path of fiscal responsibility. Third, it does some very crucial and important work for Louisiana farmers in particular in a number of different areas.

In the area of sugar, we have a three-quarter of a cent loan rate increase, the first such loan rate increase since 1985. It is long overdue.

In the rice industry, the industry requested changes in the uniform loan rate for different types of rice to make that more uniform and helpful to the industry, and we have done that.

In the area of timber, there are tax provisions that reduce maximum taxes on gains from certain timber from 20 percent, the capital gains rate, to a maximum of 15 percent. That is enormously important.

In the area of milk, as my colleague from Pennsylvania mentioned, there are important improvements and provisions that will help domestic dairy farmers.

There are plenty of good, solid, responsible reasons to be for this bill. Fundamentally, it will create that predictability, that stability our farmers need to succeed and to prosper into the future, which is good not just for them but for all Americans, including Americans as consumers, which, of course, is all of us.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this. I encourage President Bush to reconsider his veto threat and not veto the bill. But certainly, if it is necessary, I will stand and vote to support overriding that Presidential veto.

I encourage my colleagues to also be firm in that regard.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to a very valuable member of our committee, Senator Brown from Ohio, whose signature on this bill is the option that farmers have on the ACRE Program. I thank him for all of his efforts in making sure we had that in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for his terrific work as chairman of this committee, especially to unlock how our communities can conserve, nutrition, and for family farmers.

We have for many months been debating the farm bill, legislation that wears many hats, all of them important. It is an agriculture bill, it is a food bill, it is an energy bill, it is a conservation bill, it is a world development bill, and it is an economic development bill. Melding these priorities, each one critical to our Nation’s future, is a profound accomplishment.

I particularly applaud Chairman HARKIN for his work.

Last spring, I held a series of roundtables throughout Ohio and heard directly from farmers about what this year’s farm bill should look like. They told me a safety net that lends stability to market segments buffeted by unpredictable costs and volatile prices is essential. Farmers need a safety net that makes sense, but it is important to temper that sentiment but not looking for a handout. Rather, farmers are looking for assistance when prices drop or natural disasters strike.

This bill incorporates a safety net proposal I put forward with Senator Durbin in the Average Crop Revenue Program, which will help family farmers in Ohio and consumers and taxpayers across the country by strengthening and diversifying the farm safety net. For the first time ever, farmers will be able to enroll in a program that insures against revenue instability, which, for many farmers, makes more sense than the traditional price-focused safety net.

Conservation programs were another frequent topic at the roundtables I held. One point is clear: Farmers do not want Washington rhetoric about conservation and alternative energy; they want commonsense programs and meaningful incentives, which this bill brings to the table.

As I traveled around Ohio, I met with Mark Schiebel, a corn farmer in northwest Ohio, who will take advantage of the Average Crop Revenue Election Program. By targeting overall revenue rather than simply price, farmers can receive better protections against two things: natural disasters—therefore, low yield—and price volatility.

I met the same week with Ralph Dull, a hog farmer from Montgomery County who uses wind turbines to run his farm. Promoting sustainable farm-based renewable energy, such as the wind energy that Ralph’s turbines produce, is another key element of the farm bill.

As I traveled around Ohio, I met with fruit and vegetable farmers who asked for more support as they provide fresh and healthy produce to Columbus and that region of the State.

The farm bill creates a new program, the Healthy Food Enterprise Development Center, that will connect local farmers to communities in need access to healthy, affordable food.

During a roundtable in Chillicothe, I met with dairy farmers such as Bryan Wolfe who told me about the difficulty he has had meeting rising feed costs. This bill provides relief for these dairy farmers by linking the dairy safety net to the cost of feed.

This bill does something else. It fights hunger. When the purchasing power of food stamps erodes, so does our Nation’s progress against hunger. This bill increases food stamp benefits and indexes the benefits to inflation. Nearly 400,000 people in Ohio will receive additional benefits from this bill.
In Hocking County, OH, more than 2,000 residents went to the local food bank in a single day. That is over 7 percent of the local population. While we need to do more, this bill is a major step, especially in nutrition. We need to keep working with Dykema McGovern-Dole to make sure these dollars are available for nutrition all over the world.

But this bill moves us forward. Ohio’s families need this farm bill, and Ohio’s rural communities deserve this farm bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I have one more speaker. I think Senator HARKIN probably is prepared to wrap up. While Senator Cochran is on his way over here, let me make some comments relative to wrapping up this up. We are finally here. This has been a long process. The Presiding Officer is a member of our committee and knows what we have been through to get to this point. It has been a lot of hard work, a lot of strong leadership on the part of the chairman, who has done a terrific job, as I said earlier.

My friend CONRAD and I have spent countless hours together working through this extremely complex piece of legislation. I cannot say enough good things about his leadership, his intellect, as well as his understanding of what good agricultural policy is all about.

I want to thank all of the members of the conference committee on our side, Senators Cochran, Lugar, Roberts, and Grassley. What terrific work they did. It was a long conference, having been begun back in December, and from December until now, we have met on a regular basis, and decisions that have been made were sometimes extremely difficult and very emotional. But what great leadership all of these Senators have shown.

To the other members of the committee on my side, Senators Coleman, Crafo, Thune, and Graham, again, we would not be where we are without their input. I thank each of them.

I also want to say a special thanks to Majority Leader REID and Minority Leader MCCONNELL. They have provided terrific leadership on both sides of the aisle. They have been extremely cooperative, willing to do the technical things we need to do, and at the same time to push Senator Harkin and myself when we needed pushing. And we, again, would not be where we are were it not for their strong leadership, their cooperation. I thank each of them individually.

Following is a list of folks over at CBO I want to thank: Jim Langley, Greg Hitz, Dave Ully and the entire ag team at CBO, as well as Kathleen Fitzgerald, Dan Hoople, Megan Carroll, Kathy Green, Tyler Krueger, Kim Cawley, Teri Gullo, Sheila Dacey, Mark Booth, Zach Epstein, Andrew Langan, Lisa Ramirez-Braman, Burke Doherty, Amy Potz, Susan Willie, Sunita D’Monte, Matthew Pickford, and Mark Grabobitz.

As we go through the process of putting a bill like this together, we have to constantly call up CBO and ask questions, and they have been a part of the bill, and I have to say, CBO has worked overtime to make sure they accommodated every single request we had, and they did it on rush-hour time. They have done a great job over there. I thank each of them.

Another thing we take for granted around here that we never should is the staff of this Senate. I want to say a particular thanks to Dave Schiapa and the folks on his staff, as well as to Lula Davis and the folks on her staff. This has been a partnership that so many people have talked about on both sides of the aisle from an Ag Committee standpoint, but it has also been a partnership between the staff.

I do not want to leave out our folks who show up early and stay late: our clerks, our Parliamentarians, who have been unbelievable. They are always here and provide us the professional leadership we need on the technical issues. To each of them, we say thank you.

At this time, I want to turn to Senator Cochran before I ultimately conclude. As I turn to Senator Cochran and give him 5 minutes, let me say as a former chairman of this committee, he is in an arc community all across this great country. Senator Cochran has been a dear personal friend of mine for many years before I came to the Senate. As a friend and as somebody whom I looked up to when it comes to agricultural policy, it is my pleasure to turn to him now and to yield 5 minutes to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I thank you for your welcome from the great state of Georgia, the ranking Republican member of this committee, for his kind words and for his hard work and diligent efforts to bring us to a successful conclusion of this conference report.

The chairman of the Committee, Mr. Harkin, has also been relentless and thoughtful in the way he has managed the responsibilities of the chairman of this committee through this very difficult task.

This has not been an easy task. I applaud both of them for their leadership, their fairness, and their support for farmers’ and ranchers’ interests, and truly for the interests of all Americans.

I also compliment the staff members of the committee for their tireless work on this bill: Mark Halverson, the majority staff director of the committee and all of his staff who worked to resolve the many issues important to our region of the country; Martha Scott Poidexter, a former staff member of mine, as the minority staff director; the rural staff director for Senator Chambliss, deserves high praise for the successful efforts to help resolve the issues important to agriculture producers and the consumers in our State of Mississippi.

I also want to thank Vernie Hubert, Alan Mackey, Hayden Milberg, Cameron Brunt, Betsy Croker, Jane Anna Harris, Anne Hazlett, Matt Coley, Kate Patterton, Dennis Haraway, Colleen Seyfert, Dawn Stump, and Carlisle Clarke for their contributions to this effort.

This has been a team effort. I have been very fortunate to have had the privilege and pleasure of working with all of those I mentioned in the drafting and negotiation of this very important legislation.

Mr. President, the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 strikes a careful balance between the many important programs within the farm bill. I am pleased that the bill continues the farm income safety net program developed in the 2002 farm bill. Farmers in Mississippi believe these programs have worked well and are adequate support during times of depressed prices. Currently, our farmers are fortunate to be benefiting from strong commodities prices. However, we have learned from past experiences that these prices can fall as quickly as they have risen and having a safety net in place is necessary for farmers to make the significant investments needed to operate.

Conservation is an important part of a farm bill. The continuation of programs such as the Conservation Incentives Program, Wetlands Reserve Program, and Environmental Quality Incentives Program which have broad participation throughout Mississippi. Farmers understand how critical the environment is to the continuation of agriculture and the health of the community of which they live. The increased funding for these incentive based conservation programs will allow producers to adapt these programs to their greater success to their land and provide real benefits for their good efforts.

The additional funding for nutrition programs will address many of the needs facing many of America’s poor, children, and elderly. The nutrition programs authorized in this committee touch the lives of one out of every five people in this country, including over 37 million children. Also, I am pleased the conference recognizes the success of the fruit and vegetable pilot program and have expanded the program to all States.

There are many titles of the farm bill that are often overlooked but are important to agriculture and our rural economies. The research title of the farm bill is crucial to keeping U.S. agriculture a leader in food and fiber production. The streamlining of grant programs in the research title will allow for efficiency and oversight of the appropriated funds. The rural development programs provide assistance to rural communities through housing assistance, rural broadband access, water and wastewater programs, and small
business development. I am pleased that the conference has maintained and improved upon these important programs.

The issue of payments limits is always a point of contention in every farm bill. The reductions in payment levels in this bill are a significant reform from the current payment limit rules. The payment limit levels in this bill will result in a significant hardship for many producers in Mississippi. Some of the most diverse producers in Mississippi will be ineligible for income safety net programs. It is important that the supporters of stronger payment limits understand that this will not reduce farm bill spending. The land will be farmed by another producer and be eligible for program benefits. The adjusted gross income limitation has the effect of moving one farmer off the land and putting another farmer in their place. The bill doesn’t ask other businesses to go out of business if they grow and expand, why should farmers be treated differently?

Again, I want to thank Senator HARKIN and Senator BAUCUS for their good work on this bill. I encourage my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, how much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has 6 minutes 20 seconds remaining, and the Senator from Iowa has 5 minutes 40 seconds remaining.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, let me again thank Senator COCHRAN and Senator GRASSLEY and every member of the conference committee but, more than that, he has been a dear friend. I want to continue to acknowledge the hard work of a number of folks on the other side of the aisle. We had Senator BAUCUS, chairman of the Finance Committee, who worked closely with Senator GRASSLEY and every member of the conference committee on our side of the Capitol to try to find the funding for this bill. It is completely offset as scored by CBO.

In addition, he worked out a very fair and equitable tax package for agricultural issues, and I emphasize that, to be included in this farm bill. And it is that particular amount of spending that has been totally offset as scored by CBO. So Senator BAUCUS and Senator GRASSLEY deserve an awful lot of credit.

To my good friend, Senator BLANCHE LINCOLN, what a real ally she has been to all of us on the committee. Senator SPECTER has been a tireless worker from a conference committee standpoint.

This truly has been a bipartisan effort. But the real work that has been done on this bill—the policy decisions are made by the membership, was done by the staff.

I say to Mark Halverson and Susan Keith, and all of the members of the minority committee, how much we appreciate them for their hard work, their commitment to agriculture. Beginning in December, after these folks had worked so hard to get the bill done and to get the bill to the Senate floor, they did it in a single day. Since this bill was passed, including weekends, these folks have been working tirelessly to try to accommodate the policy decisions the Members have been making. It has been an unbelievable amount of hard work we simply would not be here.

Senator COCHRAN thanked all of the members of my staff, and I will not go back through those again. They know how much I love them and how much I appreciate them. But to Martha Scott Poindexter, Vernie Hubert, and Hayden Milberg I owe a special thanks, because they have had to put up with me and tell me telling them what they needed to do and when they needed to do it. And that is not an easy task from their side. So I have tremendous appreciation for all of the staff who worked so hard to make this happen today.

There are some other staff members I particularly want to acknowledge because they have been, again, tremendous and they have been right there side by side with all of the Ag Committee staff from day one. That is Amanda Taylor, Elizabeth Paris on Senator BAUCUS’s staff; on Senator BAUCUS’s staff, John Selib, Brandon Willis, Rebecca Baxter, Kathy Kock; on Senator LINCOLN’s staff, Ted Serafini; and on Senator CONRAD’s staff, Tom Mahr and Jim Miller. Tom and Jim particularly have been involved with my staff since literally about a year ago in attempting to craft the farm bill that ultimately came to the floor of the Senate. They have been tremendous in providing staff members, providing us information to help Senator CONRAD and myself make policy decisions. To those two gentlemen, I want to say a special thanks.

This bill is going to finally come to a vote on the floor. This bill is not a perfect bill, as has been said by several different folks here. There have been some folks who stood up and pointed out some objections they have to the bill.

This is my third bill, two as a Member of the House and now one as a Member of the Senate. All farm bills are extremely controversial. All farm bills are portrayed by the media as being a giant welfare program for farmers.

Nothing is further from the truth, particularly in this farm bill. In this farm bill, about 11 percent of the outlays are projected to go to farm programs. Most of the outlays are going to go to nutrition programs to feed hungry people in this country. We have an obligation, as the richest and most abundant, from a food standpoint country in the world, to take care of those folks who are in need, and we are doing so in this bill.

In addition, we are providing conservation measures that are going to save the land, save rural America from being developed in many areas where it ought not to be developed. We are also going to make sure that we provide future generations with alternative energy sources, and that we do it in the right way.

I want to close by making a comment on the point of order Senator GREGG made. He knows how much respect I have for him. He did a terrific job when he was chairman of the Budget Committee and now as the ranking member.

Again, he is doing a good job. He knows I have tremendous respect for his position on any issue relative to the budget. But here is what I wish to explain to my colleagues. His point is that we are going to spend more money above the budget than we actually say we are going to spend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I ask unanimous consent that we have an additional 4 minutes equally divided between Senator HARKIN and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GREGG. Reserving the right, I ask for an additional 2 minutes as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. If anybody in this body can tell me today what the price of corn, or soybeans or cotton is going to be 3 or 30 years from now, then we would not have to worry about projecting exactly what the expenditure, from a budget standpoint, in this farm bill is going to be. The fact is, we can’t even project what the price of corn and soybeans and other commodities is going to be tomorrow, much less what we can predict it will be 5 years from now. In fact, the 2002 farm bill, which is currently in place, had the same budget point of order made against it in 2002 and was passed.

The fact is, in that farm bill, not only did we not spend what was projected to be spent, but we spent between $15 and $18 billion less than what was projected to be spent. The reason is that commodity prices have been high. Therefore, payments coming out of Washington have been either nonexistent or very low. That is where the $15 to $18 billion in savings has come from. In this bill, as long as commodity prices remain high, all farmers are going to have what they want, which is their stream of income coming from the marketplace versus Washington. Washington is going to have what we want, which is a reduction and limitations on payments going to farmers. The point of order, obviously, is correct in saying we don’t know exactly how much money is going to be spent under countercyclical programs. That is the nature of farm bills. But the fact is, we spent less under 2002. We are going to spend less under this bill in all probability. But we cannot say that for certain. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to the
Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand that as chairman of the committee, Senator HARKIN should have the right to complete his statement. I am happy to proceed at this time.

I would simply make the point, in response to the idea that this bill and the budget, there is no way anybody with a straight face can represent that this bill is fiscally responsible in the context of the budget. When this bill left the Senate, it was at $285 billion. It is now at $300 billion. This bill has $18 billion worth of gimmicks in it. The tax years are changed for corporations to pick up money. There is an attempt to adjust programs so some basically disappear after a certain number of years on the theory that then they would seem spending enough full well that those programs are going to be continued. We also have a situation where this bill violated the pay-go rules of the House and would violate the pay-go rules of the Senate, to the extent they are ever enforced around here, if we had passed the Senate budget.

The irony is that this bill comes to the floor before the budget, which was voted on and voted in favor of by the Democratic membership. That Democratic budget is violated in this bill. I have to tell my colleagues, if a Democratic budget, which spends a heck of a lot of money, is violated, then obviously, the bill itself is spending a lot of money. In addition, it uses gimmicks such as custom user’s fees. It uses gimmicks such as this adjustment of payroll. It ends up, even using all those gimmicks such as this adjustment of payroll, almost $3 billion going to fruits and vegetables, horticulture, all the things that, again, lend themselves to a healthier diet and a healthier America. There is also a quote from the organization supporting specialty crops that says in part: This farm bill represents a sea change in U.S. agriculture in offering a place for investment in the future of the fruit and vegetable producers across this country.

We have taken a bold step to expand the fresh fruit and vegetable snack program to all 50 States, which makes certain that this farm bill doesn’t just help farmers but helps schoolchildren have greater access to fruits and vegetables. “This is truly a win-win for both agriculture and the public.” On livestock, we improved the protections for livestock producers when they make contracts. I wish to publicly thank my colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, for making sure we had those provisions in this bill. The country of origin labeling now will go into effect this fall and we will know what products come from and, finally, we will have the interstate shipment of State-inspected meat after all these years. On conservation, we have done more for conservation in this bill than any farm bill ever passed, almost 41 percent of all the money that is paid to agricultural producers will be paid through conservation programs to protect our soil, wildlife habitats, and clean water.

Lastly, I showed this picture yesterday. I show it again. This is the country of origin labeling. Farmers can plant and grow crops, but they do it in an environmentally sound way, with clean water and clean streams, with buffer strips, wildlife habitat all across the country. That is what is so good about this bill because we have improved the conservation programs.

This is a bipartisan bill. In fact, I got a note this morning that our former Secretary of Agriculture, Mike Johanns, has now said he would vote for the bill. He would support it. In addition, this is my seventh farm bill in 30-some years—I have never seen so many groups come together to support a farm bill, over 500 groups. Farm groups, conservation groups, hunters and fishermen, energy groups for renewable energy, antihunger groups, religious groups—I have never seen such a broad coalition of over 500 groups in support of this bill. Now we have the former Secretary of Agriculture saying he supports it. All these groups support the farm bill. The President says he wants to veto it. Evidently, he is right and everybody else is wrong. I beg to differ. This is a great bipartisan bill.

I keep hearing from people: Why can’t you people work together, quit bickering, get things done? We did that here. We worked together in a year and a half to produce this great product. I wish to especially thank my ranking member, Senator CHAMBLISS, for all his great work. Senator CHAMBLISS reminds me a little bit of old Senator Sam Ervin, who used to say “I am just a poor, little old country lawyer from the rural South.” Senator CHAMBLISS makes something like that, but I can tell you he is one smart, intelligent, good negotiator. He brought this farm bill forward when he was chairman. I couldn’t have asked for a better partner and working relationship in getting this through this year, so let me say, without any fear of contradiction, had it not been for Senator CHAMBLISS and all his hard work, we would not have gotten the 79 votes we got for this bill in December. The fact that I think we got an overall majority today is a tribute to Senator CHAMBLISS’s leadership and hard work on behalf of all agriculture. One thing I will say about Senator CHAMBLISS, he is a proud conservative. The only thing he is liberal about is giving out those Georgia peanuts. I want him to know, I appreciate those peanuts.

Let me thank all the members of our committee. In particular, I thank the members of our conference committee. I want to especially thank Senator CONRAD, our budget chairman, for his expertise, knowledge, diligence. Senator CONRAD was there for every meeting. He hung in there on this farm bill from the beginning to the end. We could not have gotten where we are without the help, the support, the knowledge, the expertise, the work of Senator CONRAD. I wish to say, again, that the farmers and ranchers of North Dakota have no better fighter for them, no stronger advocate than they have in Senator CONRAD. I can tell you nothing escapes his attention. When it comes to fighting for the farmers and ranchers of North Dakota, Kent Conrad is always in the lead.

I wish to publicly thank him and his staff for all the help on this bill.

I want to especially thank Senator LEAHY, the former chairman, who also fights for Vermont farmers, especially dairy producers. He had a great seat at this table. He made sure...
The Senate from Missouri is recognized.

Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, I raise a point of order under rule XLIV, paragraph 8(a), section 12034 of the farm bill conference report violates this rule in that it is a new directed spending provision to accompany H.R. 2419, the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

GREG POINT OF ORDER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on agreeing to the motion to waive paragraph 8 of rule XLIV against the conference report.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARR). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 129 Leg.]

YEAS—74

Yeas—62

Mr. HARKIN. I would be pleased to yield to me for purposes of a colloquy?

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the subsequent two votes on this agricultural matter be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The Senate from Missouri is recognized.

Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, I raise a point of order under rule XLIV, paragraph 8(a), section 12034 of the farm bill conference report violates this rule in that it is a new directed spending provision to accompany H.R. 2419, the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on agreeing to the motion to waive paragraph 8 of rule XLIV against the conference report.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARR). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 34, as follows:
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Ms. CANTWELL. Section 8105 of this bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to “provide free of charge to Indian tribes any trees, portions of trees or forest products from National Forest Service land for traditional and cultural purposes as long as those products are for commercial purposes.” Several Indian tribes in Washington State are successors in interest to tribes and bands who were signatory to treaties with the United States which expressly reserved the right to gather forest products from lands which currently include National Forest System lands. These treaties are regarded as the supreme law of the land and cannot be modified by Congress unless Congress clearly intends to do so. Am I correct that section 8105 is not in any way intended to modify or supersede the treaty rights of these tribes?

Mr. HARKIN. The Senator is correct. Section 8107 of the bill contains a “savings” provision that explicitly states that nothing in this legislation “alters, abridges, diminishes, repeals, or affects any agreement between the Forest Service and an Indian tribe”. Section 8105 of this bill does not in any way affect valid treaty rights of tribes to gather forest products from National Forest System lands.

Ms. CANTWELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, despite my great admiration for America’s hardworking farmers and my support for their children, lower taxes, and relief from government regulation. Rural America better than most. In its hundreds of pages are special favors like $170 million bailout for the west coast salmon industry included at the insistence of the Speaker of the House; $93 million in special tax treatment for asparagus growers. During debate on the Senate farm bill last year, my colleague Senator Gregg offered an amendment, which failed, to strike this provision. This is a crop that has never before received farm subsidies; $175 million would be transferred to Bureau of Reclamation for activities at three Nevada lakes; $500,000 to the Walker River Paiute Tribe for legal and professional services in support of settling tribal water claims.

In today’s economy, when hardworking American families buy groceries they feel the sting of misguided Federal agriculture policies. Instead of fine tuning our farm programs to improve their efficiency, we have allowed them to swell into mammoth government entitlements that seek to serve special interests at the behest of congressional benefactors. Sixty-nine years after the Great Depression and the advent of the farm bill, well into the 21st century, commodity prices have reached record highs. I believe American agriculture has progressed to the point where we no longer need government grown farms.

Don’t misunderstand. I am not opposed to providing a reasonable level of assistance and risk management to farmers when they need America’s help. Farmers never abandon America, and America mustn’t abandon them. When a farmer suffers from a natural disaster such as droughts or floods, they rightly deserve assistance. But they need a hand up, not a hand out.

The American taxpayer has been told before that farm bills and their thicket of rules and regulations are evil to provide our country and the world—with affordable, abundant food. Today, as food prices reach historic highs, they’re being told the same thing. We must challenge that notion as grocery shelves and food prices inflate and rationing occurs on a global scale. We must question policies that divert over 25 percent of corn out of the food supply and into subsidized ethanol production. Do Americans really want a support system that costs consumers $2 billion annually in higher sugar prices? Will we truly reduce our dependency on foreign oil by extending tariffs that make it too expensive to invest in sugar ethanol production? Can we honestly demand fair and free trade at the same time we keep millions of farmers who already produce a good surplus from dumping subsidized cotton on the world market?

The farm bill conference report is expected to cost taxpayers around $389 billion. According to the Congressional Research Service, the Food and Energy Security Act, also known as the farm bill, was voted down by a $18 billion and even though Democrats and Republicans in both Chambers have promised to rein in pork barrel spending, this bill betrays that promise. Buried within its hundreds of pages are special favors like $170 million bailout for the west coast salmon industry included at the insistence of the Speaker of the House; $93 million in special tax treatment for asparagus growers. During debate on the Senate farm bill last year, my colleague Senator Gregg offered an amendment, which failed, to strike this provision. This is a crop that has never before received farm subsidies; $175 million would be transferred to Bureau of Reclamation for activities at three Nevada lakes; $500,000 to the Walker River Paiute Tribe for legal and professional services in support of settling tribal water claims.

The bill authorizes a myriad of grant programs including grants for research into pig genetics, grants for the preservation of historic barns, and $300 million for the Sun Grant Program, which provides grants to 6 universities and science centers that conduct bioenergy research.

Twenty million dollars goes to the collection and storage of seeds for research purposes; $75 million for a crop research facility in El Reno, OK; $35 million to promote the production of “hard white wheat.” A $4 billion disaster assistance package on top of an existing crop insurance program that already costs $200,000 in annual income and $2 million in net worth. Indeed, these payments aren’t going to the average hardworking American farmer working in the Heartland. This farm bill actually increases subsidy rates for some crops and a majority of those payments are funneled only to a few staple crops. During debate on the Senate farm bill I called on the Senate to consider an amendment which would have capped subsidies for farmers whose income exceeds $250,000. That amendment, which was rejected, was written by Senators BYRON DORGAN of North Dakota and GEORGE SORRELL of Vermont—two distinguished colleagues who understand rural America better than most. Instead of fixing a system that provides farm payments to millionaire land owners, sometimes when they don’t own any land at all, we must address the cries for reform from small farmers themselves. In fact, this farm bill contains a phony payment limit designed to allow farmers to earn up to $750,000 and $500,000 off the farm before hitting any subsidy ceiling. Astounding.

This Congressional feeding frenzy is tragic because other areas of the bill have merit, like the increased funding and focus on food assistance and nutrition programs. In particular, the bill would index food stamps to reflect the current cost of living and fill shortfalls in the Emergency Food Assistance Program. Unfortunately, the bad outweighs the good in this bill.

More than hand-outs, more than bailouts--disaster payments, the families and small businesses throughout the Heartland are demanding affordable quality health care, better education for our children, lower taxes, and relief from government regulation. Rural areas have seen its farm bill passed without policies that adequately promote economic development or address population loss. We must improve rural life, provide high-tech connectivity essential for jobs and education, open trade markets, maintain our competitiveness, and reduce overregulation for farmers and ranchers.

For now, we need to put an end to flawed government policies that distort the markets, artificially raise prices for consumers, and pit producers against consumers. We have once again failed farmers in that regard, which is why I oppose this bill.
Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish today to speak about the farm bill conference report. Without a doubt, our Nation’s rural communities are in need of a new national agricultural policy. Since the last farm bill was passed in 2002, there have been substantial changes in agricultural policy, and this bill is needed to keep American farmers and ranchers on track during a time of growing demand on our food system. In recent weeks, I have come to the floor to ask my colleagues to do something about high energy prices, and today I am asking that we do something for our agricultural producers.

When this farm bill passed the Senate in December, it passed with substantial support. Today we are considering a farm bill that reflects that support and takes steps to improve American agriculture. That being said, for many agricultural producers this farm bill is not nearly as good as it could have been.

As the Senate considers this farm bill, the question that should be on all of our minds is at what cost does this farm policy come to our producers, our consumers, and our country. This conference report comes to the floor at a time when U.S. farm income is expected to reach an all-time high of $92.3 billion. It is true that our Nation’s producers are facing higher costs to fill their tanks, fertilize their fields, feed their livestock and pay for their health care. However, this farm bill does not go far enough to ensure that the subsidies handed out to the wealthiest of farmers are supported and applauded the efforts of my colleagues when the Senate considered amendments to the farm bill in December to limit these payments. Family farms are the backbone of American agriculture and the farm safety net should only be extended to only those who are in the most need, not to those who are simply upsizing their operation.

For conservation, this bill makes significant improvements to the incentives and financial assistance offered to landowners who use the Environmental Quality Incentives and Conservation Reserve programs. I am especially pleased to see that the CRP program offers additional assistance to beginning farmers and ranchers since we all know that one of the greatest challenges to the future of agriculture is attracting young people into the industry.

There are some positive changes made in the farm bill, but the conference report clearly lacks alternatives and only makes small steps to improve the condition of agricultural policy. One alternative that I would like to present to my colleagues is to continue promoting new markets for American agricultural products through trade over seas and develop better markets domestically by promoting fair and competitive markets for our livestock producers. In addition to these steps, there are scores of things this Congress can do today to ease the burden on rural America that cannot be solved in farm policy. That is where the action to address the cost of rising energy costs and more importantly reduce the cost of health care for Americans. For the past several months, I have come to the Senate floor to discuss health care reform, and today I would like to talk about the farm bill. This is by no means a perfect bill, but it is a great improvement over our last farm bill, and in some cases, a step forward that we have been fighting for a long time, but like gophers in the garden, these payments to millionaires have ruined a good product.

I support provisions that were included in the farm bill that help livestock producers and come at no expense to the U.S. Treasury. For the first time, the farm bill contains a livestock title to promote competition and fairness in our agricultural markets. In the past, I labeled the farm bill as, “Do No Harm” for ranchers across this country. I said this because the farm bill never addressed the needs of hard-working independent livestock producers like those found in Wyoming. Well this farm bill includes something that I wish to make the point that addressing the needs of both producers and consumers goes beyond the language of this farm bill. Successful farm policy begins with lower energy costs, affordable health care, and competitive domestic and foreign markets.

As the Senate considers this farm bill, the question that should be on all of our minds is at what cost does this farm policy come to our producers, our consumers, and our country. This conference report comes to the floor at a time when U.S. farm income is expected to reach an all-time high of $92.3 billion. It is true that our Nation’s producers are facing higher costs to fill their tanks, fertilize their fields, feed their livestock and pay for their health care. However, this farm bill does not go far enough to ensure that the subsidies handed out to the wealthiest of farmers are supported and applauded the efforts of my colleagues when the Senate considered amendments to the farm bill in December to limit these payments. Family farms are the backbone of American agriculture and the farm safety net should only be extended to only those who are in the most need, not to those who are simply upsizing their operation.

For conservation, this bill makes significant improvements to the incentives and financial assistance offered to landowners who use the Environmental Quality Incentives and Conservation Reserve programs. I am especially pleased to see that the CRP program offers additional assistance to beginning farmers and ranchers since we all know that one of the greatest challenges to the future of agriculture is attracting young people into the industry.

There are some positive changes made in the farm bill, but the conference report clearly lacks alternatives and only makes small steps to improve the condition of agricultural policy. One alternative that I would like to present to my colleagues is to continue promoting new markets for American agricultural products through trade overseas and develop better markets domestically by promoting fair and competitive markets for our livestock producers. In addition to these steps, there are scores of things this Congress can do today to ease the burden on rural America that cannot be solved in farm policy. That is where the action to address the cost of rising energy costs and more importantly reduce the cost of health care for Americans. For the past several months, I have come to the Senate floor to discuss health care reform, and today I would like to talk about the farm bill. This is by no means a perfect bill, but it is a great improvement over our last farm bill, and in some cases, a step forward that we have been fighting for a long time, but like gophers in the garden, these payments to millionaires have ruined a good product.

I support provisions that were included in the farm bill that help livestock producers and come at no expense to the U.S. Treasury. For the first time, the farm bill contains a livestock title to promote competition and fairness in our agricultural markets. In the past, I labeled the farm bill as, “Do No Harm” for ranchers across this country. I said this because the farm bill never addressed the needs of hard-working independent livestock producers like those found in Wyoming. This bill contains some changes since I came to the Senate 11 years ago and that is language to implement mandatory country of origin labeling, often referred to as COOL. COOL provides consumers with important information allowing them to identify the livestock producers, who hands down produce the highest quality meats in the world, to remain competitive in a growing global market. No more excuses, no more foot dragging, the time is hot for COOL.

The livestock title also contains provisions that will improve the Livestock Mandatory Reporting Act by making market information easily accessible online and will improve the enforcement of the Packers and Stockyards Act by requiring the USDA to report annually on its investigations into violations. All important provisions for livestock producers who simply wish to have a fair and competitive market for their animals. I was disappointed to see that the conference committee left out an important provision that was passed by the Senate last year, just as it did in 2002. The ban on packer ownership and the power to foreclose on the packer’s property. This was an important step in ensuring that independent livestock producers have access to markets in light of growing consolidation among meat packers. Finally, I would like to address language in the livestock title that eliminates the ability for local ranchers to market their product across State lines when processed at State-inspected plants. The interstate meat inspection language is critical for the small mom-and-pop processing plants who meet Federal standards but cannot afford to send their product across State lines when processed at State-inspected plants.
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For Wyoming and a number of other Western States, another provision in this bill that costs little but yields significant returns is the Investment in animal health programs. I was pleased to see that this bill contains provision to address the cost of rising energy costs and more importantly reduce the cost of health care for Americans. For the past several months, I have come to the Senate floor to discuss health care reform, and today I would like to talk about the farm bill. This is by no means a perfect bill, but it is a great improvement over our last farm bill, and in some cases, a step forward that we have been fighting for a long time, but like gophers in the garden, these payments to millionaires have ruined a good product.
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grants, organic farmers, farmers market programs, trade assistance and foreign market access programs, the community foods program, and important specialty crops and organics research.

The bill also provides over $1 billion in funds for the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Snack Program, expanding participation in the program to all 50 States. This program provides a critically important strategy in the fight to prevent and reduce childhood obesity by providing at-risk low-income elementary school children in 5,000 schools nationwide the ability to receive a fresh fruit or vegetable snack every day at school.

Numerous studies have indicated that eating fruits and vegetables can prevent cardiovascular disease, diabetes, cancer, and hypertension, in addition to obesity. Yet less than one out of every six children eats the USDA recommended amount of fresh fruit, and only 1 out of 5 children eats the recommended amount of vegetables.

The funding included in the farm bill will ensure that schools in California and in every State in the Nation can implement this important child nutrition program.

Also included in the nutrition title are much needed modernizations and updates to the food stamp assistance program. The bill not only renames this program as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, but it also provides critical improvements that will greatly help families in need. As a result of deep cuts to the Food Stamp Program in the mid-1990s, the purchasing power of families’ food assistance benefits has eroded greatly over time. The farm bill invests significant resources: $5.4 billion over the next 10 years, to end that erosion and partially restore benefit levels that have been lost. The bill increases the minimum SNAP benefit to $14, up from the current $10, and indexes this level to future inflation. The bill also increases assistance to families with high childcare expenses by allowing a full deduction for childcare expenses in calculating family income and benefit levels.

And with our Nation’s food banks experiencing unprecedented shortages during this period of high demand for supplemental food assistance, the bill nearly doubles the amount authorized for the Emergency Food Assistance Program, providing $1.25 billion over 10 years and providing $50 million in emergency money for food banks currently enduring severe shortages.

The farm bill also provides an important opportunity to increase protection of our Nation’s natural resources and its open space. Farmers can enroll in a number of conservation programs that allow them to provide habitat protection for native species, protect wetlands and grasslands, and undertake initiatives to improve their farms in an environmentally friendly—but the last farm bill did not do enough to provide farmers with the resources they need to fully participate in conservation activities.

In 2004, California had a $143 million backlog in payments and enrollments in conservation programs due to lack of funding and low acreage caps. An average of 4,000 farmers and landowners in California faced backlogs each year when they apply to USDA conservation programs. Sixty-eight percent of California’s farmers seeking Environmental Quality Incentives Program, EQIP, funding turned away. Nationwide these conservation applications have gone unfunded during the life of the 2002 farm bill.

As a result of inadequate funding for conservation programs, California is rapidly losing thousands of acres of farmland and open space. Ninety-five percent of the wetlands in the Central Valley have been lost, and 171,000 acres of farmland were lost in California from 2002 to 2004.

The conference report takes important steps to provide farmers with more access to conservation programs, and while I am disappointed that more funding was not included, the $4 billion in new spending will allow many more farmers and landowners in California to participate in important resource protection programs such as the Wetlands Reserve Program, the Grasslands Reserve Program, and EQIP.

I am also grateful that the conferees pushed back against efforts to restrict eligibility for participating in conservation programs. The purpose of conservation programs is to encourage farmers and landowners to provide a public benefit by protecting their land from development, and in the future we must ensure that income eligibility caps are not applied to conservation programs, as these would be very detrimental to resource protection efforts in California.

The farm bill also authorizes a number of grants and loans that will benefit California’s rural communities, such as low-interest loans to rural electric cooperatives for renewable energy production and grants and loan guarantees to develop broadband access in rural areas.

I am also pleased that the bill contains significant investments for farm-based energy, including the development of cellulosic ethanol. I am concerned about the impact of corn ethanol on rural communities, especially farmers in the South especially in light of the fact that alternative, renewable fuels can be created from a number of other agricultural sources, many of which are produced in California. This farm bill takes great steps to encourage the development of cellulosic fuels that can be produced in California by providing loan guarantees to encourage farmers to grow biomass crops and incentives to drive the advancement of commercial scale bio-refineries for advanced biofuels.

The farm bill also includes important reforms to commodity programs, including the elimination of the three-entity rule, a direct attribution requirement, and income means tests to prevent very wealthy farmers from receiving certain commodity payments. I would have liked to see some additional reforms, but the conference report represents a positive first step in the effort to improve and update our commodity programs.

I would also like to thank Chairman HARKIN and the conferees for including a number of provisions I authored into the farm bill.

Pollinator Protection Act: This provision authorizes up to $100 million over 5 years for high priority research dedicated to maintaining and protecting our honey bee and native pollinator populations. There has been a loss of about 25 percent of the Nation’s honey bee population, and it is estimated that crops nationwide that depend on a healthy honey bee and native pollinator population are valued near $18 billion.

Protecting sugar beet farmers and hundreds of jobs in Fresno County: I helped negotiate a change in the national sugar allocation program that will provide a sugar beet grower cooperative in the Central Valley with the necessary allocation to continue growing sugar beets and keep the Mendota sugar refinery open. The grower cooperative is working to purchase the sugar refinery from an out-of-state owner, and if successful, they will keep the refinery operating and save 400 full-time and seasonal jobs in Fresno County, where the March unemployment rate is 11.1 percent.

Pest Detection and Surveillance Act: This provision authorizes $407 million to give USDA the authority to enter into cooperative funding agreements with States to enhance their pest and disease detection and surveillance programs and increase inspections at domestic points of entry, implement pest trapping systems, and create pest eradication and prevention programs, among many other pest detection and surveillance initiatives. This program can help prevent the agricultural economy from harmful pests and diseases and keep our farmers competitive.
Preservation of 40-year-old meat inspection laws: The House-passed bill included language that would allow meat and poultry plants to forgo Federal inspections in favor of more lax and uneven State-run inspections—potentially putting the health of millions of Americans at risk. I worked with Senator HARKIN, consumer groups, and labor unions to protect the integrity of the Federal meat inspection process. In the wake of the largest recall of beef in our Nation’s history, Congress should be working to strengthen, not weaken, our meat safety standards, not rolling back the Federal Government’s crucial role in protecting our people.

Agricultural watershed enhancement: The Sacramento River watershed and other national regional watersheds have been identified by conservation groups as watersheds most in need of water quality and water quantity enhancement. I worked to ensure that the Sacramento River watershed is treated as a priority-funding area.

Protection against use of harmful pesticides: I led an effort to prevent the inclusion of language that would have jeopardized the ability of conservation managers to encourage the use of the safest and most environmentally friendly pesticides in carrying out activities under key farm bill programs. The House-passed bill included this harmful provision at the urging of pesticide manufacturers, and it would have tied the hands of local managers to encourage viable alternatives to pesticides that can be harmful to our air, water, wildlife, pollinators, and human health.

Edible schoolyards: The bill strengthens the Access to Local Foods and School Gardens Program by supporting the development of school curriculum that teaches the principles of ecology, origins of food, and promotes healthy food choices. This language supports the successful Garden to School Program in Berkeley, CA. The bill also includes $50 million over 5 years in mandatory funding for the Community Foods Program, which funds programs like edible schoolyards.

I also worked with Chairman HARKIN and the conferees to include an avocado marketing order agreement, a national study on biofuels infrastructure, language prioritizing edible schoolyards programs in schools under the Community Food Program, and a $15 million asparagus market loss program to help growers in California.

This bill had significant and widespread support from stakeholders in California and throughout the Nation. I want to recognize and thank the groups from my State that expressed their support for the bill. These groups include Western Growers Association, California Farmers Union, California Farm Bureau Federation, California Grapes, California Dried Fruit League, California Cattlemen’s Association, California Rice Commission, California Citrus Mutual, California Association of County Agriculture Commissioners, California Association of Winegrowers, The Wine Institute, California Rangeland Conservation Coalition of California, California Apple Commission, Nisei Farmers League, California Kiwi Commission, Merced College, Santa Clara County, San Benito County, San Benito County YMCA, San Luis Obispo County, San Luis Obispo County YMCA, San Luis Obispo Supported Living, Inc., Transnational Food and Shelter, Inc., Transnational Mental Health Association, Village Community Resource Center, Los Angeles Regional Food Bank, Stockton Food Bank, Oakland Insight Center for Community Economic Development, Greater Stockton Emergency Food Bank, Second Harvest of Santa Clara County, Second Harvest of Santa Cruz County, Second Harvest of San Benito County, Second Harvest of San Mateo County, Food Bank for Humboldt County, Community Action Partnership of Orange County, San Francisco Food Bank, San Diego Hunger Coalition, Alameda County Community Food Bank, and Eureka Food for People.

This farm bill is important for California’s farmers, families, its environmental resources, our consumers, and for the State’s economy, and I am pleased to support it.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the farm bill conference report, which would provide unprecedented amounts of funding for nutrition programs and food stamps. These programs are vital, especially in this time of high food prices and our struggling economy. The farm bill invests nearly $36 billion over 10 years into the Food Stamp Program, which is nearly $10 billion more than current law. In addition, for the first time this farm bill recognizes that the minimum benefits provided through food stamps will be indexed for inflation. This is a dramatic improvement over the Senate-passed bill, which did not include any funding for this program. New Jersey’s farmers frequently utilize EQIP to improve the environmental condition of their farms, and this provision in the conference report is critical.

This farm bill also recognizes for the first time the importance of fruits and vegetables to our health and to our agricultural economy. New Jersey is the first time the importance of fruits and vegetables to our health and to our agricultural economy. New Jersey is the third largest blueberry producer and the third largest grower of cranberries. These crops are not only nutritious, but they are vital to New Jersey’s economy. This farm bill makes major investments for fruit and vegetable growers, as well as purchasers. It provides nearly $500 million to the Specialty Crop Block Grant Program, which provides assistance to these farmers—an increase of approximately $200 million over the Senate-passed farm bill. It would also provide over $1 billion for the Fruit and Vegetable Snack Program, which provides healthy, nutritious fruits and vegetables to our schools, so that our children can avoid the health risks of a poor diet.

Finally, this farm bill takes incremental steps towards providing the kind of real reform that our Nation’s agricultural policy needs. It imposes payment limitations to restrict farmers from receiving commodity payments if they are most in need, and this farm bill calls for farm bill reform. I rise today to speak on the farm bill conference report, which would provide unprecedented amounts of funding for nutrition programs and food stamps. These programs are vital, especially in this time of high food prices and our struggling economy. The farm bill invests nearly $36 billion over 10 years into the Food Stamp Program, which is nearly $10 billion more than current law. In addition, for the first time this farm bill recognizes that the minimum benefits provided through food stamps will be indexed for inflation. This is a dramatic improvement over the Senate-passed bill, which did not include any funding for this program. New Jersey’s farmers frequently utilize EQIP to improve the environmental condition of their farms, and this provision in the conference report is critical.
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current system of subsidies for just a handful of crops and implement a system that benefits all crops. And I will continue to advocate and fight for a policy that provides more incentives for the production of healthy foods such as fruits and vegetables. While the farm bill conference is by no means perfect, it is better than the farm bill the Senate originally passed, and I intend to support it.

Mr. SOHL. Mr. President, I intend to support this conference report and encourage my colleagues to do likewise. Achieving consensus on farm bills is a notoriously difficult task. For all their hard work on this measure, I want to express my appreciation to Chairman HARKIN, Ranking Member CRAMER, and the talented staff who put in long hours to get us to this point.

The end result of these hard-fought negotiations is a better safety net for dairy producers in Wisconsin and across the Nation. This bill restores and strengthens the original MILC Program, which was a hard-won effort designed to end regional dairy battles and provide a safety net for small and midsize producers. Since its implementation 6 years ago, MILC has proven to be a critical backstop for thousands of family farmers when milk prices plummet. The “feed cost adjuster” included in this bill acknowledged rising feed costs and made dairy farming a real challenge for dairy farmers. My colleague and friend Senator LEAHY and his staff played a pivotal role in guiding these provisions and I commend their work.

This measure also moves forward in allowing interstate commerce in State-inspected meat products. This has been a significant priority for me. Wisconsin has more State-inspected plants run by Main Street entrepreneurs than any other State in the Nation. They make great products. At a time of further proposed market concentration among major slaughterhouses, we ought to find a way for these smaller entrepreneurs to safely expand their markets and compete across State borders. Doing so will be good for livestock producers, consumers, and Main Street businesses.

The nutrition title of this bill is also noteworthy. It incorporates urgently needed changes to the Food Stamp Program, to be known hereafter as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. Over the years, low-income households have suffered erosion of benefits due to inflation. The current minimum food stamp benefit has not been raised in over 30 years. This bill raises the minimum benefit and indexes it to inflation. It removes disincentives for retirement and education savings and takes childcare costs into consideration when calculating eligibility. It strengthens support for food banks and will help get more fresh fruits and vegetables into our schools.

The conference report includes a compromise on easement valuations under the Wetlands Reserve Program, WRP. Administrative changes to the WRP have diminished its usefulness in Wisconsin and other parts of the Nation, and these changes are intended to reverse that trend. As a supporter of conservation efforts, including the Conservation Reserve Program, the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program, the Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program, and others.

As a supporter of conservation efforts with a long record of working to protect Kentucky’s natural resources, it is important to me that this conference report continues to support these initiatives.

Approximately 50 percent of Kentucky’s land is forested, so it was important that this legislation open many USDA conservation programs to forest landowners. That will yield improved air quality, cleaner drinking water, and less soil erosion, among other environmental benefits to our State.

Kentucky also has an interest in the production of renewable fuels; this conference report includes important incentives to spur the growth of this industry as well.

On another note, I am glad the conference committee has seen fit to include my provision addressing the need for nutrition in our schools. This provision calls on USDA to survey what schools are serving to our children. This information will help USDA provide guidance to schools to serve healthier meals and it is sorely needed, as USDA’s most recent data on this question is over a decade old. In the last 30 years, the childhood obesity rate has more than tripled. Today, over 4.5 million American children are facing a lifetime of all the increased health risks that obesity causes. This nutrition provision can be the first step towards reversing that unfortunate trend.

Let me also note that this conference report retains a number of provisions I authored to support Kentucky’s largest agricultural product, the horse industry. I introduced the works on Kentucky one day each year for the running of the Kentucky Derby, I point out to my colleagues that the horse industry employs 50,000 Kentuckians and contributes $3.5 billion to our economy year-round. I want to ensure this important part of our farm economy is treated fairly.

On one final topic, I would be remiss if I didn’t mention my disappointment that this bill will unfairly punish Kentucky’s small farmers by making all farmers with less than 10 base acres ineligible for farm payments. That disproportionately hurts Kentucky because we have such a high proportion
of small farms. I am concerned this punitive portion of the bill will have broader consequences than the authors realize and will punish some of those farmers who might be most in need of assistance.

However, the good appears to outweigh the troubling aspects of this conference report, and a lot of Kentuckians will benefit from the many important programs that are promoted and preserved in this bill. I will support it and I encourage, support the hardworking farmers in Kentucky who are feeding our Nation and the world while providing a living for so many citizens in America.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the conference report to H.R. 2419, the Food and Energy Security Act of 2007.

I am pleased to vote in favor of passage of the conference report, as this legislation, I note that provisions of programs of paramount importance to the Commonwealth of Virginia, including the creation of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Program to replenish the bay.

Virginia, Maryland, and others in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed have worked diligently to implement programs to reduce nutrient run-off and other sources of pollution that enter the Bay, all in an effort to achieve a cleaner Chesapeake Bay. The Chesapeake Bay Watershed Program will provide the Federal assistance necessary to support regional and State efforts to reach this important goal.

In addition, this bill will enhance conservation across the United States. Its provisions, such as technical assistance and conservation easements, will help protect more land for preservation and environmental initiatives.

Also, provisions of this conference report provide greater research support and assistance for growers of specialty crops and significant changes to the nutrition title to promote better health for schoolchildren and increase support for our Nation’s food banks.

At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the Record:

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join me in supporting final passage of the farm bill conference report.

I would like to thank the Senator from Kentucky, for his leadership in crafting this 5 year, $289 billion bill, which, for the first time, directs more than two-thirds of the spending towards nutrition and food assistance. It provides a strong safety net for farmers, and gives them the certainty needed that provides an important human resource—food—amongst the unpredictable dynamics of weather and markets. The bill provides stronger financial support for conservation programs and needed improvements for livestock producers who are dealing with the packing industry.

It is not a perfect bill, but it is a good bill. Of particular note is $10 billion in new spending for food assistance programs for low-income individuals, which is particularly timely in this period of high food prices. Potential recipients are no longer disqualified because of child care or if they have money saved in tax-deferred education accounts. For the first time, food assistance is indexed for inflation, and for the first time in 30 years, the minimum monthly benefit is increased from $10 to $14. This is good news and will help reach more of the 35 million low-income individuals, the each and every day to feed their children and families.

The bill provides $1 billion in new conservation spending, with greater focus on working lands. It provides a more fiscally responsive approach to disaster assistance funding by establishing a permanent program.

The bill also recognizes our national priority to begin shifting to greater production of cellulosic ethanol as part of our biofuels mix. The bill includes provisions for cellulosic ethanol production—first proposed by my colleague from Indiana, DICK LUGAR, and myself. There are also several incentives that will help to establish croplands dedicated to cellulosic production, and concurrent research and development towards these objectives.

I am particularly pleased that this legislation includes a program authored by my esteemed senior colleague, Senator Grassley, which creates a new optional revenue-based program for farmers, called the average crop revenue election, a forward-thinking initiative that will help Midwestern corn growers.

No, this bill does not include the level of reform to farm programs that I think was warranted. I believe that the payment and income limitations could have gone much further. The bill does, however, provide long overdue improvements in the so-called three entity rule, which stops the remarkable practice of sending payments to deceased farmers. It ends the abuse of manipulating current law by collecting triple payments. It requires direct attribution of farm payments to a person, rather than a company or an entity. And it refocuses the original intent of farm payments to serve as a safety net to those who need it most by ending payments to individuals who make more than $75,000 in farm income or $50,000 in nonfarm income.

And this bill provides important relief to America’s black farmers. For far too long, our country’s hardworking African-American farmers were discriminated against. The Federal Government and county committees, which denied them credit and benefit programs because of their race. This injustice ran deep and had devastating effects.

Because so many of these farmers were denied credit and benefits, the number of African American farmers from 1920 until the early 1990s declined by almost 90 percent. During this time, too many African-American farmers saw their land foreclosed upon or were forced out of farming altogether.

In 1999, the Department of Agriculture settled a class action lawsuit with African-American farmers in the case of Pigford v. Glickman, which allowed many of these farmers to file claims against the USDA for failing to respond to racial discrimination. A Federal court approved this settlement as “a good first step towards assuring that this kind of discrimination that has been visited on African American farmers since Reconstruction will not continue into the next century.” This Pigford settlement brought relief to more than 20,000 Black farmers.

Yet the USDA underestimated the number of potential claimants and gave inadequate notice to farmers about the Pigford settlement. Therefore, many farmers were unable to file their claims before the filing deadline.

I am pleased to report that 75,000 additional African-American farmers who filed their claims of discrimination after the filing deadline were denied any opportunity to have their claims heard and evaluated on the merits.

That is why I introduced legislation in the Senate to provide tens of thousands of eligible late Pigford claimants a right to go to court and have their cases heard. Thanks to bipartisan support by the Senate Agriculture Committee, this legislation is included in the conference report before us today.

Again, I thank Senator HARKIN for his efforts on this important legislation, and I call on my colleagues to support it.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the conference report to accompany the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008. It is a good bill for Florida and I commend Chairman HARKIN, Senator Haggen, Chairman Grassley, Senator NELSON, and the members of both committees for all of their tireless work to pass this bill.

First and foremost, this bill provides a substantial increase in food assistance to our Nation’s low-income families. Nearly three-fourths of the total spending of the farm bill goes in fact to nutrition programs such as food stamps, now known as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. How do we measure the power of these benefits but we also change how a family’s need may be calculated; it will take into account childcare costs and education and retirement savings.

For the first time in history the farm bill also takes into account an agricultural sector that is of the utmost importance in Florida—specialty crops. Florida is the leading producer of citrus, tomatoes, cucumbers, snap beans, bell peppers, squash and watermelon, and the second leading producer of strawberries, sweet corn, and greenhouse and nursery products. This legislation recognizes the importance of...
crops such as these as an integral part of our Nation’s food supply, and provides nearly $3 billion in research, block grants to states, pest and disease control, farmers’ market promotion, and the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program.

Of similar importance are the strides made in this bill for conservation and energy programs. Florida’s natural resources stand to benefit tremendously from increased funding for conservation, which will allow the State to optimize agricultural lands, implement land preservation, environmentally friendly land management practices, and easement programs. Correspondingly, the bill notably encourages advancements in cellulosic energy, which will allow us to explore the production of ethanol from agricultural products that we don’t otherwise eat—products in which Florida is rich.

There are many significant improvements for Florida in this conference report. This isn’t a perfect bill, but it increases funding and support for integral programs while also making reforms to a sometimes abused system. It is a good bill for Florida, and I encourage the President to support it.

Mr. CHABBLISS of Iowa, and Senator SAXBY CHAMBLISS of Georgia for their leadership on this bill.

This is, on balance, a good bill, but it could be better. In particular, I am concerned that we were not more aggressive in making sure that the commodity program payments are targeted and justified. At a time when millions of middle-class Americans are struggling to keep up with higher gas prices, grocery bills, and health care costs, the Federal Government should not be in the business of sending checks to millionaire land owners.

Currently, only full-time farmers are eligible for farm subsidies regardless of income. Many of my colleagues and I began this process hoping that Congress would change this situation in the farm bill. Unfortunately, the conference agreement rejected all farmer income tests for the counter cyclical and marketing loan subsidy programs and includes only a weak net income cap for direct payments: $750,000 for single farmers and $1.5 million for married farmers after all business deductions.

The conference report also waives payment limits for the Marketing Loan Program. The current cap is $75,000. Millionaire land owners are now eligible for unlimited LDP payments without any income test.

In addition, the bill puts in place provisions that shield our domestic sugar program from all international competition. Sugar growers secured an increase in price supports and a guarantee of 85 percent of the domestic sugar market at these guaranteed prices. This isn’t reform and it isn’t justified.

I am disappointed with other aspects of the bill as well. There is less than $100 million in the bill for rural development. Rural communities are aching for water and wastewater infrastructure, high speed telecommunications, and financing for businesses. This bill underfunds that key priority. In conference, a program designed to improve broadband deployment by providing cost-share assistance to statewide non-profits was removed. This was a missed opportunity to improve access to broadband in rural areas at a time when the United States is falling farther and farther behind in this key area.

The bill provides marginal funding for agricultural research. The bill provides less than $100 million for the McGovern-Dole School Feeding Program, which uses U.S. commodities to feed some of the world’s poorest children in schools. However, this bill makes significant investments in nutrition, conservation, and renewable energy programs. It creates a forward-thinking revenue-based safety net. The members of the Senate Agriculture Committee can be proud of these components.

The most significant impact of this package may be in the nutrition title. In Illinois, over 158,000 households experienced hunger in 2005. If we include households that have had to struggle to put food on the table or have had to skip meals to make sure the food would last through the week, it adds up to 500,000 households in Illinois living with food insecurity. These are working families who just are not able to make ends meet.

This farm bill provides $10 billion more over 10 years for domestic nutrition programs that help lower income families put food on the table, including $7.8 billion for the Food Stamp Program, $1.25 billion for the Emergency Food Assistance Program, TEFAP, and $1 billion for the fresh fruits and vegetables snack program. In Illinois, over the next 10 years, this bill will provide $373 million in additional funding to help families that haven’t been able to outrun hunger.

In the Food Stamp Program, the bill will raise the standard deduction and the minimum benefit and index them for inflation. Nationwide, that helps 11 million people, including families with children, seniors, and people with disabilities. The adjustment to the standard deduction will increase benefits for 415,000 Illinois residents, and the minimum benefit increase will boost benefits for 27,000 Illinois recipients.

This farm bill also eliminates the cap on the dependent care deduction and no longer counts retirement accounts and education accounts toward the asset limit. The conference report helps food banks and soup kitchens meet the growing demand for assistance by increasing funding for commodity purchases for TEFAP—The Emergency Food Assistance Program—by $110 million each year. The bill increases the availability of fruits and vegetables in low-income schools.

And, I am glad to report that this package includes a modified version of the Hunger Free Communities Act, a grant program I have long supported that will help fight hunger in communities. This antihunger grant program is the first program that will encourage communities to work together to identify and address hunger locally.

What we see here is strong bipartisan support to end hunger. Even with a war abroad and budget deficits at home, this Senate made the decision that progress against hunger is possible.

This farm bill makes another important investment, to protect open lands and restore habitat for future generations to enjoy. The USDA administers many conservation programs and this bill continues and expands those programs.

In Illinois, there are a total of 78,000 contracts statewide and more than 1 million acres in the CRP program, including more than 55,000 acres of wetlands. The Wetlands Reserve Program is aiding in what will become the second largest restoration of wetlands in the United States, in Emiquon in Fulton County, IL.

These open spaces provide important wildlife habitat and recreation benefits and prevent erosion of sensitive ground. The conservation title makes significant investments in the Wetlands Reserve Program, the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, the Conservation Security Program, and the Farmland Protection Program.

Unfortunately, a key provision that I originally authored in the 2002 farm bill to prevent over-planting on sensitive land, called Sod saver, was significantly weakened in conference. These weak protections, combined what can only be called the most generous commodity title in history, relative to market conditions, provides perverse incentives to over produce, which will result in the breaking up of sensitive ground.

The investments made in conservation are tempered by the fact that we are missing an opportunity to protect wildlife and native habitats in some of the few areas that have never been farmed in this country.

Another important feature of the bill is that we were able to secure a modified version of a revenue-based safety net that Senator BROWN and I originally proposed last summer. The version in the conference report allows farmers to elect to enter into this program, which provides a revenue guarantee to producers in the program depending on market conditions and previous earnings.

It is a good step forward for Illinois producers and for the future structure of our commodity programs. At this time of high prices, the program provides producers a risk-management tool they can really use.
The energy title funds renewable energy technology, particularly focused on next-generation biofuels. These should diversify our energy portfolio and help us lower U.S. dependence on petroleum. America’s heartland is poised to become $250 million in loans and grants for smaller-scale renewable energy projects in rural parts of the country and about $200 million in cellulose feedstock and harvesting research.

I do think we missed an opportunity to make further reforms, to invest in rural America, and to help address the international food crisis with a strong commitment to McGovern-Dole. But we also made important commitments to nutrition and conservation, and I thank Chairmen Harkin and the committee for their work.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the opportunity today to support the farm bill conference report. This bill, while far from perfect, is an important step in the right direction in a number of areas. This incremental improvement in farm programs and significant improvement in nutrition is preferable to the President’s proposal to extend the status quo for several more years.

I would like to commend Chairmen HARKIN and PETERSON, Ranking Members CHAMILLIS and GOODLATTE, and the rest of the conferees and their staffs on their hard work over the past few months on this bill.

While I share the concerns I have heard from some Wisconsinites, as well as some of my colleagues, about the lack of reform to the commodity programs, I believe the good in this bill outweighs the bad. This bill makes significant improvements to programs that help farmers in Wisconsin every day, such as the Milk Income Loss Contract, MILC, Organic Certification Cost Share, and the Beginning Farmer and Rancher Programs. It is important to point out that for the first time the farm bill contains a separate title dedicated to nonprogram or specialty crops to assist a broader group of farmers with their pressing research and disease concerns among other provisions.

The nutrition title of this bill makes significant steps forward in the fight against hunger in America. My colleagues and the American people are well aware of the erosion in food stamp benefits over the past decade. In this time of increasing food and fuel costs, which are crippling many low- and middle-income Americans, it is a moral imperative to act to increase these benefits. In addition, the $50 million in immediate funding for the Temporary Emergency Assistance for Hunger Program will make a real difference for food banks in Wisconsin. I commend the conferees for recognizing the critical need for improvement in these programs and addressing it, despite the tight budget constraints we face.

I am extremely pleased that the bill makes improvements to the Milk Income Loss Contract, MILC, Program. Congress has recognized that the current programs, including Senator Kiolb’s I have called for the MILC Program’s reimbursement rate to be raised to its original 45 percent. I also strongly support the feed cost adjustor that was included in conference. I hope we can move the MILC safety net can keep up with the rapidly rising costs of production. The MILC Program is an important safety net for Wisconsin’s dairy farmers and one that operates in a responsible way—only kicking in and providing payments to farmers when times are tough. Further, the MILC Program caps the amount of payments one farmer can receive, ensuring that it helps small and medium farmers survive tough times without subsidizing expansion of larger farms. The improvements to this program are vital to farmers in Wisconsin.

I am also pleased that long-overdue oversight of energy markets is included in the final farm bill. It is past time to prevent manipulation by energy traders. Energy market speculation is part of the reason we are facing high gas prices and the farm bill takes an important step to close the “Enron loophole” that has allowed oil and gas traders to artificially drive up the price of energy trades without Federal oversight. We cannot allow energy traders to secretly bid up the price of oil and saddle Americans with the price at the gas pump. I am a cosponsor of Senator Feinstein’s Oil and Gas Traders Oversight Act that has been incorporated into the farm bill. In a February 2008 letter, a bipartisan group of my colleagues and I urged the conference to retain the Senate-passed provision in the final farm bill. Our letter stated: “With energy prices at record high levels, farmers and foresters are struggling to fill their tractors, heat their homes, fertilize their crops, and transport their goods to market. It is critical that the Congress take advantage of this opportunity on the Farm bill to increase transparency and reduce the threats of manipulation and excessive speculation that have plagued our energy commodity markets over the past several years.” I am pleased with the outcome.

The conference report included a number of provisions I included in legislation that I introduced last year, the Rural Opportunities Act, to help sustain and strengthen rural economies for the future, and create more opportunities in rural communities. I am pleased that the conference committee included a number of provisions similar to my legislation to support local bioeconomies and food markets, encourage local renewable fuels and biodiesel, high-speed Internet service in rural areas, and help develop the next generation of farmers, ranchers and land managers.

In addition, the bill includes significant improvements to programs supporting organic agriculture. Wisconsin has a number of organic farmers and consumers who will benefit from the extra funding for the Organic Certification Cost Share and Organic Transition Assistance Programs, among others. This farm bill is the first to recognize the specific challenges faced by organic farmers, particularly as more and more consumers seek out their products.

On a related note, I am pleased that the bill contains a provision similar to one I first proposed in 2006 allowing schools and other entities participating in Federal food programs to use local preference when purchasing products, which they are not currently allowed to do. This will allow schools to select in-season food grown locally, and will complement a number of programs, including Senator Jeffords in 1998, I am pleased that the conference report makes every U.S. State and territory eligible and allows this assessment to be charged on imports as was intended in the 2002 farm bill. I am somewhat disappointed that the payment rate for biodiesel is less than for domestic producers, but half a loaf is better than none. I will continue to seek to level the playing field.

In addition to the Agriculture Committee’s portion of the bill, the Finance Committee also made a significant contribution to this legislation. I was glad that a provision similar to my Farmer Tax Fairness Act was included in the Finance portion of the conference report. This legislation will update the outdated tax rates for farmers and other self-employed individuals to remain eligible for social security and disability benefits that had been eroded by inflation. It also indexes the program to inflation, so we are not in the same situation again sometime in the future.

I was also pleased that several of my amendments that were included in the Senate bill were included in some form in the conference report. In a previous amendment I began with Senator Jaffords in 1998, I am pleased that the Senate accepted my amendment to improve the authority of what we had called the Small Farm Advocate, and other previous amendments. I continued this effort with Senator Sanders, and while the conference report made this office a division within the new Office of Advocacy and Outreach, I expect that this will continue to help America’s small and beginning farmers.

Ensuring transparency and fair competition in the dairy industry has been
a priority throughout my Senate career. Over the past year and a half, a couple developments showed a need for further action in this area. First, a GAO report on cash cheese trading that I requested with several of my colleagues confirmed that the market remains prone to manipulation even though there have been some improvements. Secondly, a sustained nonfat dry milk price reporting error that lasted over a year was found to have cost farmers millions in reduced prices. I was glad to have an amendment accepted in the Senate that would require regular auditing of the dairy price reporting and require the USDA to better coordinate oversight of the dairy industry both within the department and with other federal agencies.

The conference report retained the auditing requirement and shifted the improved oversight to a directive in the underlying bill. I hope that this added diligence and transparency can help give dairy farmers added confidence in the market.

As we look to expand our Nation’s renewable energy resources and lessen our dependence on oil, we need to provide opportunities for farmers and rural communities. Several key elements of my Rural Opportunities Act supporting local bioenergy were included in the farm bill. One amendment I got accepted encourages the USDA’s continued support for and the expansion of regional bioeconomy consortiums, which can consist of land grant universities and State agriculture agencies dedicated to providing sustainable and locally supported bioenergy. The final bill maintains report language supporting these consortia. I was also pleased to work with Senator COLEMAN on another “rural opportunity” provision, which is based on our legislation, S. 1813, to provide local residents an opportunity to invest in biorefineries located in their communities. The farm bill provision gives priority to grants and loan guarantees for businesses with significant local ownership. This bill also makes significant strides in providing increased support for cellulosic ethanol and other innovative solutions to the energy problems we face as a nation.

While Wisconsin is perhaps more widely known as a leader in milk and cheese production, we also lead the Nation in the production of cranberries and ginseng. I was glad to see a priority research program for cranberries continue through the Senate bill and conference report. Similarly, I was glad that my legislation with Senator KOHL and Representative O’ROURKE to require country of harvest labeling was accepted in an amendment in the Senate and continued as country of origin labeling in the conference report. This is an important step to help combat mislabeling of foreign ginseng as U.S. or Wisconsin grown, which receives a premium price for its higher quality.

Overall, I was pleased that this bill provides a significant increase in conservation programs. I am particularly glad to see an emphasis on working lands programs like the popular Environmental Quality Incentive Program and an updated Conservation Stewardship Program, which benefit farmers and ranchers and which the farm bill also included provisions based on Senator WYDEN’s Combat Illegal Logging Act of 2007, S. 1390, which I cosponsored, to address rampant, unsustainable illegal logging practices in developing nations. The bill also reauthorizes the Great Lakes Basin Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Program and allows the Secretary of Agriculture to use this program to carry out projects to implement the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration Strategy. While I was disappointed that the funding levels of certain programs like the Wetlands Reserve Program were not what they should be and that the “sodsafer” provision was not a national protection, this bill is largely a step in the right direction.

Continuing in the category of mixed results, I was extremely pleased to see the addition of a new livestock title in the bill to promote competition and fair practices in agriculture but was disappointed that the Senate’s commonsense provisions were removed or watered down in conference. I am pleased that producers will be able to have a choice to accept or decline arbitration when they sign agricultural contracts under the conference report, even though I was disappointed that a stronger Senate provision that mirrors legislation I have with Senator GRASSLEY was not retained. On balance, this is a step in the right direction and I hope the USDA works to ensure that this remains a real choice for producers and there is no intimidation.

In addition to the handful of improved competition protections that will benefit livestock producers, the bill also added other provisions that are also especially beneficial. I was glad to support Senator KOHL’s longstanding efforts to find a way for meat from small and often specialty State-inspected meat processors to be sold across State lines so that consumers nationwide can enjoy these high quality Wisconsin products. The conference report contains a compromise that appears to strike a fair balance on this issue and this is a significant step in providing U.S. based livestock producers and processors. I was also glad that the conference report will finally allow a country-of-origin labeling requirement for meat and produce to be enforced.

While I have discussed at length the positive aspects of the legislation, let me be clear that the reforms in the commodity title should go further. I authored an amendment with Senator MENENDEZ to make modest trims to direct payments and was disappointed that the Senate rejected it. In addition, I supported the Dorgan-Grassley amendment to lower payment limits, the Klobuchar amendment to lower the AGI cap, and the Brown amendment to trim subsidies for crop insurers. I was disappointed that these efforts to make the commodity support programs more balanced and better targeted toward family farms and not concentrate payments in large, concentrated-scale operations were unsuccessful. With these defeats, both the Senate-passed bill and the conference report missed an important opportunity for meaningful targeted reform of the farm support programs.

There were some small steps in the right direction to be sure. Direct payments were trimmed by a few percent, excessive insurance company subsidies were trimmed and the cap on wealthy farmers was lowered. But there was an opportunity to do much more and I will continue that fight.

One other provision I am concerned about is the cut to the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program. In light of food shortages across the globe and the level of aid we provide to poor countries is simply wrong. I hope that, through the appropriations process, Congress will be able to continue providing funding for this important program.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I rise today in support of the Food and Energy Security Act. The provisions of the conference report represent a tremendous step forward in ensuring the health of American communities by providing low-income citizens with better access to healthy food choices by increasing the amount of funding for nutrition programs, increasing food stamp payments, bringing more fruits and vegetables into schools, and providing assistance to low-income seniors so that they can shop at farmers markets. This bill also recognizes the important place that specialty crops have on the dinner table.

While we celebrate the benefits that Americans will see at their tables, this bill also provides unique opportunities to better the environment and look out for those who cannot speak for themselves. The bill continues to support land conservation and expands protection for wetlands, grazing land, wildlife habitats, and forests. The bill increases our investment in biofuels research and production so that we can move away from foreign oil, and instead use American crops, for example, to produce ethanol and biodiesel. It also strengthens protections for animals by quadrupling penalties for Animal Welfare Act violations and prohibiting dog fighting.

For these and other reasons I will support this farm bill legislation. However, I am troubled by the bill managers’ use of the narrow provisions in the bill addressing agriculture security to expound in the Joint Explanatory Statement about the proper roles of the Department of Homeland Security and Agriculture, and the performance of DHS, in this area. Allow me to address a few of my concerns.
The managers assert, for example, that DHS has “claimed Federal jurisdiction as the lead agency” for activities “traditionally managed by USDA.” This statement is unnecessarily dismissive and ignores numerous laws and the current Federal framework for addressing threats to agriculture and food security, a framework in which the Secretary of Homeland Security is the principal Federal official to lead and coordinate efforts among Departments and agencies, State and local governments, and the private sector to protect critical infrastructure and key resources in all sectors. Among the laws that make up the framework are the Homeland Security Act of 2002, the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, the National Security Act, the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006, the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act, PAHPA, and the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007, 9/11 Commission Act. Various Homeland Security Commission Act of 2002. This statement ignores the factual record: USDA should oversee DHS in matters pertaining to agriculture and food security. The managers assert, for example, that USDA should oversee DHS in matters pertaining to agriculture and food security. They include the U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA, which is responsible for infrastructure protection for the agriculture sector and matters pertaining to meat, poultry, and egg products; the Department of Homeland Security, DHS, which oversees the U.S. Agricultural Trade and Certification, HSPD-5, Management of Domestic Incidents, HSPD-7, Critical Infrastructure Protection, HSPD-8, National Preparedness, HSPD-9, Defense of U.S. Agriculture and Food, and HSPD-10, Bio-Defense for the 21st Century.

Under these laws and directives, a number of agencies have responsibilities specifically relevant to agricultural security. These include the U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA, which is responsible for infrastructure protection for the agriculture sector and matters pertaining to meat, poultry, and egg products; the Department of Homeland Security, DHS, which oversees the U.S. Agricultural Trade and Certification, HSPD-5, Management of Domestic Incidents, HSPD-7, Critical Infrastructure Protection, HSPD-8, National Preparedness, HSPD-9, Defense of U.S. Agriculture and Food, and HSPD-10, Bio-Defense for the 21st Century.

The managers further suggest that DHS may not be placing sufficient priority on agricultural security and agricultural inspections and they appear to be concerned that DHS may not be paying sufficient attention to the concerns of the agricultural community. In fact, the agriculture mission has repeatedly received the highest level of attention. DHS Secretary Chertoff addressed the agriculture inspection stakeholders’ meeting just last month. A directive reiterating the importance of the agricultural mission has been disseminated to every CBP office. A new position—the Deputy Executive Director, Agriculture Operational Oversight at Customs and Border Protection—has just been created to provide oversight of all agriculture inspectors no matter where they serve to ensure that inspection needs are being met.

The managers further assert that USDA should oversee DHS’s agricultural inspection program and issue comprehensive reports on it to Congress. I cannot recall an example of one executive branch department over-seeing and reporting to Congress on another executive branch department. The proposal is unprecedented, unen-couraging the cooperation between DHS and USDA that, in fact, is now occurring. USDA and DHS are working together to a greater extent than ever has historically been the case in the relationship between agriculture and border officials. While challenges remain, the current level of partnership should serve as a model for interagency cooperation.

With active participation by USDA and the Federal Drug Administration, FDA, DHS is assessing agro-terrorism threats, capitalizing on the substantial assets at its National Biodefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center and its connections with the intelligence community that have been applied to other biological and WMD threats to the Nation. USDA is also participating in the DHS-operated National Biosecurity Integration Center, NBIC, authorized by the 9/11 Commission Act, to bring together information from multiple sources to detect and contain biological incidents as rapidly as possible.

The agricultural biosecurity communications center authorized by the bill, as the managers note, is expected to provide a central collection point for USDA generated information and to receive important information from DHS’s National Operations Center, which acts as the central source for homeland security situational awareness for the Federal Government. USDA and DHS also engage in regular joint exercises designed to coordinate and promote agricultural security. DHS’s role includes its sponsorship of the National Center for Foreign Animal and Zoonotic Disease and its Plum Island Animal Disease Center at which both DHS and USDA researchers work collaboratively to address the catastrophic threat of foot and mouth disease.

The Office of Homeland Security at USDA, also authorized by the bill, should be helpful in coordinating the homeland security activities of the various offices and agencies within USDA, thereby providing a primary point of contact between USDA and DHS on agricultural security issues.

While I find the manager’s statement troubling and unfounded, I have worked with the Agriculture Committee to ensure that the bill itself will not endanger homeland and agriculture security.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the conference report on the Food, Conservation, and
Energy Act of 2008, a tremendously important piece of legislation that will set our Nation’s agricultural policy for the next 5 years. It is an immense piece of legislation; and obviously, in any bill of this size, any Senator will find provisions, no matter how he or she disagrees. I am no different. Nevertheless, on the whole it is a strong bill and a good compromise that my colleagues and their staffs have spent months preparing, and I hope, for the sake of our farmers and the country as a whole, that it will be approved by both Houses of Congress and signed into law by the President.

The 2008 farm bill strengthens the safety net for farmers struggling with abrupt shifts in the agricultural market. In many ways, these farmers are the backbone of our economy, and we must ensure that they are adequately protected. Included in this safety net is an expanded Milk Income Loss Compensation Program, or MILC Program, which is of critical importance to dairy farmers in my home State of Connecticut and across the country. The farm bill conference report would increase the MILC Program’s payment rate for dairy producers when the price of milk falls below the target price; it also allows for adjustments of that price when the price of feed increases.

In addition, this bill creates important protections for specialty crop producers by providing nearly $466 million over 5 years to the Specialty Crop Block Grants Program. This new initiative is especially important for farmers in the State of Connecticut, as nearly 47 percent of our agricultural receipts come from nursery and greenhouse products. I am particularly pleased that the conference committee adopted much stricter income limits on commodity payments by significantly lowering the adjusted gross income test. To qualify for benefits, individuals would have to prove that they earn less than $500,000 per year from nonfarming sources and only up to $750,000 per year in farm income. These new income tests will help ensure that the farm bill’s safety net programs actually help the people that they were originally intended for: those small, family farmers who make up the backbone of American agriculture and who operate all too often on razor-thin margins.

I am particularly pleased by the much needed attention this bill gives to nutrition programs, particularly those that serve American families struggling on the verge of hunger or food insecurity. All told, this bill provides over $10 billion in new money for nutrition programs. It beefs up the Food Stamp Program by stopping benefit erosion and expanding eligibility, and it provides more than $1 billion in assistance to local area food banks. In addition, to help children develop healthier eating habits, this legislation extends to all 50 States a program that provides fresh fruits and vegetables to underprivileged schools. I have seen the success of the Fresh Fruits and Vegetables Program firsthand, in its Connecticut pilot test. I know how vital fresh produce is to the health of all Americans: in the case of underprivileged schoolchildren, those who need it the most have gotten it the least. This farm bill goes a long way toward correcting that disparity.

Finally, the farm bill conference report aims to preserve our fragile environment by funding critical land conservation programs and investing in renewable energy. To help American farmers act as responsible stewards of the land they work, this legislation allocates nearly $8 billion in new funding to help farmers and landowners be better and more responsible stewards of the environment. This bill also includes provisions to encourage the production of domestic biofuels, including funds to promote biomass crop production, loan guarantees for commercial scale biorefineries, and drafting funding for biomass research and development. The farm bill’s energy title is critical to ensuring that our country finally breaks its longstanding over-reliance on costly and environmentally harmful fossil fuels.

In sum, I am satisfied that the farm bill takes great steps to protect our struggling farmers, our low-income families and children, and our threatened environment. In my view, the farm bill embodies an approach to agriculture that first and foremost by a concern for the long-term well-being of all Americans. I therefore urge my colleagues to support this vital piece of legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we don’t often have the opportunity to celebrate on the Senate floor. There is often-times, we must acknowledge, a lot of acrimony, a lot of acrimony, a lot of acrimony, a lot of acrimony when there is good conservation. Now farmers and ranchers will be rewarded when there is good conservation. Now farmers and ranchers will be rewarded when there is good conservation.

Today, I want to take a minute to express my appreciation to all those involved in this bill. We know there were Senators HARKIN, CHAMBLISS, BAUCUS, and GRASSLEY, but many other people were involved in this process to get us where we are today.

This is a tremendously important piece of legislation. This was dead on at least 15 different occasions, but it was revived. There was true bipartisanship—a true situation where we had conferences, where people met in open session and voted. It was what we all should come here to look forward to doing—legislating such as we did here.

This is a very complicated and difficult piece of legislation. Was there enough reform? I don’t know how much is enough. Certain groups look at these farm programs, and there is nothing you can do to satisfy them. No matter what is done, it is not enough for them. Every time we do a farm bill, the editors roll out the old editorials, they change a few lines and send out the same editorial they did before.

This bill has reform in it. Could we have done more? Perhaps, but had we done more, we would not have gotten a bill. What did we get as a result of the compromises made? We got nutrition. What a wonderful thing. We got food stamps. For us in Nevada this is important. Since 2000, the numbers of food stamps-qualified people have gone up more than 100 percent. We didn’t change the rules to let more people into the program. They qualified under the old rules, and now, by more than 100 percent, that has been increased. This legislation takes care of that.

Children going to schools all around America, as a result of this legislation, will get fresh fruits and vegetables in their lunch programs. The admin. That is remarkable. There are people in this Chamber who didn’t have the opportunity when they were kids in school to have fresh fruits and vegetables. That is the way it is all over America, especially with kids who grow up in the city centers. Fresh fruits and vegetables are something they don’t get often. This is wonderful.

Food banks, I have heard SHERROD BURGER and others say the food banks are going empty. We have a lot of hungry people in America, and we have to acknowledge that. This farm bill acknowledges that. We are going to increase food bank money by $200 million each year. That is a lot of money. It is very important.

We have conservation. My friend, TOM HARKIN, has caused me so much grief on this conservation program. It was his idea to do some conservation programs. He was the co-author of the Energy Act of 2008, a tremendously important piece of legislation. Was there any compromise? We got nutrition. That is a lot of money. It is very important.

We have conservation. My friend, TOM HARKIN, has caused me so much grief on this conservation program. It was his idea to do some conservation programs. He was the co-author of the Energy Act of 2008, a tremendously important piece of legislation. Was there any compromise? We got nutrition. That is a lot of money. It is very important.

Even the State of Nevada will be able to compete for money in the conservation programs.

There are disaster programs. We in the West have been ravaged by wildfires. As a result of being ravaged, the Bureau of Land Management and other land managers close up range-land, and there is nothing the ranchers can do; they close them up. They will now qualify for disaster relief, which is in this bill.

For the first time, this is going to be the case: compensation for wildlife damage.

One of the favorite talking topics is energy. This bill actually does something about it. There is a demand we stop using corn and other such items that are edibles to make fuel. This legislation recognizes that point.

I have talked about reform. This bill contains reforms. There are reforms on caps on payments to farmers. Remember, farm programs count for less than
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13 percent of this bill’s spending and are expected to climb by $60 billion over the next 10 years. That sounds pretty good.

This bill, as other important legislation, is one of compromise. That is what legislation should be all about. I know we have a lot to do. I extend my congratulations for this remarkable piece of legislation. This is how we should legislate. I am so appreciative of the bipartisan nature of this legislation. I look for a real big vote. I hope we have a strong vote indicating the bipartisan nature of this legislation. We have had a very significant vote here on this farm bill. I will have to check the record, but this has to be one of the strongest votes for any farm bill in the history of farm bill legislation in the Senate. It has truly been a team effort. It took a little more than a year and a half. 2 years, actually. Senator Chambliss, when he was chairman of the committee, started the whole process, so it has been a couple of years in the making. It has been a great team effort. As I said, we have all worked together. It has been a very long road with a lot of tough negotiations. We did it in a manner in which the people of this country want us to operate around here.

We worked hard and got the bill through committee. We brought it to the floor. We had our amendments, we had good debates in December, passed it at that time, then we went to conference. We had a good number of conference meetings, frankly. But, they were good meetings. That is the way we ought to do legislation around here. The proof of doing it in that manner—in an open, cooperative manner, having all sides being able to have their viewpoints heard and input made—is that we came up with good legislation as an end product.

I want to thank and congratulate all of the members of the Agriculture Committee, on both sides, for all of their hard work in bringing this bill to this vote today. I especially want to thank Senator Chambliss for his leadership in starting this off and then serving as the ranking member for the last year and a half and working so closely with me and others to get this bill done. I especially want to thank all the Senators who were conferees. There were some long sessions that went on for hours and hours and days and days. But we hung in there.

I will start with Senator Baucus and Senator Grassley. From Iowa, the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee, for their help in coming up with the funds we needed to put this bill together. Especially I thanked my colleague from Iowa earlier, but I want to thank him also for his diligent work and effort to make sure we had a good livestock, poultry, and competition title.

I see my good friend, KENT CONRAD. I said earlier, we certainly benefited from his knowledge. It is so wonderful having the budget chairman on the Agriculture Committee helps keep us on track so we know what we can and cannot do to stay within the bounds of the budget rules. So I cannot thank Senator Conrad and his staff enough for helping us comply with the budget requirements.

I say to the people of North Dakota, the farmers, the ranchers, the people who live in your small towns and communities, I can honestly say I know Kent Conrad and there is nothing that escapes his attention when it comes to the farmers and ranchers and rural people of North Dakota. They do not have a better fighter for their interests. I might even expand that further. Farmers and ranchers and rural people all over America have no greater a fighter for their interests than KENT CONRAD.

I see Senator Stabenow. I said earlier, going to go to Senator of specialty crops. We would not have had a specialty crop title in this bill if it had not been for Senator Stabenow. She is unique, the only person, as far as I know, who has served on the Agriculture Committees of her two State legislatures, the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives, and the Agriculture Committee of the Senate. And that expertise shows through, believe me, in what she has accomplished in this farm bill.

I see my good friend, Senator Salazar, who did so much to make sure we had a good energy title; that we start focusing more on ethanol from cellulose.

Senator Lincoln from Arkansas, a strong fighter for the rice farmers, her cotton, grain, and oilseed farmers. I might also say that Senator Lincoln is a very strong fighter for nutrition programs and rural development. I thank her for all of her help on this committee.

I am going to read a list and recognize all of the staff members who work for me on the committee. They deserve to have their names in this RECORD because as hard as we worked, they worked three or four times as hard. A lot of times we went home at night and they were still here. A lot of times we were gone on the weekends, they were here.

And, of course, first and foremost, I would thank Mark Halverson. Mark has been with me on this committee since 1986. And he has brought a wealth of experience as a farmer in Iowa, and also as a lawyer. So he brings together a lot of knowledge and expertise in guiding and directing the staff. He has done a wonderful job. I cannot thank Mark Halverson enough for his patience, his leadership, and in juggling all of the balls and keeping tabs on everything. Mark Halverson has performed above and beyond the call of duty.

Susan Keith, our general counsel in commodities; Stephanie Mercier, our chief economist, trade, and international food assistance and crop insurance; Phil Buchan, who worked so hard on conservation, and especially the conservation stewardship program and the EQIP Program; Eiland Boes, who came to us from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. He has done so much work on the energy title.

Derek Miller—Derek came to us from the House side where he worked on the 2002 farm bill. He is probably the most knowledgeable person I have of what the nutrition programs work. And due in no small part to Derek Miller, we have a great nutrition title.
Richard Bender, a long-time member of my staff who handles rural development and the tax provisions; Todd Battu handled the forestry and credit titles; and John Ferrell, who did all of our livestock work and the programs for organic farming.

Adrian Ramos, who does a great job keeping track of all of the ag research and food safety; Dave White from Montana who as a detailee from the Natural Resources Conservation Service, was with us for a year and a half, and worked so hard on district conservation; Dan Christenson, who did so much on specialty crops and helping with nutrition; Kerri Johannsen, who worked on energy; Tina May on conservation; Amy Loventhal, who is our counsel providing legal advice on many issues.

Eric Juzenas, who came to us as a detailee from the CFTC for the reauthorizaton of the Commodities Exchange Act; Katharine Ferguson, who is a professional staff member who assists her mentor Mark Halko and we call her our "utility player". Whenever we need someone, Katharine is there. She can fill in for anybody and does it extremely well.

Kate Cyrul, our communications director; and Kay La discussing our chief clerk who retired last year. He was here for many of the hearings on this bill and came back to fill in periodically; Jessie Williams, our chief clerk who has done such a great job of succeeding Bob Sturm; Jacob Chaney, our systems administrator; Jonathan Urban, who did so much on the CFTC reauthorization, before he left the staff to head to law school. We wish him the best in law school. Peter Kelley, our assistant clerk and legislative correspondent, who sort of runs interference for all of us; Cory Claussen, our legislative correspondent; Micah Wortham, the Government Printing Office detailee who is here to make sure our documents are printed properly; Ellen Huntoon, who covered rural development and agricultural topics.

Now, again, I know that Senator Chambliss has thanked all of his staff. I do not know every single person there, but I do know Martha Scott Poindexter and Vernie Hubert. I particularly want to thank both of them for their great efforts, for their leadership, and for all the time and the efforts and the weekends, the nights. You ought to take a vacation to thank them.

Also, I thank the Office of Legislative Counsel, the Congressional Budget Office, the Senate floor staff, the Department of Agriculture staff. Now, I know the administration has not agreed with us on everything in this bill. But I have to say, the technical assistance provided by the Department was very helpful in putting everything together.

Again, I thank and congratulate all of the staff of the Senate Agriculture Committee, especially Senators Baucus, Grassley, Conrad. I feel very good about this bill and the overwhelming vote. I still remain hopeful the President will sign this bill. Hope springs eternal that he will sign it. If he does not, I guess we will have to face that down the road. I hope we have the votes to override. Team effort, cooperation, conciliation, bipartisanship, those are the keys to successful legislation. I am very pleased to play this role in getting this bill passed.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I voted against the Senate-passed version of the farm bill because it lacked the fiscal discipline required of Congress during a time of rising spending and exponential growth of the Federal Government. Unfortunately, the conference report is just as unacceptable as the Senate-passed version of the farm bill. As a result, I cannot support it.

Congress first approved the Federal farm assistance policies in the early 1930s to help struggling farmers during times of economic hardship due to low commodity prices. Over the last six decades, however, the farm bill has become so bloated, so voracious for funds, that it now provides extensive subsidies for farmers and agricultural landowners who may not be in true financial need.

The conference report continues this trend, spending approximately $730 billion over the last 10 years. If the administration correctly points out, it increases spending by approximately $20 billion over the current baseline, not $10 billion as claimed by the conferes. The roughly $10 billion difference is achievable by a number of gimmicks, including using timing shifts and funding cliffs.

To make matters worse, at a time when the United States' net farm income is projected to be $92.3 billion this year—51 percent greater than the 10-year average—the conference report would increase subsidy rates, create additional subsidies for a number of crops, and continue direct payments regardless of crop prices. Now is not the time to maintain or increase subsidies; it is the time to reduce or eliminate them.

The conference report would also continue to pay subsidies to million-are farmers and nonfarmers. It would allow married couples who farm and have an adjusted gross income of $1.5 million to continue to receive subsidies. It would also allow married couples with an adjusted gross income of $1,000,000 who are not full-time farmers to receive subsidies. Farm payments should only go to those who actually need them, not to some of the wealthiest individuals in the country.

Congress could use the farm bill to make substantive reforms and cut federal spending. Instead, it appears that Congress will pass a bloated farm bill that is just another example of a broken and mismatched Congress. Consequently, I cannot support it and urge my colleagues to also oppose the bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, this year's farm bill includes many important programs that will benefit Michigan and the Nation as a whole. Few States have Michigan's diversity of agricultural crops, and I am pleased that this farm bill contains a range of measures that will benefit farmers throughout my State. Agriculture is Michigan's second largest industry and this bill will help support this industry at a time when Michigan's economy is struggling.

This bill will provide significant additional assistance to specialty crop growers that has been severely lacking in past farm legislation. Specialty crops are an important part of the agriculture industry and a healthy part of our Nation's food supply. While Michigan is a leading producer of traditional crops, such as corn, wheat, and soybeans, our State is also a leader in the production of specialty crops, such as apples, asparagus, beans, blueberries, and cherries. This farm bill will provide much needed support for the specialty crop community throughout intended to protect and preserve a assured supply of U.S. grown fruits and vegetables so important to Americans nutritional needs.

Nutrition programs, such as the Food Stamp Program, provide assistance to children, low-income working families, seniors, and persons with disabilities. This bill includes a significant increase in funding for our Nation's critical food and nutrition programs on which our Nation's least fortunate and most vulnerable rely. In my State of Michigan, over 500,000 households will benefit from increased nutrition assistance, and the bill will also help to alleviate some of the stress local food banks all across Michigan are experiencing at this time.

The farm bill includes measures to improve conservation. These programs, which are aimed at both working lands and lands taken out of production, are intended to protect and improve soil quality, prevent erosion, benefit water quality, and preserve and restore habitats. This legislation expands the Conservation Stewardship Program, CSP, increases funding for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, EQIP, and reauthorizes the Conservation Reserve Program, CRP, and Wetlands Reserve Program, WRP, to protect environmentally sensitive lands.

I am pleased that this bill also includes incentives that will encourage continued development of biofuels and increased production of renewable fuels. I have long supported incentives for new technologies that can move us away from our significant reliance on foreign oil, and this bill makes critical investments in alternative energy that will help move us toward that goal.

While this bill includes modest reforms to our current producer protection programs, I am hopeful that we can go far enough. It would have been my hope that this bill would have included more innovative measures, such as farm savings accounts, and additional reforms to our agricultural subsidy programs, that can work to enact further reforms when Congress next considers farm legislation.
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There is another important reason to support the farm bill. It contains a key provision which would finally close the Enron loophole that has contributed for so many years to the problem of rampant speculation in our energy markets. I spoke previously in 2000, at the behest of Enron and others, a provision was slipped into law—section 2(h)(3) of the Commodity Exchange Act—that exempted from oversight and regulation the electronic trading of energy and metal commodities by large traders. This loophole took the cop off the beat in those electronic markets and allowed traders to operate with less supervision and fewer controls than regulated commodity markets like the New York Mercantile Exchange, NYMEX.

Beginning in 2003, my Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, PSI, issued a series of reports exposing how these unregulated markets and their unregulated trades had opened the door to energy price manipulation and excessive speculation. For example, electronic commodities contracts which are not readily susceptible to manipulation; monitor trading to prevent manipulation and price distortion; establish rules to obtain information from traders and provide it to the CFTC upon request; establish position limits or accountability levels that trigger review of a trader’s positions in order to reduce the potential threat of manipulation; possess emergency authority to require traders to reduce positions; publish daily trading information; and enforce trader compliance with its rules.

Essentially, an electronic trading facility will now have to function as a self-regulatory organization under CFTC oversight in the same manner as regulated electronic exchanges such as NYMEX. The bill gives the CFTC the same oversight and enforcement authority over the electronic exchange with respect to these contracts as it has with respect to futures exchanges. Today’s amendments to electronic energy markets are over.

Passage of this critically important legislation is the culmination of many years of work by Senator FEINSTEIN, myself, Senator SNOWE, and others, and I thank them for their sustained effort to close the Enron loophole. I also would like to thank Senators HARKIN and CHAMBLESS for working with us to include this legislation in the farm bill. In addition, I would like to thank our friends in the other body who worked diligently to get this legislation done. The legislation to close the Enron loophole is a bipartisan, bicameral success story and the winners are the American people who will gain greater protection against price manipulation and excessive speculation.

This farm bill is a bipartisan piece of legislation which includes many programs that are beneficial to Michigan. The days of unregulated electronic energy markets are over.

For the first time in the process of writing a farm bill, the tax writing committees were asked to help fund a portion of the spending. I have strong concerns about this, which I have expressed previously, and I do not believe that I would be here today without the hard work and leadership of the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator MAX BAUCUS. And he is supported by a strong staff. That starts with the Democratic staff director on the Finance Committee, Senator MAX BAUCUS, Russ Ugone, Ayesha Khanna, and Chuck Kovatch.

Of course, I am grateful for the outstanding effort of my staff as well. First I want to thank Amanda Taylor, my agriculture counsel on my personal staff for her many months and countless hours of dedication and hard work on this bill. I also want to thank my chief tax counsel and deputy staff director, Mark Prater, as well as Eliza —
these new laws as soon as possible, and I will work hard to oversee the Department in its administration of this important legislation.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, nearly 3 years after the tragedy of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and with the growing realization that we have made meaningful reforms in the way the Small Business Administration comes to the aid of disaster victims, the Senate has been working to pass legislation that will allow small businesses to get back on their feet before their payments come due.

This bill also creates a program to allow private lenders to make disaster loans to businesses and entrepreneurs. This will leverage the relationships people already have with their local lenders and ease the burden on the SBA to make a huge volume of loans quickly. These loans will carry the same terms and benefits as conventional SBA disaster loans. All lenders would be eligible to make loans to small businesses, but only lenders who are preferred lenders could make loans to individuals. The bill also provides the SBA with authority to pay a fee to private lenders to process loans during times when the SBA’s processing capabilities are overwhelmed in order to prevent application backlogs and ensure timely approval and disbursement of loan proceeds. Tools such as these will dramatically cut the time it takes to process and disburse loans in the event of a future disaster.

After a catastrophic disaster, while the disaster area clearly feels the brunt of the damage, businesses throughout the country are likely to be affected by the incident. This could be because one of their suppliers or buyers is located in the disaster area, because they receive energy from the disaster area, or a myriad of other reasons. This bill authorizes the SBA to make economic injury disaster loans to businesses located outside the geographic area of a catastrophic disaster, if they suffer economic injury as a direct result of the disaster.

This bill also updates and increases the maximum amount of an SBA disaster loan from the current level of $1,500,000 to $2,000,000, and raises the maximum amount of unsecured disaster loans from $10,000 to $34,000. It was well past time to raise these caps given the increasing costs of doing business and these provisions give the SBA the flexibility to get people the help that they need. The bill also gives the SBA the authority to make new disaster loans and refinance existing loans from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita with a 4-year deferment period giving people time to get back on their feet before their payments come due.

Finally, this bill improves SBA’s coordination with other agencies, its communication with the public, and its preparation for a future disaster. The bill adds several requirements to improve the SBA’s coordination with FEMA as they are the two main agencies responsible to respond to a major disaster. The agency will also be required to conduct biennial disaster simulation exercises and create a comprehensive disaster response plan for various disaster scenarios. The SBA will be required to improve its communication with the public when disaster assistance is made available. The bill also creates a new position for high-level disaster planning to oversee the disaster planning and readiness of the agency.

I applaud my colleagues for helping pass this important piece of legislation as part of the farm bill. I expect to see the President sign it, and I believe he is better able to assist disaster victims in the short term, and I know that the passage of these provisions will be looked upon as an essential rebuilding tool if we ever have another tragedy on the scale of 9/11 or Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, today the Senate voted on the farm bill. Leading up to that vote, we had two procedural votes which are required when budget points of order are raised against a legislative provision.

My vote on this farm bill was a difficult one. Certainly, opposition to this bill is justified. There are simply too many subsidies in this bill, there are Davis-Bacon provisions that I strongly oppose, and I believe provisions may violate our trade agreements.

To express my frustration with the negative aspects of the bill, I chose to support the procedural motions leading up to the vote itself. However, in response to very strong support for the farm bill from the preponderance of agricultural interests in my State, and to the fact that the farm bill has some provisions that are very important to me, I chose to vote in favor of the legislation.

I would like to say a few words about a provision in the bill which I sponsored and promoted for over a decade. The provision lifts the ban on the interstate distribution of State-inspected meat. I began the effort with Senator Daschle, and more recently worked with Senators Kohnl and Baucus, to include it in the farm bill.

Let me give a little background on this issue. With the passage of the Federal Meat Inspection Act of 1906, the U.S. Department of Agriculture was required to inspect all cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and horses slaughtered for human consumption. The USDA was also made responsible for setting national standards for meat and poultry inspection. In 1957, the Poultry Products Inspection Act made poultry subject to USDA inspection. Later, these two laws were amended to set up a system of State inspection programs separate from the Federal program. At that time, due to some uncertainty about new State inspection programs, a prohibition on interstate distribution was placed on State-inspected beef, poultry, pork, and lamb.

It is important to note that the prohibition does not apply to other meats such as venison, pheasant, quail, rabbit, alligator, and others that are typically inspected under the state programs. Neither does the prohibition apply to other perishable products, including milk, other dairy items, fruits, vegetables and fish. All of these products are inspected under State...
programs are shipped freely across State lines and to our trading partners. If a State can inspect these products sufficiently for international distribution, they can certainly continue to do so for our more standard milk and meat products. In the nearly 30 years that the USDA has reviewed State programs, the Department has never unilaterally found that a State inspection program should be discontinued due to an inability to meet Federal food safety regulations.

In Utah, we have 32 meat plants under our State inspection program. These establishments, like the nearly 2,000 similar plants nationwide, are mostly small businesses. Generally speaking, they cater to the needs of small, family-run farms and ranches. The outdated ban on interstate shipment of State-inspected meats clearly disrupts the free flow of trade, restricts access to the market, and creates an unfair advantage for big businesses.

Let me say that meat inspected in 34 foreign countries can be shipped anywhere in the U.S. because the USDA has certified that the foreign inspection programs are equivalent to the Federal program, yet our domestic products inspected by States cannot. This is a ridiculous situation, and it is well past time to remedy it.

So I am very pleased that the farm bill will remove the outdated and unjust ban that puts our small businesses at such a disadvantage. Removing this prohibition will increase competition and innovation. It will provide farmers and ranchers an increased opportunity to innovate and compete to serve their consumers.

I am also very pleased that the farm bill includes a provision by Senator MAX BAUCUS, which I cosponsored, that will set up a disaster program for the livestock industry. In Utah, we have agricultural disasters almost every year. Every State never know what Mother Nature may send their way, and my goal is to provide them greater stability. I am grateful that this farm bill will provide our livestock producers the security and certainty they have sought for so long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, the bill chairman of the Banking Committee, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, is speaking about is over 400 pages long. It has been amended verbally numerous times over the past week. We are going to have a meeting at 3 o'clock today. None of us has seen the bill. None of us has seen the amendments.

I have tremendous respect for the chairwoman of this committee. She is, to me, one of the best Senators in this body to work with. I respect the ranking committee member. I know time is of the essence, if you will, as to addressing some of the issues that are in this bill. I am very disappointed that today at 3 we are going to be going best we can try to do technical bill review. Many Senators in this body, candidly, may not ever take the time to look at because of the technicalities that exist and the specialties that will be addressed, if you will, by this bill.

I am very disappointed to object to this, not because it is taking place today at 3, but because of the fact that we do not have any of the documentation regarding the agreements that have been made.

Out of my respect for this chairman and out of my respect for the Ranking Member, I will not object at this time. But I will say, in the future I hope for a technical bill such as this that is more than a few lines, that is over 400 pages long—there will be time to actually go through the bill prior to a very strenuous markup. I in no way assert any negativity toward the Senator. I know he is doing the best he can to hold this bill together. I know there are a lot of competing interests. It is actually out of respect for him trying to do the job he is doing today, in order to move something forward in this body, that I will not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I appreciate the Senator not objecting, but let me, for the purpose of the record, inform him that the committee print has not been changed. There were no verbal agreements. The bill was available a week ago for anyone to read. It was in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It has been on a Web page as well the public at large could read it here.

It is a long involved process, an involved process. The only reason we are meeting at 3 today is because of the request of the ranking member to delay it a week. I wish to object to working the markup, so here are additional provisions. I want to let my colleague know that. I appreciate my colleague very much. He is a very active and constructive member of the Banking Committee, but this is a bill that has been available for some time, and I want people to review almost for a week now, before the markup actually was to occur this morning.

I appreciate his not objecting. We will see how things progress. Nonetheless, we will keep working at it, but his involvement will be critical.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I wish to say that portions—while no doubt we have the original text, it is my understanding that portions were taking place throughout the night. I was getting e-mails at 1:30 in the morning regarding the negotiations, and yet I have seen no written copies of any of the agreements that have been made. I would say that would be nice to see prior to a markup of this type, but again out of respect I will not object, and thank you very much for this colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that we now proceed to a period of morning business for 1 hour with Senators being allowed to speak therein for a period up to 10 minutes each.

I tell all Members the reason for this is we are going to move to the budget, appointing of conferences, with Senator CONRAD and Senator JUDD GREGG having some issues they need to work out prior to that. I think it would be in the best interests of us all if that consent agreement were confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that to have the time equally divided between the majority and minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

ORDRE OF PROCEDE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, we have 30 minutes on the Republican side. I would like to proceed to use probably most of that. I may not use all of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a unanimous consent agreement that speakers are limited to 10 minutes each.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a longer period of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCAPEGOATING OF ETHANOL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I come to the floor to rebut the scapegoating of ethanol, which is part of the food versus fuel debate.

I do not do it for a one-way conversation. I hope I can encourage conversation on this subject among my colleagues so we can look at this from a scientific and economic point of view and avoid scapegoating.
For almost 30 years, I have been leading an effort with many of my colleagues to promote policies to grow a domestic renewable fuels industry. We have promoted homegrown renewable fuels as a way to lessen our dependence on foreign oil and to improve our air quality.

For all these years, we have hardly heard anything negative about these policies. Now, ethanol and other biofuels are being made a scapegoat for a whole variety of problems. Never before in 30 years has the virtuous benefits of ethanol and renewable fuels been so questioned and so criticized.

The problem is, none of these criticisms are based on sound science, sound economics, or for that matter even common sense. I had the opportunity to hear an intelligent discussion of this, maybe it only lasted a couple of minutes, on a program on Fox News Saturday night called, “The Beltway Boys.” And these people are very intelligent people.

I heard Mort Kondracke, a veteran journalist, falling prey to some of the same erroneous talking points that I have heard over and over for the past couple of weeks.

Mr. Kondracke is one-half of that intelligent duo on Fox News that I referred to as “The Beltway Boys.” Maybe Mr. Kondracke has spent too much time inside the beltway and could use a little real world explanation from a family farmer like me from the Midwest.

Some of my colleagues in the Senate have also gotten involved in this misinformation campaign, and that is why I did not come to the floor to speak; I came to the floor to encourage dialogue with my colleagues on this subject because it seems there is a “group-think” mentality when it comes to scapegoating ethanol for everything from high gas prices, global food shortages, global warming, and even deforestation.

But, as was recently reported, this anti-ethanol campaign is not a coincidence. It has been well thought out, well programmed, and that program is going on. It turns out that a $300,000, 6-month retainer of a beltway public relations firm is behind the smear campaign against ethanol. And they have been hired by a trade association referred to as the Grocery Manufacturers Association. This group is known for using environmental, hunger, and food aid groups to demonstrate their contrived crisis. And it is right here in a 26-page document put out by the Glover Park Group, called “The Food and Fuel Campaign.” They enlist the support of these other non-profit groups that are involved with environment and hunger.

I think it is important for policymakers and the American people to know who is behind this effort. According to News, down-on-DC lobbyists, the Glover Park Group, and the Dutko Worldwide are leading the effort to undermine and denigrate the patriotic achievements of American farmers to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, while also providing a safe and affordable food environment.

The principal leaders behind the Glover Park Group’s proposal reads like a Democratic operatives. The effort is led by former President Clinton’s Press Secretary, Joe Lockhart. Another is 8-year veteran of the Clinton-Gore White House, Michael Feldman.

Another leader in this misinformation campaign include Carter Eskew, Mike Donilon, Joel Johnson, and Susan Brophy, all of which proudly display their ties to the Clinton-Gore White House and their credentials of helping elect Democratic candidates.

This campaign against ethanol is more sophisticated than anything I have seen put on by big oil over the last 30 years, as big oil has been a constant fighter. I will show you how this is a well-sophisticated, political operation and public relations effort. For instance, the media relations public affairs responsibility comes under the partners in charge, Joe Lockhart and Michael Feldman. The advocacy and image advertising comes under the leadership of partners in charge, Carter Eskew and Mike Donilon. The legislative affairs part of it is directed by partners in charge, Joel Johnson and Susan Brophy.

Now, these people are outstanding people. They are going to be able to deliver what they have said they could do. That is why we have to take it very seriously.

I suggest that Democrats in the Senate who claim to support our Nation’s drive toward energy independence should be alarmed by this group’s planned campaign and the tactics being used.

I happen to be one who fought President Clinton during his 8 years in office because I was concerned to undermine our renewable fuels industry. The outstanding example I remember is when California made application to the EPA for a waiver under the Clean Air Act at the very time that MTBE was being outlawed because it was poisoning the groundwater. The only oxygen that you could use in gasoline then was ethanol. California sought an exemption. We were able to win that by the Clinton administration not allowing it. Opponents of course were fighting President Clinton’s former staff and staff who worked for the Gore and Kerry Presidential campaigns, leading an effort for the grocery manufacturers to smear ethanol, after 30 years of developing an industry because people called for more renewable energy. They wanted renewable, clean-burning energy. They didn’t want to be reliant upon dirty-burning petroleum. They didn’t want to be relying upon importing so much oil.

I think they are leading this effort partly because they are being paid well for doing so, but they may not stand the fact that President Bush has proved to be the best friend the renewable fuels industry has had. Because their old boss failed miserably at crafting policies to promote ethanol, they are doing everything they can to tear down the success President George W. Bush has helped foster when he is a group of intelligent people who have been misled by this campaign and are simply wrong. They are using in their speeches a lot of the rhetoric that comes out of this effort. The facts don’t back up the argument. I invite my colleagues to look at the facts, challenge me, have a dialog on this subject so we can use science as a basis for what we are doing, and economics as well.

It is time to dispel the myths perpetuated by Mr. Kondracke, one of the Beltway boys—he was probably reporting this misinformation because he is a smart person—the Glover Park Group, and others.

The Grocery Manufacturers Association. I have come to the conclusion, needs an excuse to gouge consumers of America with higher food prices, and an easy scapegoat for increasing food prices is, of course, ethanol. One myth that pops up again and again is that ethanol takes more energy to produce than it provides. I heard Mr. Kondracke say that. Let’s look at the facts.

In 2005, the Argonne National Laboratory study concluded that it takes only seven-tenths of one unit of fossil energy to make one unit of ethanol. That is a positive net energy balance. In comparison, it takes 1.23 units of fossil energy to make one unit of petroleum gasoline. So why aren’t the grocery manufacturers of America bringing up the point that petroleum processing into gasoline is not energy positive? Because gasoline requires more than 1 Btu of energy to deliver 1 Btu to your car. That is a negative net energy balance.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture study concluded that ethanol yields 67 percent more energy than is used to grow and harvest the grain and to process that grain into ethanol. These figures take into account the energy required to not just process grain into ethanol, it takes into consideration the energy the farmer takes to plant, to grow, to harvest the corn, as well as the energy required to manufacture and distribute the ethanol.

I don’t believe that the studies we have looked at and that have been conducted on this issue, 12 of the 15 found that ethanol has a positive net energy balance. Only a single individual from Cornell University, who authored the other three studies, disagrees with this analysis. The Cornell studies have consistently used old data, some from 1979. Remember, in 1979, farmers weren’t producing as much corn per acre as they do today. Corn yields then were 91 bushels per acre. In 2005, the average is now up to 150 to 160 bushels per acre. The flawed studies also rely on 1979 figures for energy use to manufacture...
ethanol. This energy consumption was cut in half between the years 1979 and 2000 and continues efficiency gains every year. I could quantify that better than just using a broad sweep.

In the early 1980s, we were producing about 3.5 gallons of ethanol per bushel of corn. Today, we are producing 2.8 gallons of ethanol per bushel. And pretty soon, the industry believes they might be able to produce 3 gallons per bushel.

So these erroneous Cornell conclusions have been refuted by experts from entities as diverse as the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, the Argonne National Laboratory, Michigan State University, and the Colorado School of Mines. The fact is, studies using old data overestimate energy use by not taking into account efficiencies gained in agriculture, the greater use of fertilizer, and ethanol.

I don’t understand how intelligent people, then, can continue to argue that ethanol has a negative net energy balance. But that is what I heard on television last night from very intelligent people. That is what I hear in this smear campaign. The net energy balance of ethanol production continues to improve because ethanol production is becoming more efficient. A March 2008 study by Argonne National Laboratory found significant gains just since 2001. Ethanol production since 2001 has reduced water use by 27 percent, reduced electricity use by 16 percent, and reduced total energy use by 22 percent.

Another myth being perpetuated by opponents of a renewable fuels effort and by Mr. Kondracke is that ethanol harms the environment and contributes more in greenhouse gases than petroleum. This claim is likewise hogwash. Science magazine and TIME magazine made wildly erroneous claims about corn ethanol that are now being used by these detractors. They claim that ethanol production is the driving force behind increased costs for fertilizer and ground water the way the petroleum-based product MTBE did for 20 years it was used in gasoline as an oxygenate, where ethanol can be used as an oxygenate to do that.

In recent weeks, a new argument has come forward about the effect of corn ethanol on domestic and global food prices. Food prices are going up. Of course, we all have to be sympathetic to that, whether it is in America or abroad. People are struggling with higher prices for food is not something we like to hear. But to put all the blame at the feet of the U.S. ethanol industry is outrageous and misplaced, and that is what the current campaign is all about, just so the grocery manufacturers of America can have an excuse to increase the price of food here.

Watching the news and listening to some of my colleagues, there was even a hearing on this a couple weeks ago in the Senate. I have even heard expressed in this hearing that the price of oranges was going up because of ethanol. We have heard that the domestic ethanol industry was blamed for shortages not only in oranges but apples, broccoli, rice, wheat, lentils, peppers, even bananas.

Let’s stop to think about the people who are saying: You are growing more corn, so we are growing less wheat or rice. We don’t make ethanol out of wheat or rice. But for people to say that fruits are going up or bananas are going up because we are growing more corn, well, let me assure everybody I do not know of anybody who is plowing up and tearing out an apple orchard, an orange grove, a grape plantation to plant corn for ethanol. But that is the ignorance about the people who are making those mistakes, trying to make the argument that more land is going into corn and less going into wheat, so the price of bread is going up.

With regard to wheat, rice, and lentils, the global demand for food from a growing middle class in China and India is a greater problem than biofuels. Southeastern Europe have had a much greater impact on the supply of rice and wheat.

Many of these countries also have government production policies that manipulate production, supply, and trading of these commodities. Think of some of the dictators in Africa who want a cheap food policy. Farmers cannot make enough producing food, so the farmers move to town and live in the slums, when and they go into corn and producing something back home, if the governments had policies that would encourage the production. There is so much resource in Africa that there is no reason to have anything starving in Africa.

The fact is, the global demand and price for all commodities has increased. Some of this could even be due to speculation. You read that in the business papers in the United States quite regularly.

One of the biggest culprits behind rising food prices is the cost of oil at $125 a barrel. We had a recent Texas A&M study concluding that the biggest driver behind the high food costs is higher energy costs. So if Texas A&M is saying that, let’s look at what the Iowa State University Center for Agricultural and Rural Development is saying about ethanol’s impact upon the world.

One of the biggest culprits behind rising food prices is the cost of oil at $125 a barrel. We had a recent Texas A&M study concluding that the biggest driver behind the high food costs is higher energy costs. So if Texas A&M is saying that, let’s look at what the Iowa State University Center for Agricultural and Rural Development is saying about ethanol’s impact upon the world.

One of the biggest culprits behind rising food prices is the cost of oil at $125 a barrel. We had a recent Texas A&M study concluding that the biggest driver behind the high food costs is higher energy costs. So if Texas A&M is saying that, let’s look at what the Iowa State University Center for Agricultural and Rural Development is saying about ethanol’s impact upon the world.

One of the biggest culprits behind rising food prices is the cost of oil at $125 a barrel. We had a recent Texas A&M study concluding that the biggest driver behind the high food costs is higher energy costs. So if Texas A&M is saying that, let’s look at what the Iowa State University Center for Agricultural and Rural Development is saying about ethanol’s impact upon the world.

One of the biggest culprits behind rising food prices is the cost of oil at $125 a barrel. We had a recent Texas A&M study concluding that the biggest driver behind the high food costs is higher energy costs. So if Texas A&M is saying that, let’s look at what the Iowa State University Center for Agricultural and Rural Development is saying about ethanol’s impact upon the world.
Mr. GRASSLEY. Thank you, Madam President.

Out of $1 that you, as a consumer, spend for food, the farmer gets 19 cents. Look at a $5 box of corn flakes. For an interview here, I bought a $5 box of corn flakes. I had to pay a little bit more because I bought it on the Hill. But the family farmer’s share of that $5 box of corn flakes—and it happened to be a little bigger box than normal—was about less than 10 cents. I think the real share is about 8 cents. That is what the farmer gets out of a box of corn flakes.

Yet the farmer is being blamed for the high price of food because we grow some corn to make ethanol because the American people, 30 years ago, were demanding that we go to a renewable, clean-burning fuel instead of depending upon dirty-burning petroleum, putting more CO₂ into the air. The value of corn in a pound of beef or pork is about 20 or 30 cents. Yet some have suggested that we should write our policies that promote the use of renewable fuels to help drive down food prices.

If all the evidence suggests that biofuels have little, if any, impact on the rising costs of food, what good can it do to wonder if our biofuels policies? If people look at the facts, how can a public relations firm of former Clinton employees get a $300,000 contract from a very respectable organization such as the Grocery Manufacturers of America, whose job it is to raise the price of food? How do they get away with it? Well, they get away with it because nobody is looking at the facts.

I was pleased to join 15 of my colleagues in signing a letter to the Environmental Protection Agency, expressing our opposition to this misguided idea. We had about that same number of Senators in this body—some of them even voting for ethanol in the past years—sending a letter down to the same EPA, saying we have to stop ethanol, probably some of the very same people who are complaining about the dirty air we have or the global warming.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of that letter.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:


Hon. STEPHEN JOHNSON, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR JOHNSON: We’re writing to express our strong opposition to any request to partially or completely waive the Renewable Fuels Standard. We strongly disagree with the assumption that the renewable fuels mandate is harming the U.S. economy or that it’s primarily responsible for the global escalation in food costs.

We recognize that global food prices have seen a significant increase in recent years. However, waiving the RFS would not cause an immediate reduction in food prices. Ed Lazear, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, recently estimated that global food prices have increased 48 percent since last year, and domestic food inflation was 4.5 percent. Importantly, Chairman Lazear noted that the increased production of ethanol accounted for 8 percent of the 43 percent global increase and only a quarter of one percent of the 4.5 percent increase in U.S. food prices. This data is evidence that ethanol increased food prices by 3 percent of the increase in global food prices.

There are many factors behind the rise in food costs. The increased demand in emerging markets, increased cost of energy inputs, weather conditions in Australia, China and Eastern Europe, and export restrictions have all contributed to the rising costs, according to Chairman Lazear.

Corn production and consumption in the United States has very little or no impact at all on global rice, wheat or lentil markets. Joseph Glauber, Chief Economist at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, recently testified before Congress that rising prices for corn and soybeans have had little effect on the high prices for wheat, rice and other food commodities. He indicated that many factors have a greater role than biofuels, including worldwide weather problems affecting wheat production, rising marketing costs, and the weak U.S. dollar.

While we’re all sympathetic to those struggling to cope with the higher cost of food both domestically and internationally, we must be intellectually honest about the real causes behind the increases. Waiving the renewable fuels mandate will have a negligible impact on corn and food prices. A recent Texas A&M study concluded that relaxing the Renewable Fuels Standard will not result in significantly lower corn prices.

At a time when a barrel of crude oil costs nearly $140 and gasoline costs approaching $4 a gallon, the fuel produced by the U.S. ethanol industry is helping to extend our fuel supply and keep prices lower. A Merrill Lynch analyst recently estimated that oil and gas prices would be 15 percent higher if biofuels weren’t added to our nation’s fuel supply. According to Iowa State University’s Center for Agriculture and Rural Development, ethanol use has lowered gas prices by 30 to 40 cents a gallon, while relaxing the mandate would reduce corn prices by only 5 percent. The fact is, most of the rise in the price of ethanol in our nation’s fuel mix will have little if any impact on food prices and will actually increase prices at the pump for American consumers.

As world demand for biofuels and food increases in the coming years, we will need to continue to develop technologies and feedstocks that meet that demand in a sustainable manner. We strongly support efforts to develop alternative feedstocks and technologies that can satisfy the global demand in a way that addresses the goals of energy security and food security.

The U.S. renewable fuels industry has made tremendous strides to produce homegrown, alternative energy that is improving our environment, reducing our dependence on foreign oil and increasing our national security. America’s farmers are continuing to provide an ample supply of safe, affordable food for the U.S. and global markets. Therefore, we strongly urge you to reject any action that would reduce the production and use of domestically produced renewable fuels.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Grassley: John Thune; Norm Coleman; Kit Bond; Tim Johnson; E. Benjamin Nelson; Amy Klobuchar; Byron Dorgan; Richard G. Lugar; Ken Salazar; Kent Conrad; Jon Tester; Byron Dorgan; Richard G. Lugar; Ken Salazar; Kent Conrad; Jon Tester; Claire McCaskill; Tom Harkin; Debbie Stabenow; Evan Bayh.
Mr. GRASSLEY. An investment researcher with UBS recently said that lifting the biofuels mandate will not ease corn or food prices because energy costs and commodity speculation—speculation—are greater factors. Lifting the renewable fuels mandate will not only raise the cost of corn but also the price of groceries. But it will increase our demand for crude oil—dirty-burning crude oil. Big oil wins.

A Merrill Lynch analyst recently estimated that oil and gas prices would be 25 percent higher were it not for biofuels. I have already spoken to the Iowa State University study: 30 or 40 cents higher for gasoline without having the ethanol industry.

Another economist estimated an even higher price, that gas would go up $1.40 if we removed 50 percent of the ethanol scheduled to be used this year—as these letters from my colleagues suggest that we do away with half the mandate.

It is clear, then, reducing the amount of ethanol in our Nation's fuel mix will have little impact on food prices and will actually increase prices at the pump for all Americans.

So to the critics, let me say loudly and clearly: Ethanol is not the cause of all that ails you. While it is easy to blame, it is intellectually dishonest to make these claims. It is time for critics to take an independent look at the facts. They have a responsibility to brush aside this sort of "herd mentality" that is being encouraged by the Grocery Manufacturers Association. It eventually gets taken over by the pun-dits and talking heads on TV who claim that everything about ethanol is bad. And it is getting louder. It is not only bad, but it is bad, bad, bad.

I wish to tell you what is good, good, good about ethanol because the truth is, ethanol is reducing our dependence upon foreign oil. Ethanol has a significant net energy balance. The same cannot be said for gasoline. Ethanol is reducing our greenhouse gas emissions. Ethanol is not the culprit behind rising food prices here at home or abroad. Ethanol is lowering the price of crude oil and lowering the price of gasoline. Ethanol is increasing our national security, helping our balance of trade, reducing our dependence upon Middle East oil and the whims of big oil.

It is time we clear the air, look at the facts, and recognize, once again, that everything about our domestic renewable fuels is good, good, good—good for agriculture; good for the refinery business, providing jobs in rural America; good for the environment; good for national defense; good for the balance of payments—good, good, good.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Ethanol Myths and Facts from the U.S. Department of Energy be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**Ethanol Myths and Facts**

**Myth:** Ethanol cannot be produced from corn in large enough quantities to make a real difference without disrupting food and feed supplies.

**Fact:** Corn is only one source of ethanol. As we develop new, cost-effective methods for producing biofuels, a significant amount of ethanol will be made from more abundant cellulosic biomass sources.

Future ethanol will be produced increasingly from cellulosic feedstock in crop residues (e.g., stalks, hulls), forestry residuals (e.g., from forest thinning), energy crops (e.g., switchgrass, sorghum), and sorted municipal wastes. Some promising energy crops grow on marginal soils not suited for traditional agriculture.

A high-protein animal feed, known as Distillers Dried Grains with Solubles (DDGS), is produced in the process of making corn ethanol.

The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA) requires that U.S. transportation fuels contain at least 36 billion gallons of renewable fuels by 2022. Of that quantity, 16 billion gallons must be cellulosic biofuels, while ethanol from corn is capped at 15 billion gallons.

The U.S. Departments of Energy and Agriculture's Billion Ton Study found that we can grow enough feedstocks to displace about 30% of current gasoline use by 2030 on a sustainable basis—without only modest changes in land use. It determined that 8 billion to 12 billion tons of U.S. biomass feedstock is potentially available for the production of biofuels more than enough biomass to meet the new renewable fuel standard mandated by EISA.

**Myth:** In terms of emissions, ethanol pollutes the same as gasoline or more.

**Fact:** Ethanol results in fewer greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions than gasoline. With improved efficiency and use of renewable energy, this reduction could reach 52%.

In the future, ethanol produced from cellulosic has the potential to cut life-cycle GHG emissions by up to 86% relative to gasoline.

Ethanol-blended fuels currently in the market—whether E10 or E85—meet stringent tailpipe emission standards. Ethanol reduces emissions without harm to the environment and is a safe, high-performance replacement for fuel additives such as MTBE.

**Myth:** More energy goes into producing ethanol than it delivers as a fuel.

**Fact:** In terms of fossil energy, each gallon of ethanol produced from corn today delivers one third or more energy than is used to produce it.

Ethanol has a positive energy balance that is the energy content of ethanol is greater than the fossil energy used to produce it; and this balance is constantly improving with new technologies.

Over the last 20 years, the amount of energy needed to produce ethanol from corn has significantly decreased because of improved farming techniques, more efficient use of fertilizers and pesticides, higher-yielding crops, and more energy-efficient conversion technology.

Most studies that claim a negative energy balance for ethanol 100% take into account the energy contained in the co-products.

**Myth:** Rainforests will be destroyed to create the new croplands required to meet food, feed, and biofuel demands for capturing carbon dioxide and accelerating climate change and destroying valuable ecosystems.

Fact: Biofuels have the potential to significantly reduce global GHG emissions associated with transportation, but—as with all types of development—controls are needed to protect ecologically important lands.

In Brazil and elsewhere, laws have already slowed deforestation, and for the past decade China has converted marginal croplands to grasslands and the area used for biofuel production. Links between U.S. ethanol production and land use changes elsewhere are uncertain. We cannot simply assume that increases in U.S. ethanol production will lead to increased crop production abroad. In fact, since 2002, during the greatest period of ethanol growth, U.S. corn exports increased by 60% and exported corn to Dried Grains (DDGs) also increased steadily. In part, improvements in U.S. corn yield (about 1.6% annually since 1980) have enabled simultaneous growth in corn and ethanol production.

Greenhouse gas emissions will decrease dramatically as biofuels of the future are increasingly made from cellulosic feedstocks and as the associated farming, harvesting, transport, and production processes increasingly use clean, renewable energy sources.

Ethanol-gas additives can lower fuel economy and may harm your engine.

**Fact:** Most ethanol blends in use today have little, if any, impact on fuel economy or vehicle performance.

While ethanol delivers less energy than gasoline on a gallon-for-gallon basis, today's vehicles are designed to run on gasoline blended with small amounts of ethanol (10% or less) with no perceptible effect on fuel economy.

Flex-fuel vehicles designed to run on higher ethanol blends (E85 or 85% ethanol) do experience reduced miles per gallon, but show a significant gain in horsepower. As a high-octane fuel additive and substitute for MTBE, ethanol enhances engine performance and adds oxygen to meet requirements for reformulated gasoline.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum are increasingly made from cellulosic feedstocks and as the associated farming, harvesting, transport, and production processes increasingly use clean, renewable energy sources.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the House message to accompany S. Con. Res. 70, the concurrent budget resolution; that the motion to disagree to the House amendment be agreed to, the motion to agree to the request of the Senate for a conference be agreed to; the Senate, without objection, request the Chair to appoint conferees be agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore before the Senate the following message:

S. CON. RES. 70
Resolved, That the Senate insist upon its amendment to the resolution (S. Con. Res.
$30,000 a year, that mother would see her taxes go up by $1,100. That is a lot of food, a lot of clothing, and a lot of a better lifestyle that will be lost to that family.

A family of four earning $110,000 would see their taxes—that would be, for example, a mother who is teaching or a father who is teaching and a mother who is a police officer, one making $50,000 and one making, say, $60,000—that family then could see their taxes go up $1,300 under this bill.

Small businesses—which are defined by the Democratic Party as the rich, will pay more taxes. In fact right now in the House of Representatives they are defining two kids and moderate-income Americans who are paying taxes. These are low-income families. The Senator from New Hampshire, the one earning two kids and paying $1,300, will see their taxes go up $1,100. That is a lot of income for somebody who is probably spending a lot of that in order to maintain their business.

Elderly couples with incomes of $40,000, if the Democratic budget goes forward, an elderly taxpayer, someone over 65 with $40,000 of income, will see their taxes go up $2,200. That is a lot of money for somebody who is probably on a fixed income and does not have too many ways to increase their income and are trying to make fixed costs, which they also cannot reduce. To be hit with a $2,200 tax bill in 2011 is a problem for the elderly. If the Democratic Party is in power, the Democratic Party, can spend their money on some program they deem more appropriate than allowing that individual to keep their money in their pocket. Eighteen million seniors will see taxes go up under this bill as the tax policies of 2001 and 2003 are repealed and taxes are increased.

There was an argument made on the other side of the aisle that we are not going to do that, that we are going to collect this money from uncollected taxes. That argument has no viability any longer. They made that argument last year, and the amount of money which was collected from uncollected taxes is only a minuscule amount, so that argument has no credibility. There is an argument made, primarily by Senator Obama in his campaign for the Presidency, that all these new programs total up to well over $300 billion a year. He has proposed over 185 new programs. If you score just 143 of those programs he is proposing—his new or additional programs—it totals $500 billion in new spending. That is on top of the new spending already in this budget resolution. This budget radically expands spending. It is well over $200 billion in new discretionary spending over the 5-year period of this budget. We are talking of course about the Obama “spend-O-bama” on top of that and you are up another $300 billion. All of this is going to be paid for, allegedly, by just taxing the wealthy.

You have to look at the language of the budget. That is not the way it is going to be paid for. As I outlined, it is going to be paid for by taxing working Americans, elderly Americans, single moms with families and individuals who run small businesses. If you look Senator Obama at face value, and what he is proposing, he is going to raise all of these taxes on the wealthy to pay for his $300 billion of new spending and the $200 billion in this bill. The $300 billion figure is an annual number, by the way. The maximum amount, if you are going to return to the top rate in America, back to the rate during the Clinton years, which is what has been proposed by Senator Obama, the maximum amount that generates annually is $25 billion. The fact is, we will not get that much. These are wealthy people. They understand how to hire tax accountants and avoid taxes when taxes become disproportionate, and they view them as something that should be avoided rather than paid.

The great advantage we have from the tax cuts which were put in place by President Bush and which caused this economy to expand and caused Federal revenues to grow in the most aggressive rate which the way history went was that tax laws have reached fair levels. Take, for example, the capital gains tax which, under this bill, under this
That is the philosophical difference that divides us and could not be shown in a more stark way than in this budget as it left the Senate and which will be conferred, because this budget revealed almost all the constructive tax policy that was pro-growth oriented in the President’s proposals of 2001 and 2003, and as a result it drives this massive increase in the tax burden on the American people.

This is not a tax on the wealthy. This is a tax on the middle class because it is middle-class people who will have to pay for the $1.2 trillion tax increase. To review the numbers, 7.8 million people who do not pay taxes today will have to pay them under this bill; 27 million people who run small businesses will see their taxes go up by $1,100; 43 million working Americans who have children will see their taxes go up by $2,300; and senior citizens, 18 million senior citizens, will see their taxes go up by $2,200.

Obviously, we have a deep philosophical difference with the majority on this point. And that is why we are suggesting an instruction which says we should not proceed down the path of having the world’s largest tax increase.

Let’s talk about our confidence. Do not do that to the American people. Keep the tax laws at a level that is fair and is responsible.

By “responsible” I mean the tax laws, as they presently are structured today, are returning more revenue to the Federal Government from our income tax than we have ever had in our history. And even as a percentage of the gross national product, they are returning more revenues to the Federal Government than has been the historical average. Mr. President, 18.7 percent of gross national product today is being collected in tax revenue. Historically, it was only 18.2 percent. So these tax laws have not reduced Federal revenue, they have actually increased Federal revenue. When I discussed the capital gains rates.

We should not be putting in place a tax burden on working Americans which is going to be counter to the idea of creating jobs, creating economic incentives, and giving and allowing people to keep in their pockets money which they have earned and which they know better how to spend than we as a government know how to spend.

I recognize the remainder of my time. I look forward to continuing this discussion as we proceed through the afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. McCaskill.) The Senator from North Dakota.

MR. CONRAD. Madam President, I have enjoyed listening to my colleagues describe this budget resolution. But it has nothing whatsoever to do with the budget resolution we have produced. It is a wonderful speech. It is the same speech they give every year no matter what the budget resolution says. But it absolutely has no attachment to what we have presented.

I hear this talk about the biggest tax increase ever in the world history. He said the same thing last year. And you know what happened. We have cut taxes. In fact, I have that chart too. It is very interesting because he gave pre-recession billions last year. It may have been exactly the same speech.

And what has happened with this Democratic-controlled Congress? Well, here are the tax cuts we have enacted, $194 billion. After two years we were going to have the biggest tax increase in the history of the world last year, we have cut taxes by $194 billion, with $7 billion of revenue raised through loophole closers that have been enacted, in whole clowns. Unfortunately, many of them supported to advance the legislation that was important to us all. But that is the record.

After the speech, the identical slogan virtually verbatim he gave last year, that we were going to have the biggest tax increase in the history of the world—what is the record? We have cut taxes by $194 billion, overwhelmingly on the middle class.

Now, let’s a look at this budget resolution. The green line is the revenue that is in our resolution. The red line is the President’s. That is a very small difference, as you can see, a very small difference between the two. In fact, here is the difference: $15.6 trillion of revenue in our resolution, $15.2 trillion of revenue in the President’s proposed budget. That is a difference of 2.6 percent. So I do not know what he is talking about when he is talking about the biggest tax increase in the history of the world. That has nothing whatever to do with our resolution.

In fact, our resolution has substantial tax relief. The Baucus amendment adopted on the Senate floor with bipartisan support extended the middle-class tax relief by providing for marriage penalty relief, by providing for extension of the child tax credit, by extending the 10-percent bracket.

We also provided alternative minimum tax relief to prevent 26 million people from being caught up in the alternative minimum tax, almost an eightfold increase from the number affected now. We have taken effective action to prevent that from happening. We have estate tax reform that will provide that only two-tenths of 1 percent of estates will face any taxes.

We also provide for education tax cuts. We provide for property tax relief, and we provide for extension of the popular tax extenders. All of that is done in this bill. Now, there is a difference in revenue, as I indicated, a very slight difference between what is in our budget resolution and what the President called for.

Well, where are we going to get that revenue if we are not going to have a tax increase? Well, the first thing we do is go after the tax gap which is now estimated at $345 billion a year. That is the difference between what is paid and what is owed, $345 billion a year.
If we got 20 percent of that amount alone we could meet our numbers with no tax increase. But that is not the only place we can look because, as I have shown before on the floor of the Senate, this building down in the Cayman Islands called Ugland House, this little monkey business, this building is the home to 12,748 companies.

Now, I have said this is the most efficient building in the world. Think of that. That little building down in the Cayman Islands calls 12,748 companies, claim they are doing business in that little building. Of course, the only business they are doing in this building is monkey business because what they are doing is claiming they are doing business there in order to engage in tax avoidance. That is the business they are engaged in in Ugland House.

Now, if anybody doubts it, here is a recent story from the Boston Globe from March 6 of this year: Shell companies in Cayman Islands allow Kellogg, Brown & Root to avoid Medicare and Social Security taxes in the United States. What they have done down there this is the Nation’s top Iraq war contractor until last year, a subsidiary of Halliburton, is to avoid paying hundreds of billions in Federal taxes. We are talking about literally millions of dollars in Federal taxes by hiring workers through shell companies based in this tropical tax haven.

Now, what we are saying is, let’s shut down this kind of scam. How much is there? Well, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations said there is $100 billion a year that is being lost to the U.S. Treasury in tax scams being run in these offshore tax evasion schemes. So if you have $345 billion a year in the tax gap, money that is owed that is not being paid, and the vast majority of us pay what we owe, it is outrageous that some are getting away without paying what they owe. And our argument on our side is that we are going to that those folks who are not paying what they owe and are cheating all the rest of us.

On our side we say: Let’s shut down these offshore tax havens that are costing us another $100 billion a year, these tax scams that are cheating all of the rest of us. You add those two together, that is $445 billion a year.

Again, now we need less than 20 percent of that in order to completely close this revenue gap. But I didn’t show there, because I have shown this chart on the floor of the Senate too. This is a picture of a sewer system in Europe. What does a sewer system have to do with the budget of the United States? We have companies in America buying European sewer systems to write them off on their books to reduce their taxes here. Then they lease the sewer systems back to the European cities that built them in the first place. Is that unbelievable? Our friends on the other side don’t want to tell us about it. They don’t want to shut that down. They think that is OK. We don’t. We think that should be shut down. This is another tens of billions of dollars a year in these types of tax scams.

We have things we have done to try to shut down some of these operations. We have put these in bills that the President has threatened to veto. This is almost always true of this. This is what has been going on. We proposed shutting down these scams. One of the things we propose is codifying economic substance, prohibiting transactions with no economic rationale; we proposed shutting down schemes to lease foreign subway and sewer systems and deprecate their assets on the books of the United States to avoid taxes here. We have proposed ending deferral of offshore compensation by hedge fund managers trying to avoid taxation in this country. One of those people, by the way, earned over $1 billion last year alone. And there is not just one; there are many of them who earned over a billion dollars a year last year. Then there are those who move their money offshore to avoid paying taxes in this country and stick all the rest of us with the bill. We have said no, let’s shut that down. The President has threatened to veto that.

We have talked about broker information reporting to prevent this evasion and taxing people who leave this country and give up their citizenship to evade taxes they owe here. As unbelievable as it may seem, some of those who move their citizenship to this country can use their U.S. citizenship, go to one of these tax havens and say: We don’t owe any taxes in America because we don’t live there anymore. We are no longer a citizen of that country. We are now down in the Cayman Islands or another one of these tax havens.

In fact, I went on the Internet. It is amazing to go on, put in “offshore tax havens.” Punch that in and then do a search. You will get over 1 million hits. They talk about those offshore accounts in a luxury yacht, never pay taxes again.” This is the kind of scam that is going on. We say shut it down. If we only got back 15 percent of the money in the tax gap—not 50 percent, 15 percent—if we got back 15 percent of this tax gap, of these abusive tax shelters, we could meet our numbers with no tax increase. Remember, in our resolution, we have hundreds of billions of dollars of tax reduction on middle-income people, because we have extended all the middle-class tax cuts that the President offered, tax cuts, property tax relief, and the popular tax extenders. All of that tax relief is in this package.

I hope our colleagues will reject the assertion that is in the Senator’s motion because it bears absolutely no relationship to the budget resolution before us.

I yield the floor, suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, 2 years ago, Democrats campaigned on tax relief for middle-class families. They called for fiscal restraint and lowering the national debt. But as we have seen over the last year, our good friends are more concerned with increasing taxation, increasing regulation, and increasing litigation. The budget they unveiled this year is the latest example. If we were to follow this budget, it would go a long way toward turning us into a country like France, at a time when even the French, as we all know.
are trying to pull back and trying to get out of the ditch into which they have put themselves. This budget lifts the curtain on what this budget is: It is the Democrats’ way of saying yes to the failed tax-and-spend policies of the past. American families cannot afford this budget, American job creators cannot afford this budget, and neither can our children’s future.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, it is the same song, second verse. Again, it is words. It is no wonder our friends on the other side want to take that money back and then some—first their irresponsible spending habits, Washington should be doing the same. Yet they are proposing the opposite. At a time of serious economic concern, they want to grow the Federal budget to over $1 trillion in nonemergency spending.

We have heard a lot of talk over the last few months from the other side about how middle-class families are struggling to make ends meet. We even worked together to pass a stimulus package that puts money back in the wallets of middle-class families. But now our good friends on the other side want to take that money back—and then some—to fund their irresponsible spending hacks.

Let’s be clear about what this budget is: It is the Democrats’ way of saying yes to the failed tax-and-spend policies of the past. American families cannot afford this budget, American job creators cannot afford this budget, and neither can our children’s future.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, it is the same song, second verse. Again, it is words. It is no wonder our friends on the other side have lost three congressional elections in a row because they keep chanting the same mantra that has no relationship to reality. These are the same exact speeches they gave last year: biggest tax increase in the history of the world.

Now we can come and we can check the record. We do not have to guess; we do not have to wonder; we do not have to engage in make-believe. We can look at the record. Here it is: Democrats lowered taxes by $194 billion. If you are listening, you do not have to wonder if that is true. All you have to do is go to your mailbox because all across America people are getting checks from the United States that represent the tax cuts Democrats in Congress passed. So this is not a question; this is a matter of fact. Democrats cut taxes $194 billion. Those are not my numbers. Those are the numbers from the Congressional Budget Office.

All of this talk about big tax increases is just talk. It has no relationship to last year’s budget. It has no relationship to this year’s budget.

I present the factual record. It is as clear as it can be. We lowered taxes $194 billion in the year under the budget resolution we passed last year.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCAR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill clerk read as follows:
The bill clerk read as follows:

The bill clerk read as follows:
The bill clerk read as follows:
The bill clerk read as follows:
The bill clerk read as follows:
The bill clerk read as follows:
The bill clerk read as follows:
The bill clerk read as follows:
The bill clerk read as follows:

Mr. CONRAD. Let’s be clear about what this motion does, and then I will come back and make the presentation for it in a moment. This motion would instruct the House and Senate budget conferees to assume a 1-year extension of the alternative tax extenders—those so-called patches, in other words, that the filers who have not had to pay that would not have to pay it in the future for another year.

Also, it assumes an extension of the tax extenders, as we call them. Those are the provisions of the Tax Code that have already expired, things such as the R&D tax credit; plus those that expire at the end of this year, things such as the various energy tax credits; and some international tax credits that have always been the subject of our extend policy.

These tax extenders and the AMT, alternative minimum tax, fix would not have to be offset by raising taxes on American families, but that is what this motion does. It has no relationship to the failed tax-and-spend policies of the past. American families cannot afford this budget, American job creators cannot afford this budget, and neither can our children’s future.

Madam President, I reserve discussing this further until some of the other speakers are here to make the main points.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I will offer a side-by-side amendment that seeks to achieve the same goal. This is one place where we have an agreement. Most of us want to see the alternative minimum tax imposed on the American people. That would involve 26 million people, up from 4.2 million now. All of us want the so-called tax extenders to be extended. It would involve the research and development tax credit and others.

We would add this additional caveat: We ask that every effort be made to
offset the cost of these policies by closing the tax gap, shutting down abusive tax shelters, and addressing these offshore tax havens that are turning out to be so abusive. We think that is better policy.

We absolutely agree that the alternative minimum tax should not be expanded. We absolutely agree that the so-called tax extenders, such things as the research and experimentation tax credit, the deduction for State and local taxes, the deduction for classroom expenses, the deduction for qualified education expenses, the incentive for the charitable IRA rollover, the combat pay earned-income tax credit, and various energy tax incentives, be extended. But we believe that rather than just putting that on the charge card and adding to the debt—meaning that we go out with a tin cup and borrow more money from the Chinese and the Japanese—we pay for it by going after these abusive tax shelters, going after these offshore tax havens, and do it without raising taxes. So I hope my colleagues will support that as a general principle and an instruction to the conference committee.

With that, I note the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I am going to extend my remarks.

I think many people in the country hear the phrase “AMT” and they wonder: What is that? It is the alternative minimum tax. It was established decades ago because they found there were people making $200,000 a year who weren’t paying any taxes. To address that, they created the so-called alternative minimum tax.

The problem with it is that it was never indexed for inflation. The result is that now, instead of affecting just a few people, it is affecting millions of people. In fact, the estimates are that if we don’t do anything about this, it will affect 4 million people in 2007 to 26 million people in 2008.

In this budget resolution we say: No, no, don’t let that happen. Don’t increase taxes on 26 million American families. Don’t do that.

In this instruction to the conference, we say: Yes, absolutely, don’t allow the alternative minimum tax to grow like a cancer. Instead, let’s take care of that. Let’s remove it as an option, and let’s try to pay for it by closing down these abusive tax shelters, these offshore tax havens, and closing the tax gap.

Our friends on the other side have a different approach. They just want to put it on the charge card. The problem with that is if you eliminate the alternative minimum tax without paying for it, it adds $1.7 trillion to the debt. That is trillion with a “t.” Where do we get the money? Well, we borrow it.

We have been borrowing a lot of money—$1.7 trillion. At the end of his tenure, it will be $10.4 trillion. In the 8 years he is responsible for the debt will have risen to $10.4 trillion. In fact, he will have nearly doubled the debt of the country.

More alarming is where we are getting it from because increasingly we are getting this money by borrowing from Japan and China. We even owe Korea money. This chart shows it. This chart shows that it took 42 Presidents 224 years to run up $1 trillion of U.S. debt—foreign-held debt—foreign-held U.S. debt. It took 224 years to run up $1 trillion of foreign-held debt and all these Presidents, 42 of them. This President tops them all. He increased foreign holdings of our debt so far, and far beyond. He has dug a very deep hole.

We have proposed a series of reforms.

I held up just moments ago a picture of a French sewer system and asked the question: How do we do that with the U.S. budget? Well, it turns out it has quite a bit to do with the U.S. budget because we now find companies in this country—wealthy individuals buying European sewer systems, not because they are in the sewer business but because they want to avoid taxes in this country. How do the two have any relationship? Well, here is how it works: They buy a European sewer system, they put it on their books here, they depreciate it for tax purposes, and then they lease the sewer system back to Europe. That is what our debt is. It is somebody leasing the sewer system back to Europe. That is how they accumulate it.

I just held up a picture of this little five-story building. Here it is. This little building down in the Cayman Islands is home to 12,748 companies. What a remarkable building this is. That little five-story building is supposed to be the corporate headquarters of 12,748 companies. Now, are they really doing business out of that little building down in the Cayman Islands? No, of course not. They are not doing business down there. They have a postal drop down there in order to claim that it is their headquarters for tax purposes. Why would they do that? Because the Cayman Islands doesn’t have any taxes. So what do they do is they have a subsidiary of this company that sells to another subsidiary that is wholly owned, and they sell to cost at subsidiary No. 2. Then they sell to another subsidiary No. 3 that is down in the Cayman Islands. They sell to them at cost. Then the subsidiary in the Cayman Islands sells to another subsidiary over in Germany or France and shows a big profit in the Cayman Islands where there are no taxes. That is an outrage. The vast majority of us pay what we owe. We have some who don’t, and they are getting away with it with these scams. We say shut it down.

Let’s not go borrow more from China and Japan and dig the hole deeper the way the President wants us to do. That is what our budget resolution says. That is what my amendment says. Yes, absolutely, don’t let the alternative minimum tax be expanded from 4.2 million people in this country to 26 million. Don’t let that happen. Yes, extend the research and experimentation credit. Yes, extend the sales tax deduction. Yes, provide for these other important tax incentives, especially the energy tax incentives. But instead of borrowing the money, instead of just going back hat in hand to China and Japan and asking them for more money, let’s shut down these offshore tax havens, these abusive tax shelters and this tax gap where we have people who owe money but aren’t paying it.

Let’s go after them instead of going over to China and being dependent on this money of strangers to finance our country.

We are headed for a cliff here because under this administration the debt has skyrocketed before the baby boomers ever retire. I have shown the chart that shows what has happened to the debt. The debt has gone up like a scalded cat.

Here is what has happened to the debt under this President and these policies: up, up, and away. He has nearly doubled the federal debt. He has more than doubled the foreign holdings of our debt. In fact, the increase in foreign-held debt under this President is now 150 percent of the amount accumulated by all previous Presidents combined. He has increased foreign-held U.S. debt. Now we owe China hundreds of billions of dollars. We owe the Japanese even more. We even owe Korea now over $40 billion. Enough is enough. Enough is enough. Let’s quit digging the hole deeper. Yes, absolutely, let’s provide middle-class tax relief. That is in this budget.

As I have said before, with all the talk from the other side about the biggest tax increase in the history of the world, here is the record. Democrats had been in charge for 1 year and we have provided $194 billion of tax relief, and you don’t have to wonder if that is true. Just go home and check your mailbox. You are receiving a check passed by this Congress, signed by the President—a stimulus package—with $150 billion in that package alone. But we have taken other steps to provide other tax relief as well, including not allowing, last year, the alternative minimum tax to be expanded, and we hope to let that go this year. The alternative minimum tax must be expanded this year either. That is a fact. That is the record. It is not rhetoric, it is a fact.
Madam President, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Perhaps, I would ask the ranking member, could we just agree that whenever we go into a quorum call, we equally divide the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. I would ask the Senator from South Carolina, would it be acceptable—I understand it is with Senator Boxer, who has a matching motion to yours—to have 30 minutes equally divided?

Mr. DEMINT. Yes.

Mr. GREGG. On both motions?

Mr. DEMINT. Just have one. Thirty minutes equally divided?

Mr. CONRAD. On the two.

Mr. DEMINT. Yes.

Mr. CONRAD. That would help very much. I appreciate the Senator’s courtesy.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we have 30 minutes equally divided on the DeMint and the Boxer motions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DEMINT. Madam President, I send a motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

"The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DeMint] moves that the conference on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 70 (the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009) be instructed to insist that the conference report incorporate section 304 of S. Con. Res. 70, the deficit neutral reserve fund to invest in clean energy, preserve the environment and provide for certain settlements, as passed by the Senate, which such section shall include an additional requirement that legislation providing for new mandates on greenhouse gas emissions that would harm the United States economy and cost jobs should not be enacted unless similar mandates are enacted by China and India."
our destiny to save the planet. It is not our destiny to support the DeMint motion, which leaves it up to China and India.

We have a better way. We say in our substitute that no legislation should pass unless the mandate is commensurate with the emissions until it effectively addresses imports from China and India and other nations that have no similar emissions programs. We agree that no bill should pass unless it addresses the imports from these nations. So that is our alternative.

We want to stop the world from having to want to get off; not to say that America will be missing in action in the biggest domestic challenge of our time, but to grab hold of that challenge and make sure we do it in a way that is fair to our industry, fair to our workers, fair to our consumers, fair to our manufacturers. And when those imports come in at our ports, if those countries seeking entry into our country do not have equivalent programs, then they will have to get the allowances at the border in order to bring those goods into the country.

That is the way we are going to handle this problem. So, once again, I say to my colleagues, we are going to have a debate on global warming very soon, thanks to Senator Reid putting it on the schedule for June 2.

When we are told by the leading scientists of the world that if global warming is left unchecked, our planet will become inhospitable to us, our human beings, to our children, to our grandchildren, and that there will be vectors around that we cannot combat, there will be amoebas in our water, bacteria that have never been there before, there will be storms, cyclones, droughts, and floods—extreme weather conditions; when we see that the habitat for beautiful animals—God’s creatures, such as the polar bear—is already being impacted now as we speak, for us to say we will do nothing until China, India, want China dictating what I do in this country, I don’t want India dictating what I do in this country. I want to make sure that we handle this issue right and that we are not disadvantaged because they may not act. That is what our alternative does.

I hope we will have a good vote on that alternative and reject the status quo—the throwback position of Senator DeMint. I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. DeMINT. Madam President, I appreciate the comments by my colleague from California. Certainly, it should be our highest priority as a nation to continue to remove CO₂ emissions throughout our country. We don’t need to wait for any other country to act, only our own.

We want to recognize that if we put such a burden on our industries in America, they will move production to China, and they will do their polluting somewhere else rather than here. If that is what our legislation does, then we do nothing for the environment, and the only thing we do for our country is send jobs overseas. We need to be smarter in how we deal with this matter.

The side-by-side motion by my colleague from California would add insult to injury. She wants to leave us open to lose jobs in America by putting mandates on our companies that hurt our economy and cost us jobs. Then she is looking ahead with fear. It is giving veto power to other countries that are coming from other countries that don’t abide by our mandates so that products cost more for the people who live here, many of whom would not have jobs.

We cannot solve our environmental problems with this kind of convoluted logic. The motion I have put forward simply says if—and only if—a mandate is known to hurt our economy and costs our jobs, then we need to figure out a different way to deal with it than to put a mandate on a U.S. company in competition with businesses that don’t have the same mandate in other countries we trade with.

It is only common sense, and it doesn’t make sense, again, to send jobs overseas to countries that are our competitors to produce products that we buy from around the world. I encourage my colleagues to think this through. Let me provide a few more facts about what we are trying to do.

We need to work to reduce greenhouse gases, and there are many things we can do that do not hurt our economy and don’t drive jobs out of our country. In fact, if we look at it closely, good economics is usually good for the environment. We see that if we move with all compassion but just knee-jerk reactions, we end up with programs, such as an ethanol mandate, that do not help the environment, raise the price of food, and hurt people all over the world. The question is: is that same type of thinking going on right now.

It is a laudable goal, one with which I agree, that we should continue to work in all reasonable ways to reduce CO₂ emissions in our country.

One recent study from the University of California found that China passed the United States in carbon emissions in 2006 and is now the largest pollution-producing country in the world. This has just been in a few short years, and they are growing much faster than we are. We do need to keep in mind that carbon in the air that comes from China does as much to hurt the worldwide environment, if, in fact, it does affect global warming—it doesn’t matter if it is coming from the United States or China. If we ignore what other countries are doing, we do it at our own peril.

My motion is very similar to bipartisan agreement reached in the Congress when discussing the Kyoto when discussing the Kyoto conference. It makes no sense to bind our own companies with expensive mandates if we do not have cooperation from countries in other parts of the world. We simply move our production and our jobs somewhere else. So we need to be logical about it.

I mentioned before, according to a World Bank study, both China and India have increased CO₂ emissions by nearly 100 percent from 1990 to 2004, while the United States emissions in that same period only increased by 25 percent, which is less than the growth of our economy during that period.

This emissions source has to have taken about which would export American manufacturing jobs to China and India. With the solution that is being presented by my colleague from California, she is basically saying: OK, let’s hurt the economy and lose jobs in this country, but we can make it up for it by raising prices of goods that come to us from China and India. That is not going to help anyone in this country, and it is not going to do anything to reduce emissions in the world. It is playing a musical chairs with both American jobs and basically encouraging the environment to be spoiled in other parts of the world.

In order to truly address greenhouse gas emissions, it is imperative that we play a role in the world, India, and China, doing the same things that are emitting need to work together. So if we take this on simply as one country, we will hurt ourselves, we would not help the environment and we will send jobs overseas and actually encourage pollution, magnified, in effect, by not acting in a way to create jobs and basically seeking cooperation around the world.

I certainly encourage my colleagues to respond to the need to reduce CO₂ emissions and to look at ways we are doing it already that actually create jobs and don’t take them from our country. But let’s not solve the problem by making it worse and shipping our jobs and pollution overseas and expect to do any good with our legislation.

Madam President, I reserve the remainder of my time and yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. How much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 5 minutes 57 seconds. The Senator from South Carolina has 6 minutes 51 seconds.

Mrs. BOXER. Will you let me know when I have used up 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will so advise.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I say to my colleagues that Senator DeMint’s motion is a back-to-the-future position. Again, it is why his position is so stuck up. It is not looking ahead with hope; it is looking ahead with fear. It is giving veto power to countries that we should not be following. We should not be following the environmental policies of China. You can barely breathe over there. Yet they are acting as though they decide to act and we sit here and do nothing about one of the greatest challenges to face our generation.
I cannot look into the eyes of my grandchildren and tell them: Sorry, I am giving over my proxy to China. I am giving over my proxy to India, and I can’t do anything about it.

I don’t know exactly what my colleagues are thinking about. He is telling me what I support, and he has no right to do that. He has no right to say I support higher taxes on consumers because I don’t. He has no right to say I want to give away jobs. I have more support from working men and women in my State than probably almost anyone in this body. I take second to none in that category of fighting for the environment and fighting for jobs.

Actually, if my friend knew a little bit more about what we are talking about, he would understand that the bill we are going to come up with has one of the biggest tax cuts in history in—it—let me repeat that, one of the biggest tax cuts in history in—it—which is going to ease the pain and ease the burden and ease the problems and help them pay for high prices of gasoline.

My bill has cuts in carbon of 2 percent a year that we think is doable, and our bill is deficit neutral. It is, as my friend just now, a very bipartisan bill—Boxer, a Democrat; Lieberman, an Independent; Warner, a Republican, and it has bipartisan support.

For someone to stand up and say the purpose of that bill is to hurt consumers, hurt America, hurt jobs, then they have not read the bill or they are giving a political speech. You can put lipstick on a pig, but it is still a pig. I look at my friend’s motion as a sad one. It is a position of surrender. It takes us back to the nineties, when we feared taking on global warming. It takes us back to the nineties, when we feared taking on what we now know about greenhouse gas emissions should be enacted until it effectively addresses imports from China, and other nations that have no similar emissions programs.

Mrs. BOXER. I didn’t want to forget to offer the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator for 9 minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I believe we should adopt Senator Kyl’s motion to instruct the budget conference. First of all, I wish to comment on the status of the alternative minimum tax. There is some good news regarding the need to do a patch to protect some families. The Democratic leadership in this body recognized the importance of halting the effect of this tax on these families and provided room in the budget for a patch for this year.

I commend my friend, the chairman of the Budget Committee, for that improvement of the budget resolution over previous years. I do so again and note that the Kyl instruction is consistent with the chairman’s position in that regard.

The bad news is, we are halfway through the year and the patch has not been done. The reason is that Blue Dog Democrats in the other body will not supply the votes for an on-off patch in the House of Representatives. By the way, the only Blue Dog answer to deficit reduction is to raise taxes. We have seen it on the AMT, and we have seen it on spending legislation. We are seeing now the GI benefit provisions in the war supplemental bill. Why do they think of only raising taxes and not of where to cut spending levels to offset the need to spend someplace else I don’t understand. They never seem to propose spending cuts as a remedy. I think it is fair for me to say they never do. They only ask for higher taxes.

I hope people in this body will start to pay attention to this issue. The Blue Dogs’ bark is deficit reduction, but their bite is always to raise taxes.

In addition to the AMT patch, both bodies need to deal with several expired provisions of tax law. We need to focus on this problem and get legislation ready.

Earlier today, the House began work on an extenders bill. It is offset with tax increases. I urge them to send the bill to the Senate so Chairman BAUCUS and I will have a vehicle to deal with this pressing problem. We need to act ahead of time. We need to act before the IRS forms are finalized. We cannot go through another filing season fiasco, such as waiting until December last year when it finally got passed, and the IRS had a lot of extra work after the forms had already gone out. Let’s not make the problems for our taxpayers and the Internal Revenue Service.

Senator Kyl’s motion then is very important to assure us of the quickest route to complete action on AMT and extenders. The quickest route is the stand alone resolve as last year: Drop the offset demand.

Folks on the other side happen to be complaining all the time that offsets are essential. I would like to make it clear that the policy issues behind offsets are one thing. We ought to ask ourselves the same question on any tax policy proposal, whether it raises revenue or loses revenue. The question should be: Does a tax legislative proposal make tax policy sense? It ought to be decided on the basis of policy. That is the bottom line.

On the matters of tax policy, Senator Kyl’s motion to instruct, the answer is very evident. On the AMT patch and extenders, the answer is overwhelmingly clear. The answer is “yes” on the Kyl motion to instruct. The policy call is a slam dunk. It is backed up by the politics; that is, supermajority votes for an AMT patch and extenders in the House and Senate that are very difficult to get.

We have to divorce the merits of the current law provisions from the offset question. Offsets should be judged on their merits. An AMT patch and extenders should be judged on their merits. They should be at the same as the two, some might ask. Here is the reason.

Right now, we have a budget process, including pay-go, that is biased toward higher taxes and, of course, higher spending. As evidence, take a look at expiring spending provisions. According to the CBO, they total $1.3 trillion—a whole $1.3 trillion. That is double a permanent AMT patch score. That spending is not subject to pay-go. It, unlike expiring tax provisions, is in the budget as if it is home free. Just like the record tax increases built into this budget, so too is a record spending increase.
I have not even talked about appropriations increases. That additional above-baseline spending is included as permanent, once passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, through you, I ask the Senator if he would yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent agreement we have worked out?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CONRAD. I think it would be helpful to the overall process that we do this.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following motions to instruct conferences be the only motions, except the pending amendments, with no amendment in order to the motions, and that would be the Conrad AMT and the Kyle AMT amendments, with 60 minutes equally divided, with no amendment in order to the motions, with 60 minutes equally divided; that there be a Democratic nuclear energy reserve fund amendment and a Republican nuclear energy reserve fund amendment and the two amendments be limited to 30 minutes equally divided; that there be a Kyl AMT amendment and a DeMint OCS amendment, with 30 minutes equally divided.

We have already had initial debate on the Boxer China-India and the DeMint China-India amendment with 30 minutes equally divided; that upon the use of debate time on each motion, it be set aside and the motions to be voted in the order listed; that there be 2 minutes prior to each vote, and then after the first vote, the vote time be limited to 10 minutes each; that upon the use of all time, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to each motion; that there be 60 minutes of general debate time available to the chair and the ranking member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I would note that obviously the amendment that has already been debated in the title: the Gregg amendment, would be the first amendment to be voted on and these other amendments voted on in the order indicated, or we will do it as offered. I guess we can do it as offered, if that would accommodate the Senator from California, because we did the DeMint amendment offered earlier. We will do it as offered.

I thank the Senator from Iowa for his courtesy.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Would you give me 1 more minute added to what I had?

Mr. CONRAD. Absolutely, an additional minute. Always, anytime, to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I have been given 1 additional minute, so I have 5 minutes left at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bottom line is that this would continue the status quo, and takes the same, under pay-go. So the Kyl motion to instruct treaties expiring tax relief the same as expiring spending. That reason alone, aside from the merits of the AMT patch alone, would be enough to get the support from all of us on the Kyl motion to instruct.

The bottom line is that pay-go has a bias toward tax increases and increased spending. We ought to have the same rules apply to the expenditure side as to the tax side. Presently, they do not. But this would make it possible for that to be the case.

The chairman of the Budget Committee continues to say he is going to let the income be brought into a, down abusive tax shelters, which I also favor. Some examples are cross-border leases of foreign sewer systems, which he mentioned, or shutting down tax havens, which he mentioned. I would support him in every one of those efforts. But Congress has done a great deal already, shutting down abusive leasing deals. We did that in 2004. The Senate has tried to shut off tax benefits from older deals, but the House Democrats have rejected closing those loopholes. The chairman also continues to say we can count on this revenue even though he keeps saying this is the answer to all of our offset problems—in other words, getting enough new revenue to offset tax cuts someplace else. The chairman also continues to say we can get $100 billion per year from shutting down offshore tax havens, according to the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The fact is, there are no legislative proposals out there that the Joint Tax Committee has scored to bring in anywhere close to the $100 billion we are led by the other side, by the majority, to believe we are going to be able to do.

The 12,748 companies the chairman says are in the Upland House in the Cayman Islands are not claiming to be doing business there. It is simply their registered address, just like an address in Nevada or Delaware is a registered address of many more thousands of companies. They have a picture of an office building in Wilmington, DE, or Reno, NV? I assume the chairman is just as willing to go after onshore tax evasion facilities by State corporate law as offshore tax evasion, and he would want to do so in a way that does not put our information exchange network at risk.

The chairman knows that it is the Joint Committee on Taxation that provides Congress with revenue scores, not the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. Anything that would raise the kind of money assumed in this budget would involve a significant change in tax policy, which is the last thing the chairman says he wants to do.

Again, I do not see how the distinguished chairman can count on all this revenue without assuming substantial tax increases when the Joint Committee on Taxation itself, if assuming revenue coming in under tax law changes—if that “god” cannot score it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I had earlier filed and Senator GRASSLEY had spoken on a motion to instruct conferences. An alternative has been presented by Senator Conrad. I wish to discuss both of them, this motion to instruct conferences on the alternative minimum tax, and the so-called tax extenders.

The 109th Congress is required to fix the AMT because without such a fix—around here it is called a patch—but without such a fix, it would apply to, last year 22 million people, this year 26 million people. It was never intended to do that to people.

It was originated about 20 years ago because there were a couple hundred millionaires who were not paying taxes because of all of their credits, deductions, offsets, and so on. People in Congress thought that was not right, so we said: Well, no matter what, even if you have enough other tax shelters to eliminate your tax liability, we are going to make you pay an alternative minimum tax, no matter what. But it was never intended to do that to people.

The bottom line is that this is the 14th Congress that has said we need to do that. Obviously it does not make any sense to say to taxpayers: You should have not to pay the alternative minimum tax, but under the Democratic rules we have to raise your taxes so that the Government does not lose any money from us relieving you of that tax liability. That does not make any sense.

So each year we waive that requirement. All we are saying here is we need to do that again this year. I understand the pay-go requirement is part of the Democratic rule around here. It has not been applied in the past for a very good reason: It makes no sense, and it should not be applied here either.
We never intended that this tax apply to 26 million taxpayers, we never intended to collect the revenue, we are not going to collect the revenue. So why do we have to make the Government whole for revenue that we never intended to give it in the first place, especially when we have raised taxes on people in order to “pay for the reduction in revenues to the Treasury”? That is what this resolution is about.

The other half of it is to instruct the conferees to instruct the Senate to sustain the so-called extenders. Now, that is shorthand around here for a variety of tax provisions which provide various credits and other relief to taxpayers such as the research and development tax credit. But we only do that at a time, so every year about this time we have to start talking about passing the extenders package. We are going to do it; there is not going to be any debate about it. The distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee made that clear that all of us agree that this needs to be done; it is a question of how we do it.

What we are doing is saying here, today, we need to do it in the following way: Pass it as we did last year. You do not have to pay for it somewhere else in order to “pay for it.”

This is not a case that make any sense for us. If you are going to give tax relief, why would you raise taxes to have to pay for it? We are not counting on any revenue. Every year we do it this way. So why the charade that somehow we have to raise taxes to pay for something we never intended to collect revenue from in the first place?

That is what this resolution does. Let’s strip away the pretense here that somehow or other we are going to pay for it. “Pay for” are not the right words anyway. That starts from the presumption that the Government owns all of this money, and that if we ever can get the taxpayers a break so they do not have to pay for it all, the Government gets to make up the revenue some other way.

How does the Government make up revenue? It taxes people. That is the only way the Government makes revenue. So the assumption is, well, the Government deserves all of this money, and if we ever say we are not going to collect some of it because we want people to keep more of it, then we have to make up the money some other way, obviously by raising taxes.

I would rather start from the other premise, which is that the money belongs to the people and especially in times of economic downturn it is important that they be able to use, in the way that they deem most beneficial, the income they have earned, and that when we say we are going to relieve them of the alternative minimum tax liability, for example, we are doing that for a reason, and we do not need to start from the premise that it is the Government’s money and somehow we have to keep the Government whole and give the Government money by raising taxes even though they were never going to collect this AMT revenue in the first place.

This must sound like a strange debate to the American people. But that is what the rule the Democratic majority requires. That is what the budget would require. All we are saying is, since we are going to be passing a budget, let’s instruct the conferees on the budget here that is not what we are going to do here. We are going to do it as we have in the past, as we did last year. We are going to pass the AMT relief, we are going to pass the extenders, and, no, we are not going to raise taxes on someone in order to pay for them.

Now, what is the alternative that the distinguished chairman of the Committee comes up with? It is the identical motion I have, with one other provision. It is this addition:

And that we should insist that every effort should be made to:

That is a sure sign for: We are not really going to do anything about this, but we at least want to make it sound good—to offset the cost of these policies by closing the tax gap, shutting down abusive tax shelters, addressing offshore tax havens without raising taxes.

Well, I am glad we have the “without raising taxes” in there, because none of us wants to raise taxes. But this reminds me of the candidates, and we have all seen them out on the stump: Yes, we have a huge Federal budget deficit, but I want to spend more money. The way we are going to pay for it is we are going to end waste, fraud, and abuse in Government. That is a sure sign for a politician who has not figured out how to get the money in any other way. Everyone is going to end waste, fraud, and abuse. You know, I used that phrase in a sort of facetious way, but actually I think it is in here.

Shutting down abusive tax shelters. There are. Abuse. Waste, fraud, and abuse. Addressing offshore tax havens. The reality is, the Finance Committee on which we sit comes up with offsets to offset true tax policy whenever we can, and we have wrung out our Tax Code for every last dollar we can find that involves waste, fraud, and abuse. There are not any abusive tax shelters out there. If they are out there, we have not found them or we would sure encounter the money from them. The same thing about offshore tax havens. We have gotten about $60 or $70 billion from these, and there is no more to get. If there is, we would have gotten it by now.

Then there is the tax gap. The tax gap is this: Not everyone pays all of the income taxes the IRS thinks they owe, and the problem is we do not know exactly who has not paid. But the estimates are that if most businesses in an industry pay $100, and some only pay $50 or $80, then we have $70 million worth of the IRA. The assumption is that maybe those that only pay $80 probably ought to be paying more. We cannot figure it out, but we think the money would be there if we had a better way to account for it.

We have held hearings, and the experts basically say: There is not much more you can get. You probably would have to pay more to find it than it is worth to collect.

We did do one thing, though. We actually subcontracted out to some tax collectors. If they can go out and find some and they can bring it back, they get a little piece of the action. It would help us because they would collect some of the other revenue.

The only thing from the other side is, well, let’s eliminate that policy. We are not going to send these guys out to try find where these taxes are. So if they intended to collect the revenue or to end or minimize the tax gap, they would not be sponsoring the legislation to fire all of the people we hired to go out there and find the revenue.

The bottom line is, this is a nice sounding phrase, but it is like the person that goes out and says: I am going to reduce fraud, waste, and abuse. That is how I am going to pay for all of the new spending I am recommending.

I urge my colleagues to support the motion I have filed, the motion that Senator Grassley spoke to, and to reject the motion of the chairman of the Budget Committee which, at the end of the day, recognizes the reality. We are going to do the AMT patch. We are going to do the tax extenders. We are not going to pay for them. So let’s not pretend like we have to find revenue from someplace else in order to make this happen.

I reserve the remainder of my time and inquire how much remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. KYL. How much remains on the other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The other side has 16 minutes.

Mr. KYL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I am not speaking on Senator KYL’s motion. He has reserved his time. I am going to ask to set aside his motion and send another motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Gregg) moves that there be printed in part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 70 (the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009) be instructed to insist that the final conference report includes a level for 2009 budget authority not to exceed $1 trillion for non-emergency discretionary appropriations.

Mr. GREGG. As I understand the other side is collecting the motion to instruct that I offered, the motion to instruct which Senator KYL offered, the motion to instruct which Senator
CONRAD offered relative to the motion of Senator KYL, the motion to instruct which Senator DE MINT offered, the motion to instruct which Senator BOXXR offered in relationship to Senator DE MINT's motion, and this motion; is that correct? Is there anything else pending right now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is one correction; otherwise, you are correct. The Conrad motion is not pending.

Mr. GREGG. The Conrad motion relative to the KYL motion has not been sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. GREGG. Relative to the unanimous consent agreement, other than the motion I have just sent to the desk, which is a trillion-dollar spending cap, we would still have available to be sent to the desk the motion relative to nuclear energy reserve and the motion relative to offshore drilling, with the side by sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Chair. I believe all the motions that are pending, to the extent they still have time remaining on the motions pursuant to the unanimous consent request, that time is reserved; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GREGG. So right now I will address the trillion-dollar spending one and have that come off that time which is, I believe, 30 minutes equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. GREGG. What this instruction says is, we should not be spending $1 trillion on discretionary accounts around here. This budget for the first time, the Democratic budget, because of its increases last year on top of the increases in this budget, has hit the trillion-dollar mark. That should be a fairly big red flag, that we are now going to spend $1 trillion in discretionary spending. I have trouble comprehending what a trillion dollars is. I suspect almost everybody does. But if you take all the taxes paid since we began as a republic, I believe it totals something like $22 trillion. That would be over 200 years. So this one budget is going to spend a fairly significant amount of what has been raised in taxes since our country began. It is a big number, $1 trillion. It seems to me we ought to sort of maybe draw a line here, take a breath, and say: Let's stop. Let's think about what we are doing. Let's see if rather than spending this huge amount of money, we can't save a little money.

Last year the Democratic budget, and then the Democratic appropriations bills, increased spending by $22 billion. That was what they proposed. It is not a 1-year event when you raise spending around here by $22 billion. That compounds over 5 years. It is $22 billion plus $22 billion plus interest, plus $22 billion. It adds up. In fact, a 5-year number is probably closer to $220 billion, $250 billion, when you spend $22 billion in 1 year or increase spending by that much. So it is a lot of money. Last year they increased spending by $22 billion, or $22 billion in discretionary spending. This year it is not absolutely clear, because it hasn't actually been disclosed to us, but we know it is going to be well over $20 billion on non-defense discretionary spending again.

That is why this Democratic budget takes us over $1 trillion; $1.9 trillion, I believe, will be spent under this budget on discretionary spending. As I said, it is time for a timeout. That is what this motion to instruct says. It says: Let's go back and rethink this effort. Can't we somewhere in that trillion dollars find enough savings to get us back under $1 trillion? Shouldn't we certainly be saying we are not going to push the American taxpayer over the trillion-dollar mark, rather than taking a trillion-dollar number, rather, we will make a little extra effort to try to reduce spending in this account if we want to increase spending in that account, rather than constantly add on to the spending?

This Democratic budget has absolutely no programmatic savings in it. The President suggested some programmatic savings. I believe his programmatic savings added up to about $15 billion. None of those was accepted and put in this budget. None of those are assumed. In fact, all it does is add to spending and add to programs. It is hard to believe that in a trillion-dollar budget, we couldn't find a mere 1 percent or 2 percent of savings by reducing programs which have either outserved their usefulness or which, in the order of priorities, we simply can't afford, and we should make difficult decisions of maybe not increasing them as much as proposed or maybe even reducing them. In most instances, we are increasing the rate of increase. We are not actually talking about reducing.

This is a red-flag motion. It says: Let's pause. Let's think about this. Do we want to blow through the trillion-dollar mark on the discretionary side of the ledger without having made some effort to try to save some money around here, to reallocate money, to set priorities, and to do what is affordable? I don't think we do. That is why we are asking the conferees to take some action to bring this number back under $1 trillion. That means they have to save $9 billion, $10 billion. That is 1 percent. They ought to be able to do that. I know it is a lot of money, $10 billion, but on this trillion-dollar budget, it certainly ought to be a doable event. It does seem to me the American people deserve that type of effort. We could all earn our pay around here, a number of times over, if we were to save the American people $10 billion or $20 billion. That is almost enough to keep that same money so they can spend it and make their lives better rather than have the Government spend it for them.

That is what this motion does. It instructs the conferees to bring this budget back under the trillion-dollar level in the discretionary side.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending motion and send to the desk a motion on behalf of Senator GRAHAM dealing with nuclear power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], for Mr. GRAHAM, moves that the conferees on the part of the Senate on the concurrent resolution of the two Houses on the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 70 (the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009) be instructed to insist on the inclusion in the final conference report section 311 of S. Con. Res. 70, the deficit neutral reserve fund to improve energy efficiency and production, as passed by the Senate, and that such section include an additional requirement that the legislation also encourages the removal of existing barriers to building new zero-emission nuclear power plants in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I note that the Senator from Louisiana is on the Senate floor. I had planned to offer this motion on behalf of Senator GRAHAM in order to move the process along. He is in accordance with that as he is in a meeting he could not get out of, a briefing on security. I will reserve the remainder of the time on the motion so Senator VITTER can be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. VITTER. Thank you, Madam President.

I thank the distinguished ranking member for the courtesy.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Madam President, I have a motion I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER] moves that the conferees on the part of the Senate on the concurrent resolution of the two Houses on the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 70 (the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009) be instructed to insist that the conference report include a reserve fund that requires the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to adjust budget aggregates in the final adoption of the Energy Committee, if the Senate considers legislation that allows a Governor, with the
concurrency of the State legislature to petition for increased energy exploration on the Outer Continental Shelf and that allows for revenue sharing for such producing States on new areas of production and new leases made available, if the average price of regular gasoline in the United States reaches $5 per gallon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, if I could briefly explain this motion, it attempts to, again, get us to deal directly with the enormously important issues that the American people across America face; that is, the high and escalating cost of energy, including gasoline at the pump.

This will finally suggest to the American people that we get it, that we understand their plight, that we feel their pain, if you will, to use an often used phrase, and we are actually going to do something about it. We are going to act.

This motion to instruct the conference would show the Senate is serious about increasing energy supplies and doing that to decrease gasoline prices.

The motion is very simple. It would instruct the budget conference to include a reserve fund for future legislation that we would be expressing an intention to pass. That legislation would allow a Governor, with the concurrence of his or her State legislature, to petition for increased energy exploration on the Outer Continental Shelf off of that State.

It would also allow for revenue sharing coming from such exploration and production, to give producing States a fair share on new areas of production and new leases made available.

Specifically, I would suggest that we follow the precedent and the policy we set a few years ago. As we opened new areas of the Gulf, we said the producing States that have a fair share, will finally get revenue sharing—37.5 percent of the revenue from that new production.

Finally, this would only happen if the price of regular gasoline in the United States reaches $5 a gallon at the pump.

The American people are wondering right now if we understand what their daily lives are all about because as gasoline prices at the pump are high, and higher the next day, and much higher the next month, we seem to want to do absolutely nothing about it.

This Congress, under Democratic leadership, came into power in January of 2007. As that happened, the Democratic leadership of this new Congress was very clear that an absolute top priority was to deal with sky-high energy prices.

At the time fuel prices were about $2.33 a gallon at the pump. Well, if that was sky high then, I do not know what adjective to use for today because since that time, from January 2007 to today, we have gone from $2.33 a gallon at the pump to about $3.72 a gallon—a 61-percent increase. Unfortunately, there does not seem to be any real end in sight.

Now, the American people get this because they live it. They go to the gas pump weekly. They live it. They see that bill for filling up their tank go higher and higher. They have to wonder if we get it because we talk a lot on the Senate floor about a lot, but what have we done? In my opinion, very, little on this crucial challenge—even crisis-facing the American people.

When I look at this issue, I go back to economics 101: supply and demand. Prices are driven by both demand and supply. So you can try to stabilize or lower prices in two ways: You can try to decrease demand; you can try to increase supply.

I think our energy situation is so dire, so challenging, the escalating prices are so great, the pace of escalation is so staggering, that we need to take action on both sides of the equation. We need to do everything possible on both sides of the equation.

We need to try and or at least mitigate increasing demand from other countries worldwide, such as China and India. We cannot control what they do. Their demand is increasing enormously. But at least we can try to do things that mitigate that, renegotiate contracts in our own economy. I support those measures: greater efficiency, greater conservation, moving to alternative forms of fuel and energy. That is all absolutely crucial. We need to do that.

We have done a little of it; we need to do more.

But as we do that, we cannot ignore the supply side of the equation. We need to address both sides at the same time. We need to do everything reasonable we can on both sides of the equation at the same time.

That brings us to supply. For far too long, Congress has absolutely ignored the supply side of the equation, has absolutely refused to do anything to increase our country’s energy security by increased exploration and drilling on our Outer Continental Shelf or in Alaska or anywhere else.

I do not know how long we are going to wait. What does the price have to get to before we hear the American people and before we finally act more on the demand side, yes, and more on the supply side?

Again, my motion to instruct would address this challenge head on. It would say, if the price at the pump gets to $5 a gallon—we are not there yet. We are below $4, but if it gets to $5 a gallon, is that high enough to get us to act, to get us to do something, to get us to, yes, address demand but also address supply?

I think the American people think that is plenty high enough to get us to act. If we push past that point, then under my motion to instruct, we would support a reserve fund for legislation to allow exploration and production off our coasts on the Outer Continental Shelf.

But, again, I want to emphasize there would be two important rules we would have to follow with this increased exploration and production: No. 1, the host State coast we are talking about would have to want that activity to happen. That Governor and that State legislature would both have to say: Yes, we believe in the Outer Continental Shelf or Alaska, the coastal protection, the hurricane evacuation routes.

In the case of my State, Louisiana, it is perfectly clear what our priority for that money is. We have already passed not only legislation but State constitutional amendments regarding how we are going to use that money. It is to address the crisis that is happening on our coast, to battle coastal erosion, to enhance coastal restoration, to build hurricane protection and to build hurricane evacuation routes.

To me, that is a very commonsense consensus approach. The price of gasoline has been rising astronomically. As I said, from the start of this Democratic-led Congress, it has already risen 61 percent. The Democratic leadership of this Congress began in January 2007 saying this is a top priority. Yet little to nothing has happened, as that price has risen 61 percent.

Are we finally going to hear the pleas of the American people? Are we finally going to act on all sorts of fronts to try to stabilize and bring down these prices? This is a sensible solution on the supply side that can have a real impact.

Let me reiterate. We need to do everything conceivable, both on the demand side and the supply side, because our challenge is that great. I support demand side measures I supported increased efficiency standards. I supported the measure we passed a couple days ago temporarily ceasing filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. So we decrease demand in that very modest way. We need to do more in terms of fuel efficiency, conservation, and new forms of fuel and energy.

But as we address much more aggressively the demand side of the equation, we cannot ignore the supply side. We need to increase supply, particularly domestic supply, at the same time. We have enormous reserves in this country off our coasts, as well as in Alaska, as well as places on shore to do that.

What we have not done is the political will and the votes in Congress to allow our people and our industry to do it.

My motion would say $5 a gallon—if we get there, we sure as heck need to do all of those sensible things on the supply side, just as we should on the demand side.
I urge all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to support this sensible measure. The leadership of this new Congress has been talking about energy prices since the Congress came in in January 2007. The only thing that talk has done is be a cure for this pressing need to lower prices at the pump by about 3 cents a gallon.

Talk is not good enough. The American people deserve action. They deserve action on the demand side, much more than the conservative action than we have taken to date. They sure as heck also deserve action on the supply side to increase our domestic supply, which can have a major impact on price at the pump.

I urge my colleagues to support this sensible motion in that regard. I yield back my time.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I believe that two-thirds of the public does not believe that the price of oil has broken $125 a barrel makes no sense to be buying at this high level and then putting that oil in the ground when we are already 97 percent of the price of oil has broken $125 a barrel makes no sense to be buying at this high level and then putting that oil in the ground when we are already 97 percent of the price of oil has broken $125 a barrel makes no sense to be buying at this high level and then putting that oil in the ground when we are already 97 percent of the

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The Senator is correct.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I wish to claim about 10 minutes of that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, here we go again. Yet again my friends on the other side of the aisle are trying to sell the American people a bill of goods to try to convince them that drilling along our shores will do something about gas prices. Opening our shores to drilling was a bad idea in June of last year when we voted down an amendment to the energy bill—very similar—it was a bad idea when this body voted down an amendment to the budget resolution, and it was a bad idea when we voted this idea down by well over 14 votes 2 days ago on an amendment to the flood insurance bill.

Ending a bipartisan, 26-year moratorium on oil drilling is a bad idea. The future is being traded off for the present. Our energy information administration predicts: “Any impact on average wellhead prices is expected to be insignificant.” The fact is, 70 percent of the resources in the Outer Continental Shelf are already open for exploration. Since 2001, the Bush administration has issued over 100 new leases. Many of these leases are being drilled in the eastern gulf where the oil industry already has much of the infrastructure necessary to go into production. Yet only 12 of these new wells have been drilled. The industry is only developing a small fraction of the area already open for drilling. So why isn’t ExxonMobil pumping some of its profits into developing some of these areas? If companies are not interested in developing the large fields already in the Gulf of Mexico, why is it so critical to open environmentally sensitive areas to more drilling?

My home State of New Jersey and the New Jersey shore is a priceless treasure that my home State will protect at any cost. The shore generates tens of billions of dollars in revenues each year and supports almost half a million jobs. If we open the eastern coast to drilling, we jeopardize a tourism and fishing economy worth tens of billions of dollars in exchange for a couple of hundred thousand barrels of half year’s supply of oil—a half year’s supply of oil—jeopardizing, however, tens of billions of dollars. The people of New Jersey cannot afford the risk that that will take place to our wildlife, to our economy and, in fact, I believe, the people up and down the coast as well.

Florida beaches generate billions of dollars each year. In South Carolina, Myrtle Beach alone brought in more than $3 billion in revenue. Do we want to risk that for a couple of hundred thousand barrels of oil? Any other environmental assault?

The bottom line is this proposal will do nothing to lower gas prices, but it will jeopardize coastal economies all along both coasts.

Now to simply say: Well, it is up to an individual State, that doesn’t work. The ocean doesn’t have neat little boxes. The reality is that the ability to open the Outer Continental Shelf in one location threatens, if there is an accident, the beaches along the shoreline along that same region. This isn’t about making it one versus another; this is a continuity.

There are other things we can do about gas prices. Hopefully the President will soon sign into law the Democ- ratic proposal that passed Congress overwhelmingly to suspend filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve through December of 2008. When the people of this country are suffering from paying $4 a gallon for gas and when gas prices are pushing up the cost of food, and the price of oil has broken $125 a barrel, it makes no sense to be buying at this high level and then putting that oil in the ground when we are already 97 percent of the price of oil has broken $125 a barrel makes no sense to be buying at this high level and then putting that oil in the ground when we are already 97 percent of

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time that may be left in opposition, and I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The journal clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
The President has $3.84 trillion of spending over the period. What are the differences? Let me indicate as a percentage, that is a 1-per-cent difference. Forty-three percent of the difference. That is because there is almost no difference between the spending in the President’s budget and the spending in the Senate budget resolution. In fact, here are the differences: The Senate budget resolution has $3.08 trillion of spending over the period. The President has $3.84 trillion of spending over the period.

What are the differences? Let me indicate as a percentage, that is a 1-per-cent difference. Forty-three percent of the difference. Forty-three percent of the difference is we rejected his cuts to law enforcement. We rejected his cuts to veteran’s benefits. We rejected his cuts to transportation. My goodness. We just had a bridge collapse in Minnesota, 35W. Can you imagine the horror? You are driving home and the bridge collapses. We want to be cutting transportation funding when we are not maintaining the roads and bridges we have now, much less dealing with the gridlock that exists around the country as well. So we have rejected those cuts by the President.

We specifically rejected his proposal to cut the COPS program, not by 10 percent and not by 20 percent. The President proposed cutting the COPS program 100 percent. What is the COPS program? That program which has 100,000 police officers on the street in this country. In my State, it has put over 200 officers on the street. I just held a hearing with every part of law enforcement. They said it was absolutely beyond their understanding why the President would propose cutting the COPS program 100 percent, but he did.

He proposed cutting weatherization assistance 100 percent. Why would you cut weatherization assistance when that is designed to reduce fuel bills when oil is $120 a barrel? He says cut weatherization assistance 100 percent. He says cut first responder grants 78 percent. I just held a hearing that involved all of the first responders in my State: The fire chiefs, the police chiefs, and all of the others, including the EMS personnel, emergency medical services. I asked them: Do they think it is wise to be cutting first responder grants 78 percent? They unanimously said absolutely not. What are we going to do in terms of interoperability of communications if we are not upgrading those systems? One of the things we learned on that fateful day, September 11, was that the failure to have interoperable communications created a fiasco at the Pentagon when the emergency responders were going there to try to help and they couldn’t communicate with each other. That is what these grants are for, to provide interoperable communications, to provide the training to respond to disasters, both natural and manmade. The President says cut it 78 percent. The President said cut community development funds 24 percent. He said cut clean water grants 21 percent. He said cut low-income home energy assistance—the very popular LIHEAP program—which is already underfunded, another 15 percent. We said, no, that doesn’t make any sense; yet we produced a budget that balances. It balances in the fourth year—not by much, but it does balance, according to CBO. We stay in balance in the fifth year, unlike the President’s budget. The President balanced in the fourth year but went right back out of balance in the fifth.

He has an addiction to debt unlike anything I have ever seen. This President has almost doubled the national debt in just 7 years. He has more than doubled foreign holdings of our debt in that period. We owe the Chinese hundreds of billions, we owe the Japanese hundreds of billions, and we even owe Mexico. This President’s legacy is one of debt.

In this budget, we bring down the deficit as a share of GDP each and every year, according to the scoring of the budget resolution, from 69.6 percent down to 66 percent. That is not as much progress as I would like to make. Senator Gregg and I have a separate proposal to deal with those long-term entitlement problems and those challenges, to deal with that in a bipartisan special task force that would have the power to come back with a recommendation that would get a vote in both the Congress of the United States if a supermajority of the members of the task force, who are completely bipartisan, would agree on the plan.

Mr. President, I am proud of this budget resolution. I think this trillion-dollar cap on discretionary spending is a pure political gambit.

Let me add one other thing. If this cap were imposed, part of what is included in that spending is spending on our national defense. So that would cut defense under the gun and put it at risk of additional cuts. I am a little surprised that the Republicans are proposing that. I don’t think this is the time to be making cuts in national defense that were put and be subject to cuts under their proposal. I hope we reject that approach. With that, I think we are very close to being ready to go to votes.

I would like to be being ready to go to votes.

I wonder if the Parliamentarian could advise us on the time remaining.
on the Conrad-Kyl AMT amendment and the Gregg $1 trillion cap. How much time is left on those two?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the Kyl AMT amendment, Senator Kyl has 7 minutes and Senator Conrad has 16 minutes. On the Conrad AMT amendment, there is 16 minutes remaining, equally divided.

Mr. CONRAD. No, there is not. That is not correct. That was part of a unanimous consent agreement. There was 16 minutes on OCS, and Conrad combined, and all time consumed was credited against that 60 minutes. So there is virtually no time. I think we will just yield back all time on that motion.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I think we will yield back all time on the Kyl-Conrad motion.

Mr. CONRAD. Senator NELSON may want to speak on OCS. How much time is left on that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator Vitter has 3 minutes. The majority has 7 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. I am happy to yield 7 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. GREGG. I would like to retain 2 minutes to respond to my spending a trillion dollars.

Mr. CONRAD. I will retain 2 minutes on that too. So we each will retain 2 minutes on that amendment and yield back all other time, except for the 7 minutes on OCS.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 4 minutes be equally divided between Senator Conrad and myself when we get to the Kyl-Conrad AMT amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, here we go again. The oil companies are trying to have it exactly the way it was in the past. That in the past, they have developed an amendment that is very seductive by saying that you can have offshore drilling with the concurrence of the State if gasoline reaches $5 a gallon. What they have not told you is that if the price of gas goes up to $5 a gallon, of which the oil companies are making money hand over fist, they are going to utilize that to perpetuate the myth that they need to drill off the coast of a State like Florida, when, in fact, what they have not told you is that the companies already have under lease, which has not been drilled, 33 million acres offshore. The oil companies have also another 31 million acres onshore that have not been drilled. And the myth that they perpetuate, now using the fright of $5-a-gallon gas, is that we have to have more supply and therefore we have to go offshore. This is the seductive red herring of this amendment which was offered by a Senator whose State, Louisiana, has a big oil industry that drills off of Louisiana, in fact, the largest deposits of oil. But when you get to a State such as Florida, there have been several dry holes, and the geology shows very little oil, plus we have the adverse interests.

Now, why do we have to keep going through this drill over and over? It is because the oil companies are insatiable. Do we not remember what we did just a year and a half ago, where the oil interests wanted to drill toward Tampa, FL, 2 million acres? We worked out a compromise—which wasn’t 2 million acres, it was 8.3 million acres—but we kept them away from the military training and testing area, where you cannot put oil rigs on the surface of the water, where we have our largest training and testing area in the world for our U.S. military. That is because we are training the pilots for the F-22, where we train all of the pilots for the new Joint Strike Fighter being developed. That is where we are testing some of the most sophisticated weapons. That is because we have the area protected. And if you are shooting that live ordnance and you are testing in your research and development of weapons systems, you cannot have oil rigs down there on the surface of the Gulf of Mexico. We etched that into law.

But here we go again. Having gone through this and having the oil industry have 33 million acres that is already available for lease but has not been drilled, they want to make an exemption. And once you make an exception of this $4 gas—maybe going to $5 gas—in order to do that. That is wrong, and we ought to put a stop to it.

Here is the greatest wrong it perpetuates. When you look at it, it keeps us in the same old mindset where we stay married to oil. The emphasis is drill, drill, drill to solve the problem, as evidenced by $5 gas, when, in fact, that is not going to solve our problem. What is going to solve our problem is what is keeping us in the same old mindset where we stay married to oil. The emphasis is drill, drill, drill to solve the problem, as evidenced by $5 gas, when, in fact, that is not going to solve our problem. What is going to solve our problem is going to be renewables. What is going to solve our problem is going to be to have a new President of the United States who will make the United States independent of foreign oil, of which we now import 60 percent for our daily consumption from places such as Nigeria, Venezuela, and the Persian Gulf.

So what we have to do is change the mindset of the old way of doing things, which this amendment by the Senator from Louisiana is suggestive of; that is, to go to the alternative fuels, to go to a serious research and development program and a new mindset on the line, to encourage the increase of miles per gallon. In Japan, they are driving cars that get 50 miles per gallon. In Europe, they are driving cars, on a fleet average, that are getting in the area of 40 miles per gallon. We can’t do that in the United States—if we had the political will—change our way of doing things as oil guzzlers through our consumption in our personal vehicles? Can we if we have the political will?

Mr. VITTER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I appreciate the Senator from Louisiana asking me to yield. But I have a lot on my mind, and the Senator has already had his 15 minutes, so this Senator is going to complete his thoughts.

So here we go again. The emphasis is drill, drill, drill. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Well, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized. The Senator has 3 minutes.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, if I can briefly respond on my own time—and I invite a conversation or colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Florida—I hope the distinguished Senator realizes that in this proposal, in order for any offshore drilling to take place, both the Governor and the State legislature of the host State have to say, yes, we want it. That is an absolute requirement under this proposal. The distinguished Senator from Florida knows Florida politics far better than I, but based on everything I know, that is not going to happen in Florida, including under Republican Governors and Republican legislatures, anytime soon. So I don’t understand why he considers this a threat to the State of Florida, because they are in absolute control of their own destiny under the details of this motion. If the Senator is asking for a response to that simple fact, I would love to hear it and engage in a discussion.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am very grateful to him for giving me this opportunity. When it comes to the defense interests of the United States, I think it would be folly to allow a State legislature to impose their will with regard to the defense interests. This Senator has already given the example of the largest testing and training area in the world for the U.S. military, which is the Gulf of Mexico off of Florida, which we have prohibited in law from being drilled.

Let’s take, for example, the Atlantic coast of Florida. Thirty years ago, this Senator had to oppose the Secretary of the Interior James Watt from drilling off the east coast. The only way this Senator was able to beat him then was because it finally dawned on the administration that we were launching from the Cape Canaveral Air Force station from west to east and launching from the Kennedy Space Center from west to east, therefore dropping the solid rocket boosters into the Atlantic Ocean along with the first stages of the expendable booster rocket out of the Air Force station, and that, in fact, we cannot have oil rigs down there.

So a State legislature might well not understand and be able to impose its security interests on the U.S. Government.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, if I can reclaim my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. VITTER. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute since I seemed to cede all my time.
Mr. CONRAD. I will allow the Senator an additional minute if the Senator in opposition will be given an additional minute as well.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I say to my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, perhaps since he is from the gulf coast, he does not understand that all the way up the Atlantic seaboard, there are areas with restricted airspace where live fire training is done. A State legislature would not necessarily be attuned to the security interests of the U.S. Government.

If a State legislature were at the beck and call of a particular lobby—in this case the oil industry—wishing to drill, it would be at cross-purposes with the security interests in many of those regions off Florida, off Georgia, off the Carolinas, off Virginia, and further up the seaboard and, therefore, would have a veto over the U.S. Government.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I say to my friend, the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair, and I thank my colleague very much. I thank Senator Gregg. We have had an interesting day. Senator Gregg, we can see by his head with that nasty bruise, is bloodied but unbowed.

Mr. GREGG. That came from the farm bill.

Mr. CONRAD. He said he got hit by a farmer with a lamb chop or asparagus, I don’t know which.

Mr. GREGG. It must have been asparagus.

Mr. CONRAD. I think we are ready to proceed to vote.

Mr. GREGG. We are. I suggest we have 2 minutes equally divided before each vote to explain what we are voting for in our colleagues.

Mr. CONRAD. I think that is fair.

Mr. GREGG. And after the first vote, the votes be 10 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. I think we would be well advised as well. We advise colleagues after the first vote there will be 10 minutes. We shall have eight votes. Typically, that will take us 3 hours. If Members will come and stay here, we can conceivably get done in 2½ hours. It is up to the Members whether we are able to do that.

With that, I go to my colleague for an explanation of the first motion.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, it being my motion, I am sure the chairman would like to go first.

Mr. CONRAD. I will be happy to go first. The Senator is talking about this being the biggest tax increase in history. That is the same speech he gave last year. We can now check the record and see what actually happened and, lo and behold, there was not the biggest tax increase ever. In fact, there was no tax increase. In fact, there were tax cuts. The Democrats in both Houses of Congress cut taxes by $194 billion.

In this legislation before us, we have no tax increases. We have additional tax reductions. In this resolution are the middle-class tax cuts, the marriage penalty relief, the child tax credit, the 10-percent bracket, further alternative minimum tax relief, estate tax reform, energy and education, property tax relief, and extenders.

The difference in revenue, which is only 2.6 percent between our bill and the President’s, can completely be met...
The motion was rejected. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is about to explain what is going to happen in the next few minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, two of our colleagues and a third, counting me, have very graciously agreed to take voice votes to shorten this process. Now we will turn to Senator Kyl, for an explanation of his motion.

Mr. KYL. Both the chairman of the committee and I have resolutions that are almost identical. They both call for us to extend the so-called patch for the alternative minimum tax which otherwise would affect millions of taxpayers this year; to extend the so-called tax extenders package that has tax provisions like the R&D tax credit in it for another year, and to do so without raising taxes.

The addition on the Conrad motion is to use our best efforts to shut down abusive tax shelters, address offshore tax havens, and to close the tax gap. Since I assume we are all for ending any waste, fraud, and abuse, I cannot disagree. I would be pleased to take votes on both of these motions by voice vote.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank Senator Kyl for his willingness to do this on a voice vote. He has described the amendments well. I see no purpose in further discussion.

I ask for a voice vote on the Conrad and Kyl motions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL, on the AMT.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. CONRAD, on the AMT.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has a motion on net energy. The addition on the Conrad motion is to use our best efforts to shut down abusive tax shelters, address offshore tax havens, and to close the tax gap.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL, on the AMT.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has a motion on net energy. The Senator from North Dakota continues to rise in the judgment of his colleagues.

Can we then go to a voice vote on the Graham motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, on nuclear energy.
The motion does not affect any of the attempts to reduce CO2 emissions except when we know it is hurting the economy and hurting jobs. In that case, we cannot move ahead with penalties and mandates unless China and India—the two largest polluting countries—have similar emissions standards. So it is just a ‘hold on,’ let’s not hurt our economy and ourselves. There are many ways we can reduce CO2 emissions without hurting jobs in this country.

I encourage my colleagues to support this motion.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina, Mr. DEMINT.

Mr. DEMINT. Could I get another minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there another objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. Mr. DEMINT. I thank the Chair.

My motion does not affect any of the attempts to reduce CO2 emissions except when we know it is hurting the economy and hurting jobs. In that case, we cannot move ahead with penalties and mandates unless China and India—the two largest polluting countries—have similar emissions standards. So it is just a ‘hold on,’ let’s not hurt our economy and ourselves. There are many ways we can reduce CO2 emissions without hurting jobs in this country.

I encourage my colleagues to support this motion.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, how much additional time did Senator DEMINT get?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator had an additional 1/2 minute.

Mrs. BOXER. Then, Mr. President, I would ask for the same amount of time, equally divided, between myself and Senator DEMINT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the request of the Senator?

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I have the same amount of time, equally divided between myself and Senator DEMINT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to 1 minute being equally divided between Senator BOXER and Senator WARNER?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. If the Presiding Officer will tell me when I have used half the time so I can stop.

Colleagues, this is a very important vote. We already voted to level the playing field for America in that last vote so that countries cannot take advantage of us. But I have to say, this motion would hold this Nation hostage to China and India. Since when do we just sit here and wait four countries such as China to act on human rights issues, on economic issues, on environmental issues? That is not America.

I believe this is a motion that looks to fear, not hope. This is the greatest country on Earth, and I do not think we should tell ourselves we can do nothing about a pressing issue until a foreign country acts.

Most of the things we can do to improve our environment and to stop CO2 emissions can actually improve our economy. We know, as we try to build dozens, if not hundreds, of nuclear plants, it will create new jobs all over the country and improve our economy, just as solar panels and wind, as well as hybrid cars and hydrogen fuel—all of these things are good for the economy and energy. My motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

Mr. DEMINT. Could I get another minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there another objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. Mr. DEMINT. I thank the Chair.

My motion does not affect any of the attempts to reduce CO2 emissions except when we know it is hurting the economy and hurting jobs. In that case, we cannot move ahead with penalties and mandates unless China and India—the two largest polluting countries—have similar emissions standards. So it is just a ‘hold on,’ let’s not hurt our economy and ourselves. There are many ways we can reduce CO2 emissions without hurting jobs in this country.

I encourage my colleagues to support this motion.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina, Mr. DEMINT.

Mr. DEMINT. Could I get another minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there another objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. Mr. DEMINT. I thank the Chair.

My motion does not affect any of the attempts to reduce CO2 emissions except when we know it is hurting the economy and hurting jobs. In that case, we cannot move ahead with penalties and mandates unless China and India—the two largest polluting countries—have similar emissions standards. So it is just a ‘hold on,’ let’s not hurt our economy and ourselves. There are many ways we can reduce CO2 emissions without hurting jobs in this country.

I encourage my colleagues to support this motion.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, how much additional time did Senator DEMINT get?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator had an additional 1/2 minute.

Mrs. BOXER. Then, Mr. President, I would ask for the same amount of time, equally divided, between myself and Senator DEMINT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the request of the Senator?

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I have the same amount of time, equally divided between myself and Senator DEMINT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to 1 minute being equally divided between Senator BOXER and Senator WARNER?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. If the Presiding Officer will tell me when I have used half the time so I can stop.

Colleagues, this is a very important vote. We already voted to level the playing field for America in that last vote so that countries cannot take advantage of us. But I have to say, this motion would hold this Nation hostage to China and India. Since when do we just sit here and wait four countries such as China to act on human rights issues, on economic issues, on environmental issues? That is not America.

I believe this is a motion that looks to fear, not hope. This is the greatest country on Earth, and I do not think we should tell ourselves we can do nothing about a pressing issue until a foreign country acts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I have been working with Senator BOXER and Senator LIEBERMAN for almost 10 months on a bill with regard to global climate change. This week—or perhaps tomorrow or the first of next week—we will offer a managers’ amendment which will address the important issues my colleague raises.

I simply ask this Chamber to consider that when our bill comes up there will be ample opportunity to address your issues and that we have a provision in the managers’ amendment giving the President of the United States the chance to proceed to correct the very things the Senate seeks to be corrected with his motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. DEMINT.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER); the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. DEMINT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has heard the roll. The quorum is present.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are ordered to be recorded in the Journal of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 132 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Akaka Feingold Nelson (FL)
Baucus Feinstein Nelson (NE)
Bayh Harkin Reid
Biden Inhofe Rockefeller
Bingaman Kennedy Rockefeller
Boxer Kerry Salazar
Brown Kyl Sanders
Byrd Kohl Schumer
Cantwell Landrieu Smith
Cardin Landrieu Snowe
Carper Leahy Specter
Casey Levin Stabenow
Coleman Lieberman Stabenow
Collins Lincoln Tester
Conrad Martinez Webb
Dodd McCaskill Whitehouse
DeMint Mikulski Wyden
Durbin Murray

NAYS—40

Allard Domenci McConnell
Barrasso Enzi Murkowski
Bennett Enzi Pryor
Bond Graham Roberts
Brownback Grassley Sessions
Bunning Greer Shelby
Burh Hagel Stevens
Chambliss Hatch Sununu
Colburn Hutchinson Thune
Cochran Inhofe Thune
Coryn Isakson Voinovich
Craig Johnson Voinovich
Crapo Kyl Wicker
DeMint Lugar

NOT VOTING—5

Alexander Carper Obama
Clinton Collins

The motion was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on the motion to instruct offered by the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. DEMINT.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, during the last vote, some of my Republican and Democratic colleagues asked me if it didn’t make sense to vote for these motions. Both understand we need to be careful in mandates that hurt our economy and jobs, unless we recognize what other countries are doing and they are polluting.

My motion focuses on here at home. I want to make sure folks understand what it is about.

Most of the things we can do to improve our environment and to stop CO2 emissions can actually improve our economy. We know, as we try to build dozens, if not hundreds, of nuclear plants, it will create new jobs all over the country and improve our economy, just as solar panels and wind, as well as hybrid cars and hydrogen fuel—all of these things are good for the economy and energy. My motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

Mr. DEMINT. Could I get another minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there another objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. If the Presiding Officer will tell me when I have used half the time so I can stop.

Colleagues, this is a very important vote. We already voted to level the playing field for America in that last vote so that countries cannot take advantage of us. But I have to say, this motion would hold this Nation hostage to China and India. Since when do we just sit here and wait four countries such as China to act on human rights issues, on economic issues, on environmental issues? That is not America.

I believe this is a motion that looks to fear, not hope. This is the greatest country on Earth, and I do not think we should tell ourselves we can do nothing about a pressing issue until a foreign country acts.
The motion was rejected.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes equally divided prior to the vote on the motion to instruct the Senator from Louisiana.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, this motion is very straightforward. It creates a reserve fund in support of the following bill, a bill that would say: If the price at the pump, the price of gasoline reaches $5 a gallon—if it reaches $5 a gallon—then we are going to allow exploration and production off our coasts in the Outer Continental Shelf, but only if two conditions are met. No. 1, the host State wants it; the Governor and the State legislature of the host State say yes, we want that activity; and No. 2, the host State gets a fair revenue share of 37.5 percent which is the policy and the precedent we set about 2 years ago.

It would also ensure that nothing in this bill would disrupt military training, military activity off the coast, and that also the host State could decide to do natural gas only.

We can’t drill our way out of this energy problem, but increased domestic supply is part of the solution. We need a new energy future, but we also need to get that future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, what the Senator didn’t say is that this puts a State’s veto power over the U.S. Government as to its security arrangements in restricted areas off the coast which you never want to put at stake.

What the Senator also didn’t tell you is there are already 31 million acres offshore that are ready for lease that have not been drilled.

I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, the Senate has on three different occasions over the last year defeated similar efforts to end the 26-year bipartisan moratorium on the Outer Continental Shelf. This is another attempt to get at it. Even the Energy Information Administration projects that if we opened the entire east and west coasts, we wouldn’t achieve anything because it would take up to 2017 to ramp up and 2030 to actually achieve results.

So this isn’t about gas prices; this is about tapping into another vein of oil, continuing our addiction, and putting our shores at risk.

I urge my colleagues, particularly from coastal States, to oppose it.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be a cosponsor of the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Vitter.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted “yea.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 134 Leg.]

YEA—44

Alafrord, Domenici — Murkowski
Barasso, Ensign — Nelson (NE)
Bennett, Enzi — Roberts (WV)
Bond — Graham
Brownback — Grassley
Bunning — Gregg
Burr — Hagel
Chambliss — Hatch
Coburn — Johnson
Cochran — Inhofe
Culmell — Isakson
Corzine — Kyl
Craig — Landrieu
Crappo — Logan
Doiint — McConnell

NAY—51

Akaka — Durbin — Menendez
Baucus — Feingold — Mikulski
Bayh — Feinstein — Murray
Biden — Harkin — Nelson (FL)
Bingaman — Inouye — Pryor
Brown — Johnson — Reed
Byrd — Kerry — Rockefeller
Cardin — Kohl — Sanders
Carper — Lautenberg — Schmier
Collins — Levin — Smith
Conrad — Lieberman — Snowe
Dodd — Lieberman — Stabenow
Dole — Martinez — Tester
Dorgan — McCaskill — Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Alexander — Corker — McCain
Clinton — McCaskill — Obama

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for all Senators, there have been meetings this afternoon with Senators KENNEDY, ENZI, GREGG, and MCCONNELL, of course. We believe it would be in the best interests of the Senate to vitiate the cloture vote in the morning. Senator KENNEDY and ENZI have agreed to continue working on the firefighters bill. Yesterday, it was interrupted by the farm bill, and the Graham amendment was an interruption.

As I have said a number of occasions, there is no more of a gentleman in the Senate than MIKE ENZI. He felt aggrieved—that is my word, not his—and he needs more time on this. Again, I have talked to him and Senator KENNEDY. They believe they can get from here to there and work out something so that we can wind up completing the bill.

I have asked the managers to work together to see if they can reach agreement on the process that will permit the Senate to complete action on the bill in a timely way.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote be withdrawn with respect to H.R. 980.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID, Mr. President, let me further say that when these two good Senators come back to the process, I will confer with the Republican leader, and then I will make a decision when to return to this. I favor this a lot. I think it is a great piece of legislation. I hope we can complete it.

We should continue the bipartisan approach we have had up to this time on that legislation. I appreciate the understanding of the Senate in allowing us to approach this in a different way. This is not unique. We have done it on other occasions. For a lot of reasons, cloture would not be invoked tomorrow. I think people favor this legislation and they would vote for cloture if there is more of an opportunity to work on amendments. I appreciate the cooperation of everybody.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if I may add, I think the majority leader has made a wise decision, after consultations with both sides. Cloture would not have been invoked tomorrow. Senators KENNEDY and ENZI can work out an orderly process. I think it is an approach that I applaud and recommend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to personally thank the two leaders and Senator ENZI. This is important legislation involving national security. I am grateful for the opportunity to work with my friend and colleague, Senator ENZI, to try to make recommendations here in the Senate. I
know there are diverse views on this issue. We will try to work out an orderly procedure so that Members will be able to get their views out and considered in the Senate and do it in a timely way.

Again, I thank the two leaders and the Senator from Wyoming as well for his cooperation, as always.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.J. RES. 28

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, upon disposition of the House message on S. Con. Res. 70, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 731, S.J. Res. 28, a joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the FCC with respect to broadcast media ownership, the statutory time be reduced to 2 minutes equally divided and controlled between Senators DORGAN and STEVENS or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of the time, the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Finally, as I understand, we have one more rollecall vote we are going to have now. There will be no votes tomorrow. This will be the last vote until Tuesday morning, unless someone has an objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to vote on a motion offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG, on discretionary spending.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, under the budget resolution, spending goes down each and every year as a share of domestic product, 20.8 percent down to 19.1 percent.

The Senate opposite seeks to make those reductions more steep and embrace the President’s proposal which would eliminate the COPS Program—not just cut it but eliminate it, a program that puts 100,000 police on the street—cut the Weatherization Assistance Program 100 percent at a time of $120 oil; cut the first responder grants—police, fire, emergency medical 78 percent; cut community development 24 percent; cut clean water 21 percent; cut LIHEAP 15 percent.

More than that, because of the way this amendment has been written, this would put defense in the pool to be cut.

Mr. DURBIN. This is a resolution of disapproval of an FCC rule dealing with media ownership. The Commerce Committee has passed this out to the floor of the Senate. I will not go into great length on the merits of the issue except to say we have visited this issue previously. I think there is too much concentration in the media. The FCC rule moves in exactly the wrong direction, adding more concentration.

I ask that Members of the Senate who wish to would be able to make statements that appear prior to this vote. I believe we have agreed to a voice vote.

I yield the floor. I reserve my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. CONRAD, Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote. I ask unanimous consent I be recognized.

Mr. GREGG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair appoints, Mr. CONRAD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GREGG, and Mr. DOMENICI conferees on the part of the Senate.

DISAPPROVAL OF FCC OWNERSHIP RULE SUBMITTAL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S.J. Res. 28, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A resolution (S.J. Res. 28) disapproving the rules submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to broadcast media ownership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes equally divided. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. This is a resolution of disapproval of an FCC rule dealing with media ownership. The Commerce Committee has passed this out to the floor of the Senate. I will not go into great detail on the merits of the issue except to say we have visited this issue previously. I think there is too much concentration in the media. The FCC rule moves in exactly the wrong direction, adding more concentration.

I ask that Members of the Senate who wish to would be able to make statements that appear prior to this vote. I believe we have agreed to a voice vote.

I yield the floor. I reserve my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. CONRAD, Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

The motion was rejected. Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.
Yet I believe that if the Senate adopts this resolution, the existing waivers contemplated under the FCC cross-ownership rule should be protected. This means that those waivers would not be a part of this resolution. I have significant concerns that if these cross-ownership rules are not protected, this legislation could harm some media markets and constituents’ access to news and information in my State of Virginia.

I would like to confirm that this resolution, while it would nullify the revised version of the FCC’s newspaper cross-ownership ban, would not undo or in any manner change the FCC’s decision to grant permanent waivers to five existing newspaper-broadcast combinations, and thus grandfather them, as set forth in paragraphs 77 and 158 of the FCC’s December 18, 2007 Report and Order. It is my understanding that this resolution will not affect these five specific waivers, and I would like to clarify this finding.

Senator DORGAN, is it your goal and understanding that the waivers that the FCC granted in conjunction with the cross-ownership rule be protected?

Mr. DORGAN. Under the Congressional direction of the resolution, the disapproval is intended to overturn a specific rule, not other parts of an agency’s order. The waivers are not rules.

The resolution is written in a specific way referring to an order, but it is the rule that is nullified. These waivers could have been granted alone or under the previous cross-ownership ban. It is not the intention of this resolution to affect the waivers in the order.

Ms. SNOWE, Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the resolution of disapproval that repeals the recent Federal Communications Commission’s media ownership rulemaking.

As an original cosponsor of this measure, Senator Menendez and I once again taking the lead in introducing critical legislation to overturn a misguided attempt by the commission to relax crucial media ownership rules—a move that will only lead to further consolidation within the industry that will ultimately harm consumers.

As my colleagues are well aware, consolidation in the media market has led to fewer locally owned stations, and less local programming and content. Indeed, it speaks volumes that the number of independent radio owners has plunged in the past 11 years by 39 percent.

Just in 1996 and 1997 alone, more than 4,400 radio stations were sold following the first round of consolidation following passage of The Telecommunications Act of 1996. Between 1995 and 2003, ownership of the top 10 largest television stations increased from 101 owned to 299 owned.

At the same time, we know that locally owned stations aired more local news and programming than non-locally owned stations—and that is not just me talking. That is according to the FCC’s own studies, which also found that smaller station groups overall tended to produce higher quality newscasts compared to stations owned by larger companies.

So the resolution is a mistake—fewer independent, local stations mean less local content and programming.

Minority and women-ownership of media outlets are also at perilously low levels—currently only 6 percent of full-power radio stations are owned by women and 7.7 percent are owned by minorities. Ownership of broadcast television is even lower—5 percent for women and only 3.3 percent for minorities. Instead of being a catalyst promoting localism and ownership diversity, the FCC’s action will actually hasten the decline in these crucial areas.

The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation last fall held a hearing to consider these very issues, and the actions required for improvement. During that hearing, I and several of my colleagues voiced strong concern about Chairman Martin’s intent to ease current media ownership rules, particularly because of the public’s concern with cross-ownership.

That is why I, along with many committee members, joined Senators DORGAN and LOTT in introducing The Media Ownership Act of 2007, which was reported favorably by the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee in December. This constitutes yet another step in the mounting opposition to the loosening of these crucial rules.

We had hoped that Chairman Martin would heed not only our urgings, but the concerns expressed by the American public, and complete the 4-year-old rulemaking on localism.

However, on November 13, less than a week after that hearing, the Chairman issued a new proposal to lift the 32-week gap between cross-ownership ban in the top 20 media markets. Worse still, the FCC allowed only 28 days for the public to comment on the proposal when it has historically provided 60 to 90 days on pivotal matters such as this.

Clearly, the FCC’s actions demonstrate a litany of highly-misguided priorities that neglect to consider the full impact of the FCC’s rule change on the American people. Therefore, this resolution of disapproval is necessary to rescind this hap hazard approach.

I must say it feels a little like déjà vu all over again, when nearly 5 years ago the FCC attempted a similar effort to relax another set of media ownership rules. And fittingly, the opposition to the commission’s attempt then mirrors the opposition that is coalescing now. And the action we are considering now is reminiscent of the joint resolution passed by the U.S. Senate in September 2003, which I cosponsored, condemning the Commission’s efforts to rewrite those rules.

So that naturally begs the question—why would the commission continue to attempt to weaken media ownership rules when the American public has vociferously opposed these efforts time and again? When the U.S. Congress in 2004 enacted a statute prohibiting the FCC from raising national ownership limits above 30 percent? When the Third Circuit Court of Appeals rejected as arbitrary and capricious this attempt at revising the rules after finding the FCC had no factual basis for the limits it set? We deserve an answer.

Many proponents for relaxing media ownership rules have cited the precipitous decline of the newspaper industry as the reason change is mandatory. They have even cited a recent report by the Newspaper Association of America, NAA, which found print ad revenue for the industry fell by 9.4 percent last year—the biggest decline since it started keeping records in 1950.

However, what these proponents are neglecting to mention is that the NAA also found that online advertising revenue increased 19 percent last year.

Furthermore, the NAA president and CEO John Sturm stated “newspaper publishers are continuing to drive strong revenue growth from their Internet activities.” This hardly sounds like an industry in irreversible peril if this longstanding rule remains in place.

Opponents of this resolution will also argue that the FCC crafted a very narrow revision, lifting the cross-ownership ban for only the top 20 media markets, so this resolution is unnecessary. However, the FCC also adopted “four factors” and two broad “special circumstances” that would allow this ban to be lifted for a station in any media market.

These scenarios and factors include evaluating financial condition, possible increased local news, as well as existing market media concentration, and newspaper ownership. Given the vagueness and loopholes that exist with the rulemaking, the “high hurdle” that the Commission has supposedly set for proposed combinations could be easily cleared by using only a step ladder.

Preventing further media consolidation has been a bipartisan effort, and the resolution before us today is no different. We must not allow the indispensable role the media plays in promoting diversity and localism to be further marginalized and miniaturized by unchecked consolidation within the industry.

We owe it to the American people to restore confidence in the FCC’s commitment not only to uphold the public interest but to analyze it and stand behind it. That is why it is undeniably incumbent upon the commission members to revisit these rules and establish a set of standards that will effectively promote localism and minority and women-ownership, not more media consolidation. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today we are considering a critical
piece of legislation. The resolution of disapproval is critical to the diversity of our media and I would like to thank Senator DORGAN for his leadership on the issue. In December, the FCC pushed through new media ownership rules on a partisan three to two vote. The proposal to relax newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rules that have protected diversity for 32 years in the top 20 markets.

This proposal has been described by the chairman as a modest rules change. That is far from the truth; it’s directed to the top 20 markets, and since it only applies to television stations not in the top 4 in ratings in those markets, its some sort of compromise. The reality is that is simply not true.

To begin with, 44 percent of Americans live in the top 20 markets. This includes my State of New Jersey, which is split by two of the largest markets in the country. And there are a number of loopholes in the rule. Companies can consolidate outside the top 20 markets or to purchase one of the 4 largest stations need only be granted a waiver from the FCC.

The standards for granting these waivers are vague at best. Here is an example: the standards state either company must show in order for a waiver to be granted is whether the broadcast station has enough editorial independence. How does anybody quantify that?

The fact is there is no way to objectively judge the parameters Chairman Martin’s rule requires to grant the waivers. This means that depending on who is running the FCC, a waiver can be granted in any market or for any station. As Commissioner Adelstein put it so appropriately, this proposal is nothing more than a wolf in sheep’s clothing.

While the FCC devotes its resources to opening up more loopholes for consolidation, the commission has done virtually nothing to address the issue of minority ownership. The reality of diversity in our Nation’s broadcast ownership is a far cry from the reality in which we live.

Despite making up 35 percent of the population and owning roughly 18 percent of all nonfarm businesses, minorities currently own only 3 percent of all broadcast TV stations.

It is in the best interests of our democracy that media ownership reflect the reality of our Nation’s diversity. As a public trustee of the broadcast spectrum, it is the responsibility of the FCC to advocate on behalf of women and minorities.

Yet this Commission under President Bush has failed in this pursuit. In fact, the FCC has so mishandled the issue, nobody even uses their statistics on minority ownership anymore. The best estimates we have on minority ownership have to come from outside groups because the FCC simply doesn’t have accurate numbers. In 2000, the FCC released five studies conducted to help the commission comply with its own regulations that require the elimination of market-entry barriers for small business. These studies largely found that media consolidation negatively impacted minority ownership, and noted that minority owners face historic barriers to accessing capital from lending institutions to finance purchases. Rather than act on these studies to address the underlying problems, the FCC took 4 years to even issue a notice for public comment.

So today we have a chance to overturn a misguided decision by the FCC. And we have a chance to tell the Commission that rather than spend their time on finding loopholes for major media corporations to buy up more outlets throughout our country, the FCC should be working to its charge as the trustee for America’s airwaves.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 28, a joint resolution disapproving the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, rule that relaxes the newspaper-broadcast media cross-ownership.

Like many of my colleagues, I am deeply troubled by the FCC’s rule-making that would allow greater consolidation of our media. The media is a fundamental element of our democracy. It can inform, educate, and entertain, as well as nourish our democratic dialogue. Unfortunately, the media also has less savory powers.

In recent years, we have seen an increase in the number of violent programming, coupled with a decrease in local news and hardhitting journalism. To say these trends are not in the best interest of the American people, and especially our youngest citizens, is clearly an understatement.

In addition, as corporate ownership over our media grows more concentrated, we see less and less of the diversity of our Nation. When programming is the same from coast to coast, our airwaves will no longer reflect the rich mosaic of our country and our citizens. Such a landscape should prompt the FCC to act with an overabundance of caution, but it has not.

Five years ago, the FCC substantially relaxed the rules that govern media ownership in this country. Millions of Americans contacted the FCC to complain. The U.S. Senate voted to support a “resolution of disapproval” in response to the FCC’s decision. Next, the D.C. Circuit Court involved, and the Third Circuit Court of Appeals shipped the agency’s handbook right back to the FCC.

In 2006, the FCC began a new rule-making, and in November of 2007, the Commerce Committee held a hearing to discuss the effects of consolidation on localism and diversity in news and entertainment.

Over the following month, the Senate made a clear to the Commission that it had serious concerns about the FCC’s process and its apparent rush to issue a new rule. But on December 18, 2007, over the objections of Commissioners Michael Copps and Jonathan Adelstein, the FCC approved a relaxed set of ownership rules under which newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership is permissible in the top 20 markets.

I commend Senator DORGAN for introducing S.J. Res. 28, a joint resolution disapproving the FCC rule. I am pleased to join him in support of this resolution. I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting S.J. Res. 28.

Together we can send a strong and united message that media diversity is clearly in the national interest, and that the U.S. Senate will defend that interest with all the tools at its disposal.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask that I be recorded as voting no on S.J. Res. 28, a resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to broadcast media ownership.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan disapproval of the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, recently issued rules on media cross-ownership. I want to commend my colleague from North Dakota for his leadership on this most important of issues. This resolution would be a modest rules change.

And now, the FCC has green-lighted further media concentration by voting to overturn a 32-year-old rule prohibiting the cross-ownership of newspapers and broadcast stations—a rule that could impact markets in which nearly half of the American public lives and works.

Put simply, the FCC rule change would harm local and independent owners and help big media owners. In particular, the change further disadvantages minority media owners. While such owners control a mere 3 percent of the Nation’s commercial TV stations, as many as 90 percent of minority media owners would be subject to these new rules. Further consolidation will only reduce the number of opportunities for minorities to enter the market while putting those already in the market more at risk of being forced out by larger media conglomerates.

The FCC argues that this rule is necessary to “save” the newspaper industry. But as an internal FCC study showed, despite all the stories we are hearing about newspaper cutbacks, publicly traded newspapers earn 16 to 18 percent annual rates of return. An internal FCC memo found the industry was not in decline and said nothing of the fact that the FCC has given no compelling reason for it to be in the newspaper business in the
first place. The FCC regulates the broadcast airwaves—and it should remain that way.

Perhaps most disturbing is the way the FCC went about implementing this radical new rule. First, it completely ignored Congress. Bipartisan bill, the Media Ownership Act, of which I was a proud cosponsor. Then it ignored the public. Indeed, the Chairman’s proposed rule changes were first made public in an op-ed he published in the New York Times outlining the changes for the first time, which might have been helpful had the public comment period not already closed the day his column appeared.

Public comments are not merely a formality, Mr. President—they are a vital piece of the rulemaking process and an integral part of responsive, open government. Five years ago, more than 3 million Americans spoke out when the FCC voted without any public input whatsoever to allow a single company to own up to three television stations, a local newspaper, a cable system, and as many as eight radio stations in a single media market. At large part because of the public outcry, the courts overturned the rules.

Mr. Dorgan, isn’t more consolidation and homogenization the American people want from their media—it is less. No one can seriously argue that the consolidation of the media in recent years has been a good development for the fourth estate. As coverage has become increasingly superficial, people wonder more than ever about the quality of the information they are receiving from the media. And quite frankly, I do not blame them.

Must we act to ensure the strength and vitality of the American media in the 21st century? Absolutely. But that should be accomplished within an open and transparent framework as prescribed in the Media Ownership Act—a process that gives the public a voice. On this fight, the Senator from North Dakota has said, “Localism and diversity of media ownership is vital in a democracy.”

Indeed it is, Mr. President. It is time to tell the FCC that this is no way to maintain a free, open and diverse media, and I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution of disapproval.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask the Senator from Washington to use the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now be in a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

MEDIA DIVERSITY

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, for those who may not have observed that voice vote, it was a very positive result for the voices of America supporting diversity. I want to spend a few minutes talking about this issue, to make sure we give it the due consideration that is important.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if the Senator from Washington will yield for a question. I have to leave the Chamber due to another event.

First, I thank the Senator from Washington. Senator Cantwell has been unbelievably strong and supportive in getting us to this point of having passed the resolution of disapproval. We got it through the Commerce Committee. She was a leader in that effort. We now have voice voted it. It has passed the Senate. I did want to say, as I said earlier, the issue here is simple. We have far too much concentration in the media. The Federal Communications Commission, at least the Chairman and two others who have been members, have become cheerleaders of more concentration. That means less localism. It means your local radio station, in many cases your television station, other media outlets, are run by somebody living 1,500 miles away, running homogenized music through a radio station or satellite dish with covering the local baseball team or news events. I think this moves in exactly the wrong direction. I believe there needs to be more localism and I think there has to be a procedure on localism at the Federal Communications Commission. There need to be public interest standards with respect to broadcasters that do not now exist. The standards have been emasculated. We have a lot to do to put this back on track.

Suffice it to say, the FCC was anxious to move in the direction of more consolidation, allowing newspapers to buy up television stations. We have had more than on that for three decades. We prohibited the cross ownership in a market. The reason we have done that is pretty simple: We don’t want there to be only one or a couple of dominant voices in a market. We want there to be many voices.

That is what our purpose is, to bring this resolution of disapproval. It is unusual to do this, but we did it. It got through the Commerce Committee, now through the Senate. It says to the Federal Communications Commission, get things right, do things right, don’t truncate these things and cut the American people out of this process.

We have also said today we believe this is moving in the wrong direction. Everyone says there are choices out there in the Internet and cable channels and so on. More voices but the same ventriloquist. We had one person testify from Los Angeles who came and said in my office we have 48 cable channels. I went through who owns the channels—42 of them are owned by the same few companies and that is the problem with concentration.

I again thank the Senator from North Dakota. She has done a great job and I am proud to work with her and Senator Snowe especially, on the other side, and Senator Lott when he was here, to accomplish this result.

Ms. CANTWELL. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. The praise should go to Senator Dorgan for his leadership on this issue for the last year-plus time, continuing to make sure the Senate holds the FCC accountable for their actions, trying to pass a rule on media consolidation when they know there have been dissenting views all across America about this issue. Certainly there has been a dissent from the Senate.

The ownership of broadcast and print media touch on some of the core values Americans stand for—freedom of speech, open and diverse viewpoints, to have vibrant economic competition from a variety of sources, and local diversity.

Attention to diversity and localism has served our economy well and has also provided us a good civics lesson. These opportunities—when we hear from small companies, when we hear from minorities, when we hear from women—are the types of diversity we want to protect. We did that tonight.

The diversity in media does energize our democracy. Viewpoint diversity that comes from the various views that
can now be expressed are key to making us a stronger nation.

Having independent sources of news helps citizens to take opinions, not just locally but nationally and even globally. That is why I am glad we stopped the FCC from moving forward on their media consolidation proposal.

I remind my colleagues of the history here because I have a feeling this issue may come up again. Back in 2002, the FCC voted on media ownership rules, but even then announcing the agency would fulfill and review the full range of broadcast ownership rules, but the announcement of the review was the only thing that was truly conducted in public.

On June 23, 2003, on a 3-to-2 party line vote, the FCC issued its new rules on media consolidation. Then-Chairman Powell did not issue the proposed rule for public comment prior to the vote.

The reason I am bringing this up is because what ensued is millions of people sent e-mails and weighed in with postcards and petitions to oppose the consolidation. Then-Chairman Powell did not issue the proposed rule for public comment prior to the vote.

What happened after that? Obviously there were a lot of people in loud chorus saying they disapproved of the FCC’s action to further concentrate the media in this country. In 2007 the FCC passed the new media ownership rule, barely a month after it was proposed, allowing for little public comment and for even less time for consideration of the comments that came in. I know Chairman Martin likes to talk about allowing public comment for over 120 days and 6 hearings around the country, but all of that was done before the rule was even out there in public, what public comment would be.

In one example, they came to Seattle on November 9 and I think we had a mere 1-week notice for that. They had the meeting on a Friday afternoon. I think it was a 3-day weekend. Maybe they thought no one would show up, but it does not take a lot of notice in Seattle to get people to show up for a hearing about media consolidation, so 800 people showed up and spent 9 hours letting the Commission know their thoughts on what they thought the impact of increased media concentration would be.

It would hurt competition. It would lessen diversity. It would impact localism and was not in the broader public interest. I know Chairman Martin received an earful in Seattle, but clearly he didn’t pay much attention to what we said, because a few days later he proposed new media ownership rules.

They were released in a November 13 op-ed piece, think in the New York Times, in a Commission press release.

So what we are saying is we do not like the process which the FCC pursued in not having the broadest public comment in this, and also when it looks at some of the issues that were discussed in trying to validate why the Commission continues to try to push for media consolidation.

I think that is very important. We have seen a pattern emerge. We see economic studies from the Commission where they cannot hold up to peer review, where data are not supportive of the predetermined conclusions that the FCC had, and that maybe they were making the box when it comes to these public hearings and maybe giving mere lip service to localism and to women and minority ownership issues.

So all of those issues are going to continue to be duly noted by the Commerce Committee, and certainly we are going to continue to fight on this issue.

The FCC media ownership rules were created decades ago to foster these longstanding goals that our country has to promote competition, to promote localism, to have diversity of voices.

The courts and industry experts and selected officials of all ranks across America have come together in an overwhelming chorus saying “no” to the FCC move to try to further consolidate the media.

I am glad my colleagues tonight as well disapproved of their action so we can continue to have the diversity of voices in America that I believe my constituents and Americans all across this country deserve.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I want to say a few words on the 100th anniversary of the National Governors Association.

I especially want to thank my friend and colleague Senator DURBIN for yielding to me to speak first this evening.

It was 100 years ago today that the first meeting of our Nation’s Governors took place. In recognition of the National Governors Association’s Centennial today, I, along with a number of my colleagues, including Senator VOINOVICH of Ohio and Senator ALEXANDER of Tennessee, have submitted a resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of the National Governors Association.

It is my hope we will be able to clear this resolution honoring the 100th anniversary this evening. As former Governors currently serving in the Senate, Senators BAYH, BOND, GREGG, and BEN NELSON will also be joining myself and Senator ALEXANDER, along with Senators ROCKEFELLER, in sponsoring this resolution.

If you think about it, that is all of the former Governors who are in the Senate and who were at one time members of the National Governors Association. I was privileged to serve, along with Senators VOINOVICH and ALEXANDER, as chairman of the National Governors Association at one time.

It is a special privilege for me to take a moment to reflect on the organization’s growth and its accomplishments over the last 100 years. On May 15, 1908, 100 years ago today, President Teddy Roosevelt hosted the first meeting of our Nation’s Governors at the White House. They gathered to discuss conserving America’s natural resources.

Now, 100 years later, the Federal Government is still working with our National Governors to making effort to protect America’s natural resources through conservation provisions such as the farm bill that we adopted here today or addressing climate change or protecting our air through legislation such as the Clean Air Act.

Today, 100 years later, the National Governors Association serves as the collective voice of our Nation’s Governors and remains one of Washington, D.C.’s most respected public policy organizations. Through this bipartisan organization, Governors are able to identify and discuss a broad range of issues relating to public policy and to governance. I have long said the 50 States are laboratories of democracy, and we should use them as such, and we do.

Today we do that. From the redwood forests to the gulf stream waters, initiatives and policy recommendations that have come from the Governors often serve as catalysts for change both in the States and at the national level.

I was Governor of Delaware back in 1995 when Congress was actively debating how to reform a failing Federal welfare program, trying to decide how do we make work pay more than welfare. Without solutions coming from the Congress, the States had already begun taking reform efforts into their own hands. Over half the States, including my own State of Delaware, and I believe the State of Vermont, had made significant changes to their own welfare programs by seeking waivers from the Federal rules.

Many of the welfare policies and practices tested by States were ultimately adopted by the Federal Government in the sweeping 1996 welfare reform legislation passed by the Congress and signed by President Clinton, which the Governors helped forge for the welfare reform, the National Governors Association has played and continues to play a key role in developing national policies ranging from...
transportation to education, to environmental protection and health care, to name a few.

In the 1950s, President Eisenhower enlisted the Governors’ help to help build our very first interstate highway system. The Federal partnership forever changed the face of transportation in America and underscored how critical States’ participation has been to realizing national goals.

The same is true of Medicaid and the SCHIP program, the State Children’s Health Insurance Program. The same is true of the implementation of the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts, and as we fight wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the National Guard units of all 50 States.

Over the past century, the National Governors Association has played a key role in shaping public policy and addressing America’s most pressing challenges. On behalf of each of the Governors both past and present, to honor to acknowledge the leadership of the Governor mark Radicot, former Governor of Montana, who later went on to be national committee chair and general campaign manager for President Bush’s reelection; Mike Leavitt, former Governor of Utah, who succeeded as chair and who serves today as a Cabinet secretary in this administration. What we have tried to do in the Senate, those of us who used to be Governors who serve here today but went through new Governors school, is take that idea and transplant it here. I call it Senators school. It is really orientation.

This fall, in November, 2 weeks after the election, we will have new Senators, newly elected Senators, their spouses will come. They will spend 3 days together; some sessions with spouses, others not with spouses. The faculty will be current Senators and our spouses. We will have 3 days to get to know each other, to try to teach the new guys and gals the ropes and to begin to develop new personal relationships that really are needed here to make this place work. I look forward to being a part of doing that this November. But the idea was one of those ideas that came from the National Governors Association.

Again, the NGA and the States are laboratories of democracy. Taking that lesson and applying it here on the national level will have good effect.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 568 submitted earlier today by yours truly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 568) commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the National Governors Association.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CARPER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the Record. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 568) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. Res. 568

Whereas, 100 years later, the National Governors Association serves as the collective voice of the 55 Governors of States, commonwealths, and territories; Whereas, for the past century, Governors have organized themselves to discuss mutual concerns and share State practices; Whereas, 100 years later, the National Governors Association serves as the collective voice of the 55 Governors of States, commonwealths, and territories; and

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the leadership of the Nation’s Governors and honors their contributions to American politics and society; and

(2) commemorates the 100th anniversary of the founding of the National Governors Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

ARMED FORCES DAY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, tomorrow we celebrate Armed Forces Day. One hundred years ago the National Guard units of all 50 States, from Van Wert to St. Clairsville, from Sandusky to Ironton, will pause to honor the service and sacrifice of the men and women in all branches of the military services and the Reserve and National Guard.

I have held close to 100 roundtables around my State where, in many of them, I had the opportunity to speak with dozens of these honorable man and women. Those conversations reinforced my profound respect for their unstinting bravery, their unshakable sense of duty, and their unwavering commitment to our national security. Long ago, at my State, I visited two Ohio marines recovering from wounds suffered in Iraq. I asked each of them what was the first thing they thought about when they realized they were wounded. Both marines, independently of one another said: “Don’t stay in the Marines.” That simple statement speaks volumes about our men and women in uniform.

Armed Forces Day is an opportunity to honor our troops, an opportunity to honor the sacrifices they and, equally importantly, their families have made to protect our Nation, and an opportunity to honor the promises our Nation has made to repay their services and sacrifices. That is so important. We are stewards of those promises. We have a responsibility to work every day, against opposition sometimes, to ensure that our Armed Forces receive the wages and benefits and services they have earned. But最重要的是，我们的武装部队应该更多地是出于感情。它应该行动。当我们在对我们的部队，我们应该保持他们。他们最可能确实已保持了他们所承诺的。

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.
Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I join the remarks of the Senator from Ohio acknowledging the great contribution made to America by our men and women in uniform. I hope we can honor their service, not only by providing for them while they are at war but providing for them as well when they come home. I am sure the Senator joins me in believing that a new GI bill which will provide for those returning soldiers is a fitting tribute to their service and a great investment in our future.

Our initial GI bill after World War II was born in conflict. After World War I, those returning soldiers marched on Washington time and again, demanding some payment for their service to our country. They were rebuffed and even attacked at times by our then Army in uniform. By the Second World War, we understood that we owed a great debt to the 16 million men and women who served, and 8 million of them took advantage of the GI bill.

That GI bill was groundbreaking and revolutionary. It paid for their tuition, their books, their room and board, as well as a monthly allotment so they could go to school. Those graduates of the GI bill became the thriving middle class of America that built our great Nation in the late 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. It was the greatest single investment in returning soldiers in our history, and it should be replicated.

Those who served in the armed services should also honor them when they come home, to make sure they receive all the health care and benefits promised and are given a chance to have a full life after having served our country so well.

I am happy to identify myself with the remarks of the Senator from Ohio.

REPUBLICAN FILIBUSTERS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I also want to say that this has been a week when we have achieved a few things in the Senate but not nearly enough. We started off the Senate with a historic occasion, one which is not likely to be remembered by great historians but should be remembered by all who follow the business of the Senate. As of this week, the Republicans, the minority in the Senate, have now engaged in 71 Republican filibusters. A filibuster is an effort to stop the business on the floor of the Senate or at least to slow it down. It is a time-honored tradition in the Senate, but it is a tradition which has not been overused until this session of Congress.

In the entire history of the Senate, the total number of filibusters in any 2-year period, the maximum, was 57. So far in this 2-year period, the Republicans have engaged in 71 filibusters, and, of course, we have another 6 or 7 months to go in this session of Congress. The implication that their ambition is to stop the Senate from addressing the major issues facing our Nation, or at least to slow us down to a crawl.

We have what we believe are good ideas and good proposals to deal with the high gasoline prices facing America's families and businesses, farmers and truckers. We have good proposals to deal with tax breaks for working families so they can meet the needs of their families with escalating prices for food and health care and daycare and the cost of daily living. Again, the Republicans have done their best to slow us down, if not stop us.

It reached a fever several weeks ago that was nothing short of ridiculous. The Republicans initiated a filibuster to slow down the consideration of a bill known as a technical corrections bill. That is a bill that takes care of applying and grammar errors. They engaged in a filibuster to slow down the Senate so it would take us a whole week to finish a technical corrections bill. When we finally reached the point and asked them for amendments, they had three or four that could have been dispensed with quickly.

They are dragging their feet and slowing us down with this record number of filibusters, that isn't it alone. There is also a device in the Senate known as a hold. Most every Senator has used a hold, either on a bill or a nomination. Some of the holds that have been applied recently are so-called secret holds. Senators don't stop forward to identify why they have held up a nomination or bill.

I have used holds. I am currently using those. But I have been very public about it. I have said exactly why I am doing it. The bill that takes care of applying releasing the hold. For example, when the Department of Justice wanted the approval of the Deputy Attorney General Mark Filip, a good man from Chicago, I said I would hold his nomination until I had received responses to questions I had submitted to the Department months before. Well, to his credit, Attorney General Mukasey moved on it extremely quickly. Within 48 hours, I said I would move on it extremely quickly. I withdrew the hold immediately and I promised. I am sorry it reached that point, but after waiting months, I didn't know another way to turn to get answers to important questions. So holds can be used effectively and honestly and openly.

Then again, there are holds that have been applied that I think are almost impossible to explain or justify. For example, one of the Senators on the Republican side put a hold on a bill which was not controversial and very bipartisan, which would establish in the United States a national registry of those who are suffering from a disease known as ALS, or Lou Gehrig's disease. It is a devastating disease. It was the hope of the sponsor, Senator Harry Reid of Nevada, that we could establish this registry and move even closer to finding the cause of this disease and perhaps lead to a better understanding of a high-minded and sensible approach to a very serious medical condition affecting thousands of families across America.

One of the Senators from Oklahoma on the Republican side put a hold on this bill—in other words, stopped us from calling this bill for a vote. That is extremely unfortunate. There is nothing controversial about this bill. He should reconsider that hold. But it is not the only one.

PEPFAR REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise this evening to speak for a few moments about another hold that has been placed on critically important legislation.

Anyone who follows what we do here on the floor of the Senate or in the House of Representatives knows that many of us on the Democratic side have disagreed with President Bush as to his policies. Over the last 7 years, there have been ample opportunities to vote against the President's policies, whether it is on the invasion, the war in Iraq, or economic policies that brought us to this sorry stage of the American economy, with working families struggling to pay their bills and to survive.

I have opposed President Bush's economic policies and many other things during the course of his administration. But there was one moment I can still recall when the President gave the State of the Union Address and announced that the United States would try to lead the world in dealing with the global AIDS epidemic. On the Democratic side, I joined many of my colleagues standing and applauding President Bush for that announcement. Though I may disagree with him on many issues, I salute him for his special efforts to deal with the global epidemic of AIDS and tuberculosis and malaria.

The President established a program known as the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, commonly known as PEPFAR. This important program is up for reauthorization so that it can continue to save lives all over the world.

They have renamed it in honor of two men who served in the House of Representatives—one a Democrat, Tom Lantos; the other a Republican from Illinois, Henry Hyde. It is known as the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee considered this bill and passed it out 18 to 3—an overwhelming bipartisan vote. Our colleagues in the House passed a similar measure with an overwhelming vote at the end of March of this year.

The President has urged Congress to send him the bill before the end of the year. President Bush takes great pride in this bill. He believes it is one of the hallmarks of his tenure in office and administration. I join him. I think it is one of his most positive achievements as President of the United States.

The purpose of this bill is to prevent 12 million new infections; support
treatment for at least 3 million people; provide care for another 12 million, including 5 million very vulnerable children.

That kind of assistance helps to save lives, and it is an important step not only from a humanitarian viewpoint but also from the economic viewpoint, as part of the global effort to achieve good values in America. We are in a struggle across the world now. Many of our harshest critics paint a picture of the United States that is not close to reality. This kind of legislation, where the United States puts investment in the health care of people around the world, tells the right story about who we are and what we believe.

There is a sad ending, regrettably, as is too often the case in the Senate. This bill—despite the President’s support, despite broad bipartisan support in the House and the Senate—is being blocked by several Republican Senators. Seven of my colleagues across the aisle, who have publicly identified themselves, have stopped the consideration of this bill to deal with the global AIDS epidemic. Those Senators are Senators Coburn, DeMint, Sessions, Chambliss, Vitter, Bunning, and Burr.

Now, former Bush speech writer, Michael Gerson, issued a scathing criticism of this Republican hold in a recent article in the Washington Post. I quote him when he says:

"It is the nature of the Senate that the smallest of minorities can impede the work of the world and can, with a parliamentary maneuver in the path of reauthorizing that program. When they were asked why they opposed this program being reauthorized, one of the Senators argued that it has become an exercise of opposition to treating AIDS and now is dealing with other issues. This criticism of the program, my Senate colleague, called it "mission creep." I wish that Senator could go to Africa and see it firsthand. To argue that adding nutrition, safe water, and sanitation programs, treatment of tuberculosis and malaria, and protection of vulnerable populations is somehow beyond the scope of the original bill is to miss the point.

I went to a portion of Nairobi, Kenya, to one of the larger slums, which has some 600,000 people and a rampant AIDS epidemic. Well, it is being treated with drugs and testing, and we are making some progress, but they took me to a small area where a group of parents who were infected with HIV were sitting and watching their children play.

I looked on as several of the women who were sitting there looked as if they were about to die, they were so emaciated. I said to the person with me: It is a shame they didn’t have access to the drugs. The person said: They have access to the drugs. They are taking the drugs. They just don’t have access to food.

These drugs don’t work on a hungry person and an empty stomach. So when the critics of this PEPFAR reauthorization, nutrition and nutrition as part of the program, are ignoring the obvious. If you want to treat a woman with a child, and you want the drugs to work, she needs basic nutrition. That has to be part of the program. It is impossible if her mother had not been by her side for every class, every lab, every study session, and there to turn every page of her daughter’s textbooks when Lucy’s arms were too weak.

On Saturday, Lucy Trevino overcame the greatest obstacles and earned her degree. And Rosa, in reporter Barbara Mahany’s words, taught us “all a lasting lesson of a mother’s love.”

At Lucy’s commencement, the dean of UIC’s engineering college stopped the ceremony to tell the members of the Class of 2008 about Lucy’s persistence and Rosa’s devotion. He said he
could barely get the words out without bursting into tears. When he finished, the entire audience rose and delivered a thunderous 2-minute ovation.

Spinal muscular atrophy is a progressive disease that withers the muscles that control the legs, arms and lungs. It can make breathing a struggle and make turning the page of a heavy book nearly impossible. But it leaves the brain and the mind untouched.

Lucy Trevino was 4 years old when she was told she had the disease. She started using a wheelchair when she was 9.

It was during countless visits to neurologists and orthopedic surgeons when she was a child that Lucy first became fascinated by science. During medical tests, she says, she used to wonder, “How do those devices work?”

During her senior year in high school, she learned about a summer camp in bioengineering at UIC and immediately signed up. And she was hooked.

The following fall, Lucy Trevino became the first person in her family to go to college.

For her major, she chose bioengineering—one of the toughest programs in the College of Engineering.

Now, the prospect of years of studying such complicated subjects as thermodynamics and circuit analysis would be daunting for almost all of us. For Lucy, college presented special challenges.

You see, Lucy often needs help performing even such simple physical tasks as dressing, brushing her teeth, and cutting her food.

It takes her twice as long as other students to write up her labs because it sometimes shoving up the stairs or cutting her food.

And before all this, she has slipped her into the CTA train to find the lab report for BioE 494, bioengineering-based physiology. When the cell phone rings, she holds it to her daughter’s ear. She zips her coat. Dabs a tissue to her nose.

After all this, she has slipped her into jeans, tied her shoes, smeared toothpaste on her toothbrush and combed her thick black hair into a perfect ponytail.

Lucy Trevino’s mother, Rosa, is right behind her firstborn daughter— all through college—sometimes shoving through mounds of snow, or up an icy ramp.

Over the last six years, Rosa Trevino also became fluent in the CTA Pink Line, as the mother and daughter made their way five days a week from home, a red-brick two-flat in Cicero, to the University of Illinois at Chicago.

Lucy Trevino graduated Saturday from UIC with a degree in bioengineering, and the dean stopped the commencement of the Class of 2008 to tell the story of Lucy. He barely made it, he said, without breaking into tears.

For the six years it took to get through one of the most rigorous programs in the College of Engineering, it was Rosa—a tad shy and always thinking two steps ahead— who got her daughter to every class, lab and seminar. She bought her a brand new laptop and notebook to lay on Lucy’s desk. And she turned the pages when a heavy book tired Lucy’s hands.

For two or three hours, as Lucy absorbed lectures in calculus or thermodynamics or circuit analysis, Rosa sat not far away, just in case Lucy needed a sip of water or began choking.

Lucy, who is 24, was told she had a rare genetic degenerative disease, spinal muscular atrophy, when she was 4. SMA is a progressive disease that withers the muscles that control the legs, arms and lungs, and can make breathing a struggle.

Lucy’s type of SMA usually takes away your ability to walk by the time you are in your teens—she began using a wheelchair at age 9—but unlike some other types, doesn’t necessarily affect life span.

Lucy, who is the oldest of four, has a younger brother, Hugo, who has the same disease. He, too, uses a wheelchair; he’s a freshman at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, studying architecture.

PARENTAL DEDICATION

“Lucy’s story is about the sacrifices our mothers make for all of us,” said Pete Nelson, interim dean of UIC’s engineering college, told the Tribune’s Barbara Mahany. “Lucy’s story is about the sacrifices our mothers make for all of us.”

Michael Cho, who teaches mostly graduate engineering courses at UIC, has come to know Lucy and Rosa and is in awe of them.

Of Rosa’s devotion, he says, “The first thing that comes to my mind is that this can’t be anything else but a mother’s love. It goes beyond commitment.

It is sacrificial love. And I am just overwhelmed. It’s not just 1 month or one semester. It’s every day for 4 years.”

In fact, it took Lucy Trevino 6 years to earn her degree. Serious health challenges forced her to take a break from school in her junior year.

Last year, a student told Lucy that she had felt like skipping class, but she thought, “Th’ere’s Lucy, she’s always here. There’s nothing wrong with me. I’m just lazy.”

Lucy was amazed anyone noticed her. Another is Lucy’s younger brother Hugo, also has spinal muscular atrophy—SMA—and uses a wheelchair. He is studying architecture at the University of Illinois Champaign-Urbana.

As much as Rosa would like to see Lucy and Hugo walk, she says she knows that God is good. She explains: One daughter can walk, one can’t. It’s the same with her two sons. What she can’t see in one child, she sees in the other. And she sees in each child special talents.

In a few weeks, Lucy will go back to school to take one more class so she can complete a math minor. After that, she says, she would like to study law and become a patent attorney.

I hope Rosa is ready for law school. Because I suspect that once Lucy makes up her mind to do something, there’s no holding her back.

Rosa Trevino is one of four new Americans who came to this country from Mexico 30 years ago, when she was 17. This past Saturday, the day of Lucy’s commencement, was Mother’s Day in Mexico.

As Lucy received her cherished degree, she gave her mother a gift she had ordered months earlier: a formal-dress shoe.

When Lucy asked, “How would you feel if I went with you?”

Rosa had never even attended high school. But she had vowed years earlier that she would do whatever she could to see that her first-born daughter was never held back by her disease.

So every day, every semester for the last 6 years, Rosa was by Lucy’s side.

Five days a week, mother and daughter took the CTA train from their home in Cicero to the University of Illinois at Chicago.

They became a familiar sight on campus: Rosa pushing Lucy’s purple wheelchair. Rosa ordering for Lucy in the cafeteria line because Lucy’s voice is sometimes barely louder than a whisper.

And there was Rosa, sitting a few feet behind Lucy in class, copying recipes or cutting coupons—always watching for something that needed a drink of water, or help turning a page. She sat through more than 2,100 hours of lectures in 51 different classes.
One of the professors pounding on Nelson’s door was Michael Cho, who teaches mostly graduate courses in cell and tissue engineering, but who has gotten to know—and has been本领 to—and to love, a distinguished old lady and his daughter-duo, so often sought wending their way up a ramp, on or off an elevator, or tucked away studying in some secluded corner.

‘The first thing that comes to my mind is this can’t be anything else but a mother’s love.’ Cho said. ‘It goes beyond commitment, it’s not just about biological love. And I am just overwhelmed. It’s not just one month or one semester. It’s every day for the last four years that I can think of.

In fact, it was easy, because Lucy had to take time off when she got really sick her junior year; she suddenly couldn’t lift her arm or her legs, losing memory. It took months before a sleep test showed she stopped breathing 30 times an hour when she was asleep. She now sleeps with a machine that helps her breathe, and, within a week of using it, she said, she regained her memory, if not her arm strength.

‘Ever since I was little, I loved science,’ said Rosa Trevino, who is 47 and moved to Chicago about a year ago. ‘My mother runs a deep cocoa-colored eyes and rolls around campus in a purple wheelchair with back wheels that sparkle, like fireworks, with tiny neon blue bits. ‘Because of the medical care we received here, there were a lot of medical exams, I would always wonder, “How do these devices work?”

In high school, Morton West High School in Berwyn, Trevino learned from a counselor about a summer camp in bio-engineering at UIC, so she signed up, and found her life’s work.

She once dreamed of working to find a cure for her own disease, but decided “it would be too stressful if I couldn’t find it.”

The family had to ever to go to college, Lucy Trevino said she was “too afraid” to venture down to the U. of I. in Urbana-Champaign, where there’s a whole dorm for students with disabilities, and the nation’s oldest college-level disabilities-services program provides trained personal assistants, physical therapy, even wheelchair repair.

‘I didn’t know if I should risk going all the way down there,” she said.

Sticking closer to home seemed like a better plan. But because UIC doesn’t have a personal assistants program, she was stuck trying to find someone who could help her in a thousand little ways and be there whenever she needed it.

‘In college, you have such a crazy schedule. You stay after to study with other students. And you have to be a professor. It was like, “Oh, my gosh, how am I going to find someone who’s going to put up with all of that?”’

‘My mom was like, “Well, I guess I’ll just go with you.”

‘And then it was getting closer to the start of the first semester, and I still hadn’t found Lucy, who shares her mother’s deep blue-gowned classmates rose and sashayed from the red-carpeted UIC Pavilion, as Nelson saluted a student and a mother who had taught them all a lasting lesson, a sea of Lucy’s blue-gowned classmatess rose and nearly drowned out the dean with a thunderous ovation. Challenges are Lucy and Rosa Trevino finally understood how very much a whole college noticed.

ZIMBABWE

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, with skyrocketing inflation and unemployment, riots over land reform and food shortages, and streams of economic and political refugees fleeing into neighboring countries, the primary constant in Zimbabwe over the last 30 years has been the increasingly despotistic and disastrous rule of President Robert Mugabe, who has in large part been able to maintain his grip on power, for a combination of high interest rates and inflation galvanized public support for the Zimbabwean Congress of Trade Unions led by Morgan Tsvangirai, who was chosen in 1999 to lead a new opposition party—the Movement for Democratic Change, or MDC. President Mugabe’s ruling ZANU-PF party rigged Presidential and Parliamentary elections to maintain its grip on power, and while he tried to do it again on March 29 of this year, the MDC and the people of Zimbabwe were determined not to be intimidated or outmaneuvered.

Despite the Zimbabwean Government’s best efforts to limit the access of international monitors and journalists, most observers concur that the general elections conducted this March were fraught with rigging, mainly to favor the ruling ZANU–PF. Even so, these efforts failed to silence the people of Zimbabwe’s call for freedom. After significant and inexplicable delays, the Zimbabwe Electoral Commission announced that the MDC had won a majority in Parliament and that Mr. Tsvangirai won more votes for the Presidency, but not enough to avoid a runoff.

For more than 6 weeks now, Zimbabwe has been in a state of increasing political uncertainty and violence. With each passing day, there are new reports of state-sponsored intimidation and detention of opposition leaders and supporters, human rights activists, trade union leaders, lawyers and journalists. The delay in announcing and now in setting a date for the runoff election has allowed the ruling party to mobilize traditional state security services as well as youth militias and bands of military veterans to weaken the opposition. Mr. Tsvangirai has agreed to participate in a run-off election, but he is reluctant to return to Zimbabwe, mindful of the risk to his security.

Mr. President, we can not stand by while this disaster unfolds. President Mugabe has been losing legitimacy, both at home and abroad, for years, isolating himself and his country to the detriment of Zimbabwe’s citizens. The people of Zimbabwe are calling for change, but it will take engagement from external actors to help them escape the devastating status quo. The recent decision by dock workers across southern Africa to refuse to unload a Chinese ship carrying Zimbabwe-bound ammunition sent a strong message, one that the international community should echo. Public statements condemning the situation in Zimbabwe by the newly elected President of Botswana followed on the heels of these protests and resulted in the denial of a port at which the Chinese ship could dock. Decisions by other leaders in the region to line up with President’s government, for a visit have been equally important signs of this growing political will but they are not enough.

The MDC’s runoff conditions are more than reasonable, and should be supported in any way possible by regional and international governments. Given the tense environment and high potential for politically motivated violence, a commitment to ending impunity for human rights violations and stopping the attacks must be a top priority. Yesterday, Ms. Faith Nkakala, Zimbabwe’s representative in Washington, reported “indications that the level of violence is escalating . . . and could reach crisis
levels." I urge the U.N. to immediately send a team to investigate these human rights abuses so that the perpetrators will be held accountable and future violations might be deterred. Similarly, I welcome the African Union’s decision to send additional monitors for the runoff election, and I encourage the AU or SADC to draw together resources for a short-term peacekeeping mission to maintain order and protect civilians in Zimbabwe during this uncertain time.

In an immediate manifestation of violence, I fully support demands by the United States Government and others that the Zimbabwe Government permit unfettered access for international media and observers during the campaign and conduct of the run-off polls and guarantee Mr. Tsvangirai’s safety. South Africa’s President Mbeki and other leaders of the Southern African Development Community should join this forthright call. The Nhiwatiwa Mugabe and his top brass must respect fundamental human and political rights and allow for a fair, nonviolent, and independently monitored runoff election that can bring to power a legitimate government capable of bringing stability and growth to this embattled nation.

HONORING AMERICA’S FINEST

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, this week, 358 new names were inscribed on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, representing officers from across the country over the course of many years. We often take for granted the thousands of brave officers who dedicate their lives to protecting our streets and our communities every day across Maryland and across America. But this week, during National Police Week, we all should take a moment to thank these brave men and women—America’s finest who would sacrifice themselves for the greater good of safety and security.

Nationally, 187 law enforcement officers gave their lives in the line of duty during 2007. More than one-third succumbed to gunfire. On average, they were 39 years old, and seven of those brave officers were women. Most importantly, these were sons and daughters, husbands and wives, sisters, brothers, and true role models for those who knew them well or saw them on the street proudly wearing their uniform or badge. So our thoughts, during this special commemoration, also are with their families and the communities they touched by their presence.

Four of Maryland’s finest gave their lives for our safety in 2007 and one more recently on New Year's Day, January 1, 2008. I would like to take a moment to tell you about these brave law enforcement officers.

Troy Lamont Chesley, Sr., was a detective with the Baltimore City Police Department. At age 34, he was a 13-year veteran of his agency. Shortly after Detective Chesley got off duty at a public housing unit, a suspect attempted to rob him. Despite being shot and mortally wounded, Detective Chesley was able to take police action and return fire. He was arrested later in the day and charged in connection with Detective Chesley's murder. A widower himself, Detective Chesley is survived by his three daughters, two sons, parents, and brother.

On April 25, 2007, Police Officer Luke Hoffman had been with the Montgomery County Police Department just 1 year when he was struck by a car while involved in a foot pursuit of a suspected drunk driver. The driver had fled on foot and been spotted in the Aspen Hill area early that morning. Officer Hoffman was struck after chasing the suspect across Old Georgia Avenue in an area with very low lighting conditions. Another patrol car struck Officer Hoffman when his patrol car went down an embankment and struck a tree. The officer in the patrol car was injured. Officer Hoffman was flown to a local hospital where he later died.

Corporal Scott Wheeler of the Howard County Police Department was struck by a speeding vehicle he was attempting to flag down on Route 32. He had stepped into the roadway in an attempt to stop the car for speeding while working an enforcement detail. He was flown to Maryland Shock Trauma Center where he died on June 18, 2007, 2 days after the accident. Corporal Wheeler had served with the Howard County Police Department for 6½ years. He was posthumously promoted to lieutenant. Corporal Wheeler is survived by his wife, parents, and brother.

Another brave Marylander who lost his life far too early was 25-year-old Police Officer Christopher Nicholson of the Smithsburg Police Department. Officer Nicholson was shot and killed while responding to assist members of the Washington County Sheriff's Office at a call involving reports that a man had just murdered his girlfriend during a domestic disturbance. As he waited in the patrol car for additional units to arrive, the suspect drove toward Officer Nicholson's patrol car and opened fire as he pulled even with the officer's door. A rifle slug struck him in the chest, penetrating his vest. The suspect fled into a nearby cemetery, where he engaged members of the Special Response Team in a shootout. The man was wounded and taken into custody. Officer Nicholson was flown to a local hospital where he succumbed to his injuries shortly after midnight on New Year's Eve 2007. A 13-year veteran of the Maryland Transportation Authority Police, Officer Nicholson was setting out cones at the interchange of I-95 and I-395 to keep commercial vehicles out of downtown Baltimore during New Year’s celebrations when he was hit. The driver fled in his vehicle but was apprehended early the next morning. Corporal Brooks was transported to Maryland Shock Trauma Center where he succumbed to his injuries shortly after midnight on New Year’s Day, January 1, 2008. Lost at the age of 49, Corporal Brooks is survived by his children and a fiancée.

I mentioned earlier that gunfire accounted for more than a third of the law enforcement deaths nationwide. This was the single-biggest cause of death. Perhaps after hearing about Police Officer Hoffman and lieutenants Wheeler and Brooks, it is no surprise that automobile accidents fell second on that list, claiming the lives of over 25 percent of law enforcement officers who died nationwide last year.

During this commemoration, let me also offer thanks to The Officer Down Memorial Page, a nonprofit organization dedicated to honoring America’s fallen law enforcement heroes every day of the year by telling the stories and preserving the memories of each of these officers at www.odmp.org. I also offer my tribute and respect to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, which generates increased public support for law enforcement, promotes professional law enforcement safety, and leads our Nation in remembering the fallen 365 days a year but especially during National Police Week.

I am humbled by the sacrifice these law enforcement officers have given for their fellow Marylanders. I would hope that they represent the last of our Nation’s finest law officers who would sacrifice themselves for the greater good of safety and security.

Unfortunately, we know that is not likely. That is why, as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee I am working with my colleagues to improve the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program to make it easier for States to qualify for grants under this program. While not a guarantee, bulletproof vests do save lives and allow more men and women in law enforcement to return home to their families at the end of their shift.

We held a hearing in the Judiciary Committee earlier this week, during which we heard from Detective David Azur, an ATF agent from Baltimore, MD. He testified about how, in 2000,
January 12, 1945 in an attack on Japanese shipping in Camranh Bay in French Indo-China, which is now Vietnam. As the citation by President Roosevelt stated:

Kelly fearlessly dove his plane through a heavy curtain of powerful anti-aircraft fire to score two direct hits with his rockets and contribute to the damaging of an enemy merchant vessel. Then, joining in an attack against three large gunboats on the water, he executed a series of strafing runs and, striking furiously at his target, personally destroyed one of the enemy aircraft.

Courage like that is what made Leo Kelly a true American hero, and the Nation owes him a debt we can never fully repay.

After the war, Leo Kelly continued his career in the Navy for nearly two decades. From 1953 to 1965 he was assigned to a Naval ROTC unit in Philadelphia and earned his bachelor's degree in political science and attended the Navy's postgraduate school. He retired from the Navy in 1964 and went to work for Tennon Plastics Company in Burlington, where he and Claire raised their wonderful family.

He had many interests. He was an excellent golfer, and had played for various Navy teams early in his career. He loved classical music, especially playing the violin. He had a profound faith in God, was a member of St. Paul's Roman Catholic Church in Burlington, and had been a member of the Bridge Prison Ministry.

He was also a wonderful family man, as so many members of his family said about his service held for him in February. His daughter Beth said it beautifully in her eulogy at the service:

Our father was a strong, quiet force in our lives, guiding us, always encouraging, smiling or nodding his approval. . . . He always adjusted to whatever came his way. The very qualities that made him excel at being a pilot prepared him for a life with six daughters and one son.

America is grateful to Leo Kelly for all he did for our country during his extraordinary life, and I know that future generations of his family will always treasure his memory.

I ask unanimous consent to have his daughter Beth's eulogy printed in the RECORD, along with the full texts of the World War II citations he received.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY BY BETH KENNEDY FOR HER FATHER, WORLD WAR II NAVAL HERO LEO KELLY

(Military Chapel, Wrightstown, New Jersey, Feb. 25, 2008)

Good afternoon. I'm Beth Kennedy, one of Leo and Claire's many daughters who no one can ever keep silent! No one can keep silent as though our names are interchangeable!

On behalf of my father and my mother and my sisters, I'd like to thank all of you for coming to celebrate our father's life and mourn his passing.

I just wanted to share a few words before we all leave today. My mother always told me it was important to talk about our father, so here goes. I know that God will never give you more than you can bear. He will give you the strength to accept His will.

And for my family, those words were never more true than during the past week as we began a life without our father. We each have our special memories of Dad. Some we remember with lots of laughter, and some we reflect on privately. But all of them are filled with love, and all of them are joined with our mother, who was always by his side, because without her, we would not have had him — and later, with her children—was a gift, and it was a gift for us, too.

You were Dad's co-pilot. The love of his life. You taught us what love and devotion truly are.

Kathy, your expert so much time helping take care of Dad, always with humor and grace. You were a leader for all of us.

Michelle, you spoke so beautifully last night about Dad. You took care of so many details of his health care, always with patience and love.

Nancy, you embraced our parents' spirituality and, and shared a strong religious bond with Dad.

Leo, you inherited Dad's quiet strength, and this day you should be filled with energy helping your family and your friends in need, most times without even being asked.

Teresa, you would always brighten Dad's day with your sparkling optimism and good cheer, along with a little something for his sweet tooth and a visit from Michael.

Jackie, you could always make Dad smile, and you could always handle anything. Dad was so happy and proud to finally become a grandfather.

Mom gave us so many wonderful memories: trips to the seashore; our family outing to the Poconos; grilling steaks in the backyard at Salem Road; Friday night fish fries at Aunt Howie's. As the years later in our lives, as our father gave each of us girls away on our wedding days, dancing with the happy bride. And always, always, praying with us for God's blessing; Our parents gave us the highest standard for a strong marriage filled with love and faith.

Our father was a strong, quiet force in our lives, guiding us, always encouraging, smiling or nodding his approval. I remember the day I moved to Boston after graduating high school. After my tearful goodbye, my father drove me to the train station in Trenton. He got me settled in on the train, bags secured, and I took so long saying goodbye to him with tears in his eyes and later, train took off with both of us on it!! He had to get off at the next stop and wait for a train to take him back to Trenton. I was delighted to have his company for such a nice send-off, but I do recall an inordinate amount of throat-clearing by Dad.

He always adjusted to whatever came his way. The very qualities that made him excel as a pilot prepared him for a life with six daughters and one son. I read through Dad's rating book today, and I was struck by the consistent comments and descriptions of him: "smooth, dependable, eager to learn, retains instruction, good cooperation in unfavorable weather conditions, good pilot material."

Well, Dad, we're all here to say a prayer for you as you join Grandpere and Mamie, Aunt Teen, and all your friends up in Heav en. And as you always said to me at the end of every conversation or phone call—"God bless you good." Goodbye, Dad; I love you; God bless you good.

CITATION FOR THE DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS AWARDED TO LEO KELLY

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Distinguished Flying Cross to Lieutenant Junior Grade Leo
Kelly, United States Naval Reserve, for service as set forth in the following citation: For heroism and extraordinary achievement in aerial flight as Pilot of a Fighter Plane in Fighting Squadron Forty-Four, attached to the USS Langley, during operations against enemy Japanese forces in the vicinity of French Indo-China, on January 12, 1945. Participating actively against enemy shipping and installations, Lieutenant Junior Grade (then Ensign) Kelly fearlessly dove his plane through a heavy curtain of powerful anti-aircraft fire to score two direct hits with his rockets and contribute to the damaging of an enemy merchant vessel. Then, joining in an attack against a group of hostile vessels and water, he executed series of strafing runs and, striking furiously at his target, personally destroyed one of the enemy aircraft. By his expert airmanship, courage, and devotion to duty in the face of grave danger, Lieutenant Junior Grade Kelly upheld the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service. For the President, [signed] James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy.

CITATION FOR THE AIR MEDAL AWARDED TO LEO KELLY

For distinguishing himself by meritorious acts while participating in an aerial flight in an attack on enemy shipping, Camranh Bay, French Indo-China on 12 January, 1945. As an attack on enemy shipping, Camranh Bay, acts while participating in an aerial flight in

TRIBUTE TO SANDRA ESTY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I would like to recognize Ms. Sandra “Sandi” J. Esty, one of our most distinguished civil servants who will retire from Federal service on June 7, 2008, after contributing over 35 years of dedicated service to our country. She serves as the Chief, Air Operations Division, Office of Legislative Liaison, Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, the Pentagon, Washington, DC. She is responsible for managing, planning, developing and executing of congressional travel matters for the Department of the Air Force. Ms. Esty also serves as the senior adviser and special assistant to the Director, Legislative Liaison and Air Force leadership with oversight of the Air Force Congressional Travel Program.

Ms. Esty left Syracuse, NY, in 1972 to begin her illustrious civil service career as a clerk-stenographer in the Office of the Air Force Reserve, the Pentagon. After demonstrating remarkable competence in working congressional constituent inquiries, she was selected to work Air Force constituent issues in the Secretary of the Air Force Legislative Liaison Inquiry Division, in 1975. She was promoted to Senior Clerk and then, in 1978, she moved to Washington, D.C. as the Executive Assistant to the Deputy Assistant to the Chief of Staff, Air Operations Division, Legislative Liaison. Ms. Esty was promoted to Air Operations Division, Legislative Liaison in 1981, this time as the Legislative Liaison to the Chief of Staff, Air Operations Division, Legislative Liaison. She was promoted in 1983 and served as Administrative Assistant to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Electronic Warfare. In 1985, she returned to Legislative Liaison as the Legislative Liaison to the Director of Legislative Liaison and then was assigned as an action officer in the White House Liaison Branch, Legislative Liaison, where she established herself as one of the top leaders of Legislative Liaison. In 1988, she was promoted and selected as the Deputy Chief, Air Operations Division, Legislative Liaison, and then, in 1997, she was promoted as a GS-15 and continued to serve in her current position as Chief, Air Operations Division.

During her tenure in the Air Operations Division, Ms. Esty was responsible for all the travel requirements of Members and staff of Congress arranged by the Air Force. Ms. Esty’s calm, logical, thorough method of dealing with unique situations involved some of this country’s most important citizens, its legislators. Her true dedication to “doing it right” exemplifies an absolute commitment, and the patience under extreme daily pressure are the standards that Ms. Esty leaves for all those who follow. She coordinated and executed over 10,000 congressional trips worldwide, to include the movement of approxi-mately 70,000 Members and staff of Congress to 193 countries and 7 continents. I personally travelled on many of the trips with the Senate Armed Services delegations that Ms. Esty arranged, coordinated, and flight followed. Each was a complete success.

I join my colleagues in expressing our sincere appreciation to Ms. Esty who has provided many years of dedicated and professional service to the Congress and the U.S. Air Force and wish her well in all her future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO DR. CARL V. PATTON

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I wish today to honor in the RECORD of the Senate a great educator in the State of Georgia. On June 30, 2008, Dr. Carl V. Patton will retire as president of Georgia State University after 16 years of outstanding service.

Dr. Patton has led Georgia State University in its transition from a commuter school into a vibrant research university that is home to more than 28,000 students representing every county in the State, every State in the Nation, and 160 countries.

Georgia State has grown into one of this Nation’s leading urban research universities, reflecting Dr. Patton’s vision for a partnership between Atlanta and the university. In 1992, when designing walls to keep the city and its urban ways separate from the campus, he has insisted that the university fully integrate its research, teaching and service mission into the fabric of the urban environment of its downtown Atlanta home.

As the university has grown physically, it has grown in stature as well. The College of Law, which was in its infancy when Dr. Patton became president in 1992, is now ranked within the top 100 law schools. The Andrew Young School of Public Policy, founded in 1996, has grown from an idea to an internationally recognized program that works in over 30 countries around the globe as well as at home in the areas of health care, environment, air quality, taxation, aging, education, child care, and diversity.

The J. Mack Robinson College of Business continues to rank among the best in both graduate and undergraduate offerings, with two programs ranked in the top 10 by US News and World Report. The College of Health and Human Sciences leads the country
in research on urban health issues such as HIV, health care shortages, criminal justice, social work and nutrition.

Georgia State’s College of Arts and Sciences hosts one of only two bio-safety level 4 labs, which will move shortly into a new Science Park that this Congress has seen fit to support. The new Science Park promises to bring cutting-edge research in the bio and neuroscience and will facilitate the growth of bio-technology in Atlanta and beyond.

Finally, the College of Education is hard at work partnering with urban schools to provide a clinical, supervised method for training our future teachers to ensure the success and longevity of these new teacher careers and, most importantly, the long-term success of our children who live within our major urban centers.

Dr. Patton has lived his life in the way he hopes his students live theirs, tirelessly volunteering for service in his community through organizations such as Central Atlanta Progress, the Rotary and the Grady Memorial Hospital Corporation. However, his example and his hard work will not stop at retirement, as he plans to continue to live downtown and assist Georgia State in its future endeavors to raise capital through partnerships for the university, the city of Atlanta, the State of Georgia, and the interconnectedness of its residents, when describing the generosity and selflessness of the Elks’ giving and volunteerism there. “Almost all of them went through our schools,” he notes. “So they’re giving back to the community in which they’ve grown up, and that is just tremendous.”

Among the recognitions and awards the Oswego Elks bestowed in the local school system are Teen of the Month awards and annual scholarships for high school students. “In a smaller community like Oswego, which serves about forty-five hundred students, such awards and recognitions are by definition significant and profile strongly. Indeed, Foley can speak of them with personal zeal, since his own son, Michael, was named Teen of the Month during the 1996-1997 school year. "I have to say, I’m proud,” Foley recalls. “He held his head so high when he achieved that; it meant so much to him to be recognized.”

From such experiences, Foley says that it’s clear that “students need to receive some recognition. Being named ‘Teen of the Month’ or receiving a scholarship builds confidence, morale, and there’s nothing but positive value in this, and the Elks are having a major impact on our youth through such programs.”

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HOLY NAME OF JESUS PARISH

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I wish today to congratulate Holy Name of Jesus Catholic Church and School in Beech Grove, IN, currently celebrating the centennial year of the founding of the parish. On the weekend of June 27-29, 2008, the clergy, students, and parishioners who are part of the Holy Name community will honor this significant event. I am confident it will be a time of joy, worship, and fellowship that members will cherish well into the future.

Holy Name was founded in 1908 by the Rt. Rev. Silas Chatar, the first Bishop of Indianapolis. In its inaugural decade the parish grew steadily, and the years that followed brought about exciting changes and expansions to the facilities and ministries provided by the church. In the early 1920s, the Holy Name School was built; its first class graduated in 1923; and to date, the school has graduated over 4,200 students from prekindergarten to eighth grade.

I applaud Holy Name and its many members for the laudable service they provide local communities in the greater Indianapolis area and beyond, and I am hopeful that these festivities will be an opportunity for celebrants to not only honor the past achievements of their parish, but the blessings of another 100 years as well.

OSWEGO ELKS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask that the following statement be printed in the Record:

The statement follows.

[From the Elks Magazine, Apr. 2008]

ALL-AMERICAN LODGE—OSWEGO ELKS SHINING FORTH IN NEW YORK STATE

(By Mark Hagland)

Just because something is old doesn’t mean it’s tired. In fact, in the case of Elks Lodge No. 271, in Oswego, New York, the opposite is most, vigorously, true. The Oswego Lodge, with over eleven hundred members and a very large contingent of core active members, has been for years a leader lodge in its region, its state, and the nation. Showered with awards for outstanding success as youth programs, veterans activities, and ritual ceremony, the Oswego Lodge was designated an All-American Lodge in 2006-2007 by the GL Lodge Activities/State Associations Committee.

In fact, in the key area of youth programs, the Oswego Lodge has won first or second place in state competitions every year for more than twenty years, confirms John Rin-aldo, Oswego’s exalted ruler. “We’re absolutely committed to the youth of this community,” Rinaldol继续。the awards are evidence of the lodge’s long-term commitment, a commitment that actually goes back nearly to the beginning of the lodge’s history, he notes.

That history is a long and storied one. The Oswego Lodge was inaugurated on June 24, 1894, at a time when Grover Cleveland was in his second term as president, during the nationwide depression of 1893 to 1896.

“Of course, the depression was hard on many of the Elks,” observes him to be recognized.

Foley and Sheri Valle, referring to community leaders like Bill Foley and Sheri Valle, “is what this lodge is all about. Everything has been geared toward the kids, toward the vets, toward the community. It all comes back to what the Elks are doing for the community. As far as the All-American Lodge Award goes, I think we’ve earned it. Everyone here is committed to this community.”

“At the same time,” says Daniel Capella, a past exalted ruler of the Oswego Lodge and a past president of the New York State Elks Association, “we have a lot of fun, and that’s part of what makes it go nicely. We know how to laugh.”

Still, Capella notes, a tremendous amount of work and energy go into all the lodge’s activities, including the social activities that take place at the lodge itself: “From the first Friday in January through April, we serve three hundred or four hundred meals every Friday night here at the lodge. Volunteers show up at four o’clock in the afternoon, we start serving dinner at five, and it goes on well into the evening. And yet we’re never short of volunteers to support the Friday dinners.”

GOOD CITIZENSHIP MAGNIFIED

The Oswego Lodge demonstrates its Americanism and good citizenship in various ways,
including very strong support for local law enforcement and broad community efforts. Those efforts and that support are clearly recognized and appreciated by law enforcement officials. In a community of seventeen thousand, such good works are very much noticed.

"In a smaller city such as this, everybody seems to know that everybody else is doing," says Edward Geers, Oswego’s fire chief. "And if there’s a need in one family, everybody helps out. I visit other places, but love Oswego." He adds: "Everybody here is interested in the city as a whole and the community as a whole. If somebody’s father is in the community pulls together; and the Elks have always been a big part of that.''

The Elks’ appreciation of the people and organizations that keep the town together is shown regularly through public recognition. For the lodge’s annual public safety recognition event, called Lincoln Day in Oswego, Geers develops a profile of the personnel who might deserve the lodge’s Firefighter of the Year Award, and then he “lets the firefighters decide who they feel is worthy. And when we name that person, that person means a lot.” Geers continues, “I think everyone realizes that even though an individual wins an award, it’s not just that one individual that gets recognized. It impacts on the entire department. We stand as one, and that perception is very important for us.”

Geers, an active Elk for twenty-three years, adds: ‘I’m proud to say I’m a member of the Oswego Elks, because of the wonderful things they’ve done in the community. Other organizations do things, but the Elks are trendsetters, who make sure everything’s done right.”

Oswego’s chief of police, Michael Dehms Jr., agrees that receiving the Oswego Lodge’s public safety award is a distinct honor. “It’s good to be recognized, but when you’re recognized by an organization like the Oswego Elks, it means a lot.” Dehms notes that the Elks also have made numerous important contributions directly to public safety. For example, in the 1980s, the Oswego Lodge purchased a working police canine for the department’s canine unit. What’s more, Dehms points out, every year during the community’s annual Trivia Night, called Bartlett’s, the Elks “supply meals for our officers and state police, for the officers who have to work through it and can’t go home for dinner. And when we’ve asked for, they’ve always helped us,” he adds.

According to Dehms, the Elks “definitely set an example of community involvement. One of the Elks’ programs, for example, honors the memory of a deceased police officer by maintaining an ongoing memorial fund in his name that provides college scholarships. May 1982 easily recognizes the Oswego Elks’ exceptional volunteerism by saying that “the Elks’ contribution to the community is greater than ever involved in various activities, including youth activities. And last year, they hosted the New York Elks’ bowling tournament, which brought significant income into the city.”

Another example of the Oswego Elks’ civic involvement that Mayor Bateman cites is the Youth Community Day that the lodge sponsors every year in May. Youth Community Day includes an Elks-sponsored lunch-in for students and local government officials. At the luncheon, the mayor and various city department heads speak to the students, explaining some of the functions of city government, and give the students the opportunity to meet officials from different city agencies. Such events, Bateman says, are extremely important in helping reinforce the natural cohesiveness that already exists in a community like Oswego.

As the school district’s Bill Foley sees it, a smaller community like Oswego brings out the best in people, and the Elks of Oswego help to encourage that. “We look like a sleepy little town on the lake,” he says, “but what amazes me is the way this town always pulls together, whether during the ice storm of a few years ago, or during Harborfest. This is a caring community,” he emphasizes. “It’s almost like a community of the past. We don’t like to have anyone behind other places, but we care about each other and pull for each other. And to have folks like the Elks be so involved, it’s tremendous.”

TRIBUTE TO VESTAVIA HILLS HIGH SCHOOL

• Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would like to make some remarks today about Alabama’s State champion and national finalist in the “We the People” competition. Vestavia Hills High School placed fourth in the national We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution national finals, held in Washington, D.C., this past Summer. This competitive event, headed by the Center for Civic Education, engaged young people in the fundamental ideals and values of American constitutional government.

Members of this remarkable team from Vestavia Hills included Diana Chennells, Colleen D. Cusick, William Desmond, Felipe Goncalves, Lauren Hammonds, Peli-Lin Lin, Tyler Martin, Robert Nuttall, Shannon O’Shea, Thomas Oliver, Sean Sapp, Curry Stevenson, Andrew Swindle, Wesley Vaughn, Jay Watson, Yila Wilson, Shin Xu, and Zakiya Yazidi.

I would like to congratulate Amy Maddox, the teacher who led this fine team. Teachers shape the future, and I appreciate Ms. Maddox’s investment in these students and former educator. She is the father of three children, I have a great admiration for educators, and I am grateful that educators like Ms. Maddox are making a difference.

I would also like to thank Janice Cowin, the executive director of the Alabama Center for Law and Civic Education.

I applaud the efforts of students, teachers, and community leaders who made this accomplishment possible. Vestavia Hills High School is an exceptional school and has represented Alabama well. I encourage these students to continue pursuing a deep understanding of the Constitution and our Government. It is important that we raise up quality leaders that will serve our country in years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:14 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3642) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 5:32 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H. R. 6022: An act to suspend the acquisition of petroleum for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, for other purposes.


The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. Byrd).

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–6276. A communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the receipts and expenditures of the Senate from October 1, 2007 through March 31, 2008; ordered to lie on the table.

EC–6277. A communication from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Cyproconazole; Pesticide Tolerance” (FRL–8276–6278. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act that occurred within the Department of the Navy and has been assigned case number 07–96, to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–6279. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Environment), transmitting, pursuant to law, notification of the Department’s decision to conduct a streamlined competition of aircraft maintenance functions performed by the Department of the Navy, marine MRE Support Squadrions at Andrews Air Force Base, MD; to the Committee on Armed Services.
EC–6260. A communication from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Landfill Emissions: Site-Specific Treatment Variance for P and U-Listed Hazardous Mixed Wastes Treated by Vacuum Thermal Desorption at the Energy Solutions, Inc., Clive, Utah" (FR No. 8565–9) received on May 13, 2008; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6261. A communication from the Director, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Rule for Implementation of the New Source Performance Standards for Particulate Matter Less Than 2.5 Micrometers" (RIN 20600–AN160) (FRL No. 8566–1) received on May 13, 2008; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6262. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the feasibility study that was undertaken to evaluate hurricane and storm damage reduction opportunities for Pawleys Island, South Carolina; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6263. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Assumption of Liabilities" (RIN 1545–BH5) (TD 9397) received on May 13, 2008; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6264. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicaid Rebates" (Rev. Rul. 2008–26) received on May 13, 2008; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6265. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "QSP: Reverse Subsidiary Merger; Step Transaction" (Rev. Rul. 2008–25) received on May 13, 2008; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6266. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Section 966 Rep Exemption Relief" (Rev. Proc. 2008–26) received on May 13, 2008; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6267. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Simplified Relief from Withholding Tax Upon Disposition of U.S.-Related Property Interests!" (Rev. Proc. 2008–27) received on May 13, 2008; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6268. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles to Chile for the manufacture of the SIG556 Rifle; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6269. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles to Brazil for the SP 2022 semi-automatic pistol; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6270. A communication from the Director of Regulations Management, National Cemetery Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Grave Marked with a Private Headstone or Marker" (RIN 29900–AM93) received on May 13, 2008; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC–6271. A communication from the Director of Regulations Management, Office of General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Certification of a Proposed Manufacturing License Agreement for the Export of Defense Articles to Brazil" (RIN 29900–AM62) received on May 13, 2008; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment—S. 2511. A bill to grant the program for law enforcement armor vests to provide for a waiver of or reduction in the matching funds requirement in the case of fiscal hardship.

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute—S. 2913. A bill to provide a limitation on judicial remedies in copyright infringement cases involving orphan works.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. INOUYE for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation—*William J. Brennan, of Maine, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere. *Lily Fu Claffee, of Illinois, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee’s commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. BOXER: S. 3029. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the postmarket surveillance of devices; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. SNYDER, Mr. CREIGHTON, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. WILKINSON, Mr. LEONARDI, Mr. CASEY, Mr. RIVLIN, Mr. LINCOLN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. VOINOVICH, and Mr. WICKER): S. Res. 566. A resolution designating June 2008 as ‘‘National Internet Safety Month’’; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. VINOGRADOVICH, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BOND, Mr. GIGEOG, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER): S. Res. 566. A resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the National Governors Association; considered and agreed to.
ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS  

S. 211  
At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 211, a bill to facilitate nationwide availability of 2-1-1 telephone service for information and referral on human services, volunteer services, and for other purposes.

S. 400  
At the request of Mr. SUNUNU, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 400, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that dependent students who take a medically necessary leave of absence do not lose health insurance coverage, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1437, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the semicentennial of the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

S. 196  
At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 196, a bill to understand and comprehensively address the oral health problems associated with methamphetamine use.

S. 197  
At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 197, a bill to amend Attachment I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to understand and comprehensively address the inmate oral health problems associated with methamphetamine use, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2040, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the alternative tax liability limitation for small property and casualty insurance companies.

S. 2059  
At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2059, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for direct graduate medical education and responsible state secrets privilege Act.

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Ms. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2553, a bill to enact a safe, fair, and responsible state secrets privilege Act.

S. 2565  
At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2565, a bill to provide for the enhancement of the suicide prevention programs of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

S. 2566  
At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2566, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage investment in affordable housing, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2585, a bill to authorize programs to increase the number of nurses within the Armed Forces through assistance for service as nurse faculty or education as nurses, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from California (Mr. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2766, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to address certain discharges incidental to the normal operation of a recreational vessel.

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) were added as cosponsors of S. 2766, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act addressing certain discharges incidental to the normal operation of a recreational vessel.

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2781, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase the per resident payment floor for direct graduate medical education payments under the Medicare program.

At the request of Ms. LANDREI, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2790, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of comprehensive cancer care planning under the Medicare program and to improve the care furnished to individuals diagnosed with cancer by establishing a Medicare hospice care demonstration program and grants programs for cancer palliative care and symptom management programs, provider education, and related research.

S. 2795  
At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHER) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2795, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a nationwide health insurance purchasing pool for small businesses and the self employed that would offer a choice of private health plans and make health coverage more affordable, predictable, and accessible.

S. 2862  
At the request of Mr. SANDERS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2862, a bill to provide for National Science Foundation and National Aeronautics and Space Administration utilization of the Arecibo Observatory.

S. 2874  
At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2874, a bill to amend titles 5, 10, 37, and 38, United States Code, to ensure the fair treatment of a member of the Armed Forces who is discharged from the Armed Forces, at the request of the member, pursuant to the Department of Defense policy permitting the early discharge of an only surviving child in a family in which the father or mother, or one or more siblings, served in the Armed Forces and, because of hazards incident to such
service, was killed, died as a result of wounds, accident, or disease, is in a captured or missing in action status, or is permanently disabled, and for other purposes.

S. 3023

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIBERMAN) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 3023, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exempt complex rehabilitation products and assistive technology products from the Medicare competitive acquisition program.

S. 3022

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 3022, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program to provide assistance for poison prevention, sustain the funding of poison centers, and enhance the public health of people of the United States.

S. 2938

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) were added as cosponsors of S. 2938, a bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to improve educational assistance for members of the Armed Forces and veterans in order to enhance recruitment and retention for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2932

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. SALAZAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2932, a bill to authorize funding for the National Media Campaign, and grant programs to provide educational assistance for members of the Armed Forces and veterans to become college graduates and to enhance the global competitiveness of Americans.

S. 2930

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. SNOWE) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2930, a bill to authorize the National Media Campaign, and grant programs to assist college-bound members of the Armed Forces and veterans to become college graduates and to enhance the global competitiveness of Americans.

S. 2907

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2907, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, to provide for the extension of the American Opportunity Tax Credit, and for other purposes.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 411, a resolution designating July 26, 2008 as "National Day of the American Cowboy".

S. RES. 541

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) were added as co-sponsors of S. Res. 541, a resolution supporting humanitarian assistance, protection of civilians, accountability for abuses in Somalia, and urgent concrete progress in line with the Transitional Federal Charter of Somalia toward the establishment of a viable government of national unity.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 3023. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to prescribe regulations relating to the notice to be provided claimants with the Department of Veteran's Affairs regarding the substantiation of claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, today I introduce the proposed Veterans' Notice Clarification Act of 2008. This bill would require VA to issue regulations specifying the content of notices provided to claimants who seek VA benefits and services. Following a number of court decisions, VA's notification letters to veterans have become increasingly long, complex, and difficult to understand.

The notification letters must be simplified, as veterans, VA, veterans' advocates and outside review bodies have all recommended. These letters should use ordinary language rather than bureaucratic legalese and they should be focused on the specific type of claim that the veteran is bringing.

My bill would require different notice contents depending upon whether the claim is an original claim, a claim to reopen, or a claim for an increase in benefits. VA would also have the discretion to provide additional or alternative contents for notice if appropriate to the benefits sought. For example, an original claim for service-connected compensation may require different content than a claim for a specially adapted housing grant.

The notice required for original claims by the Veterans Claims Assistance Act, Public Law 106-467, should provide useful information based on the documents submitted to VA and the benefit sought. The information and evidence requested by VA should be relevant to the claim filed. For example, the information and evidence requested by VA for a claim for disability compensation and financial information concerning claims for pension benefits are wholly different. A veteran would not be made to submit information that is unrelated to his or her claim.

I believe that this bill, if enacted, will assist VA in developing appropriate criteria to implement the requirements of the current law. In addition, courts which review appeals from VA decisions should find it easier to identify errors in notification by measuring the notice against clear regulatory criteria.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this measure, so that veterans, survivors and dependent seeking VA benefits may be provided with clearer and more understandable notices.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3023

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Veterans' Notice Clarification Act of 2008”.

SEC. 2. REGULATIONS ON CONTENTS OF NOTICE TO BE PROVIDED CLAIMANTS WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS REGARDING THE SUBSTANTIATION OF CLAIMS.

Section 510(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “Upon receipt”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2)(A) The Secretary shall prescribe in regulations requirements relating to the content of notice to be provided under this subsection.

“(B) The regulations required by this paragraph—

(i) shall specify different contents for notice depending on whether the claim concerned is an original claim, a claim for reopening a prior decision on a claim, or a claim for an increase in benefits;

(ii) may provide additional or alternative contents for notice if appropriate to the benefit or services sought under the claim;

(iii) shall specify for each type of claim for benefits the general information and evidence required to substantiate the basic elements of such type of claim; and

(iv) shall specify the timing of the issuance of notice.”.

By Mr. REID (for Mrs. CLINTON):

S. 3027. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to establish a program to provide college coaches to low- and middle-income high-achieving high school students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, in honor of AmeriCorps Week, I am pleased to introduce legislation that will place more of our Nation's low- and middle-income high school students on the road to higher education. My legislation will address the disparity that exists in college persistence between lower-income, high-achieving students and their more affluent peers.

According to the National Educational Longitudinal Survey, NELS, more than 1.5 million high school students with annual household incomes of less than $15,000 do not earn college degrees despite having ranked in the top half of their high school classes. Further, a recent report from the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation found that 59 percent of lower-income high-achieving students graduated from college compared to 77 percent of their higher-income peers. America cannot remain competitive in the global economy if we continue to squander our college talent every year. With that in mind, I am sponsoring the Coaching Our Adolescents for College Heights Act, or the COACH Act.

May 15, 2008
The COACH Act creates a pilot AmeriCorps program to recruit, train, and place recent college graduates, or coaches, in high schools to help prepare low- and middle-income, high-performing high school students for success in college. Under this program, coaches will be responsible for working with school staff to build a strong college-going culture within their high schools. Coaches will be paired with a cohort of low- and middle-income, high-achieving students to ensure student enrollment and success in college-prep coursework and to connect participating students with summer internships, community service activities, and other opportunities that will enrich each student’s academic experience. Coaches will also help students and their parents in understanding the college application, admissions, and financial aid processes as well as work with students to select and enroll in the college-going culture that best meet each student’s educational and social needs.

The role of coaches will not end once students are enrolled in college, as coaches will be required to monitor their students’ academic performance and social adjustment through the end of each student’s first year of college. In this way, coaches will ensure that students are connected to the support services they need to persist in and ultimately graduate from college.

A recent study by the Consortium on Chicago School Research found that only 41 percent of students who aspired to go to college took the steps necessary in their senior year to apply and enroll in a four-year college, despite being well-qualified for even the most selective colleges and universities. It is among these students that the Nation suffers the greatest loss in potential talent. Unfortunately, the challenge is not that high schools are struggling to provide these students with necessary guidance. In 2002, the National Center of Education Statistics found that the average ratio of high school students to full-time guidance counselors was 315 to 1. Furthermore, only 10 percent of public schools have advisors whose sole responsibility is college counseling. The COACH Act not only addresses the need to prepare our high-achieving, low- and middle-income students for college, but it also engages eager AmeriCorps members as a necessary resource for completing this task.

I hope my colleagues will join me in this effort to help these students succeed in higher education and compete in the global economy.

By Mr. REID (for Mrs. CLINTON): S. 925 A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to promote community service among United States youth by connecting secondary school seniors to community service opportunities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, in honor of AmeriCorps Week, I am pleased to introduce a bill that will help keep our Nation’s high school seniors engaged in learning and community service. My legislation will connect high school seniors to service opportunities within their schools or communities while earning money for college.

The senior year of high school is a crucial transition time for youth. Despite this fact, many twelfth grade students opt to take less challenging coursework or no courses at all during their final year of high school, a phenomenon commonly termed “senioritis.” I strongly believe we should use this opportunity to provide a service-oriented education for young people across the country. That is why I am sponsoring the Senior Year Community Service Act.

This legislation will create a pilot program to enable six local educational agencies with service opportunities within their communities or schools. The bill calls on the Corporation of National and Community Service to assist local educational agencies with the implementation of this pilot program. Using grant funds, the local educational agency will establish a partnership with a community based organization to implement this pilot program, provide a service coordinator to assist participating high schools, and provide information to students about this program as early as their junior year.

The Senior Year Community Service Act also requires the Department of Education to study the effects of this program on participating seniors. The evaluation will measure student academic achievement on State academic assessments, graduation rates and student rates of college enrollment, persistence and graduation. If the evaluation proves that this program is successful in increasing student achievement, the legislation calls upon the Department of Education to make this program a universal experience for high school seniors.

Research has shown that participation in community service activities can lead to increased student achievement. In one study, students involved in community service and service-learning reported higher grades and better school attendance. In another study, civically-engaged high school students tended to make greater academic progress and were more likely to graduate from college.

The benefits of community service participation can reach beyond the school walls. The National Service-Learning Clearinghouse notes that in addition to increased academic achievement, service learning contributes to students’ increased self-efficacy, enhanced problem-solving skills, and enhanced civic engagement.

We have seen colleges and universities take their own approaches to solving the problem of “senioritis.” Earlier this year, the New York Times reported that a handful of universities are taking action against slacking high school seniors—ranging from requiring students to meet monthly with the dean of admissions once enrolled, to rescinding admission status completely. Programs that keep seniors engaged in school can prevent college-bound students from squandering their precious opportunities.

The Senior Year Community Service Act will prevent many high school students from wasting their senior year and makes community service a common expectation for high school seniors. I hope that my Senate colleagues will join me in supporting this bill that will help our youth stay on track for a bright and successful future.

SENATE RESOLUTION 567—A BILL DESIGNATING JUNE 2008 AS “NATIONAL INTERNET SAFETY MONTH”

Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. COCHETTE, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KERRY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. VONOICH, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

SENATE RESOLUTION 567
Whereas there are more than 1,000,000,000 Internet users worldwide;
Whereas, in the United States, 35,000,000 children in kindergarten through grade 12 have Internet access;
Whereas approximately 86 percent of the children of the United States in grades 5 through 12 are online for at least 1 hour per week;
Whereas approximately 67 percent of students in grades 5 through 12 do not share their online activities with their parents;
Whereas approximately 31 percent of the students in grades 5 through 12 do not share their online activities with their parents;
Whereas approximately 31 percent of the students in grades 5 through 12 do not share their online activities with their parents;
Whereas 47 percent of parents feel that online bullying of children is an issue that needs to be addressed;
Whereas 61 percent of parents feel that their ability to monitor and shelter their children from inappropriate material on the Internet is limited;
Whereas 61 percent of parents want to be more personally involved with Internet safety; Now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) designates June 2008 as “National Internet Safety Month”;
Mr. BOND, Mr. GREGG, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

SA RES. 568

Whereas, in 1908, President Theodore Roosevelt invited the Nation’s Governors to the White House to conserve America’s natural resources;
Whereas the Governors decided to form an association through which they could continue to come together on a bipartisan basis to discuss mutual concerns and share State practices;
Whereas, 100 years later, the National Governors Association serves as the voice of the 55 Governors of States, commonwealths, and territories;
Whereas, for the past century, Governors have utilized the organization to explore issues, develop solutions, and build consensus on diverse national policies;
Whereas the National Governors Association has played a key role in shaping public policy and addressing America’s most pressing challenges; and
Whereas the National Governors Association is celebrating gubernatorial leadership—honoring the past, celebrating the present, and embracing the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

(a) recognizes the leadership of the Nation’s Governors and their contributions to American politics and society; and
(b) commemores the 100th anniversary of the founding of the National Governors Association.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4777. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4751 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. GREGG (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY)) to the bill H.R. 980, to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4778. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4751 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. GREGG (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY)) to the bill H.R. 980, to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. 1. AUTHORIZATION OF THE EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUVENILE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 506 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (22 U.S.C. 3758) is amended by striking “for fiscal year 2006” through the period and inserting “for each of the fiscal years 2006 through 2012.”

SA 4779. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 980, to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. 2. LIFE AT CONCEPTION.

(a) The 14th Amendment, and declaring such protection is a right enjoyed by each human being from the time of conception.

SA 4780. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 980, to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions; which was ordered to lie on the table.
him to the bill H.R. 980, to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 4(a). MEMBERS-ONLY BARGAINING.
(a) MEMBERS-ONLY BARGAINING.—Section 4(b) of the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) In order to protect the rights of the individual worker—

(A) prohibiting a State or local government from entering into an exclusive representation agreement with a labor organization; and

(B) ensuring that a labor organization is only representing its own members, and that the rights of nonmembers to bargain on their own behalf is provided for;.

(b) ROLE OF THE AUTHORITY.—Section 5(a) of the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007 is amended by striking “in section 4(b)” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “in section 4(b)”.

SA 4781. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 980, to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 4(b). LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.
(a) PREVENTING PAYROLL DEDUCTION.—Section 4(b) of the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007 is amended by striking “in section 4(b)” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “in section 4(b)”.

(b) ROLE OF THE AUTHORITY.—Section 5(a) of the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007 is amended by striking “in section 4(b)” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “in section 4(b)”.

SA 4784. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 980, to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 4(c). PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER RIGHT-TO-WORK.
Section 4(b) of this Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) Forbidding any public safety employer from negotiating a contract or memorandum of understanding that requires the payment of any fees to any labor organization as a condition of employment.”.

SA 4785. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 980, to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: On page __, line __, insert the following:

SEC. 4(d). COLLECTION OF UNION DUES FROM ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS PROHIBITED.
(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for a labor organization to collect dues or initiation fees from any individual who is physically present in the United States in violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(b) STATE RESPONSIBILITIES.—

(1) In general.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a State law shall be deemed to have failed to substantially provide for the rights and responsibilities described in section 4(b) unless the Authority determines that such law, in addition to meeting such rights and responsibilities, prohibits labor organizations from collecting dues or initiation fees from any individual who is physically present in the United States in violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(2) ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—The Authority may issue and enforce regulations to carry out paragraph (1) in the manner provided under section 5.

(c) DECREETIFICATION OF PUBLIC SAFETY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.—In addition to any enforcement measures authorized under subsection (b), if the Authority determines that a labor organization has violated any provision under subsection (a) or (b), the Authority shall issue an order that decertifies the labor organization or otherwise notifies the labor organization that the organization will no longer be recognized by the Authority as the exclusive representative of employees for collective bargaining purposes.

(d) REQUIRED PARTICIPATION BY PUBLIC SAFETY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 402(e) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (title IV of division C of Public Law 104–208; 8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—All labor organizations (as defined in section 3 of the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007) shall elect to participate in the basic pilot program and shall comply with the terms and conditions of such election.

“(B) VERIFICATION OF ALL MEMBERS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, each participating labor organization shall use the confirmation system to seek confirmation of the identity and employment eligibility of each member of such labor organization.

“(C) DEADLINE FOR COMPLIANCE.—The verifications required under subparagraph (B) shall be completed—

“(i) not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007 for all members of the labor organization as of such date; and

“(ii) for individuals who become members of such labor organization after such date of enactment, not later than 14 days after the commencement of such membership.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate May 15, 2008, at 3 p.m. in Executive Session to consider pending military nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 15, 2008, at 10 a.m. in room 233 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 15, 2008, at 10 a.m. in room 223 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 15, 2008, at 1:50 p.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 15, 2008, at 2 p.m. to hold a hearing on U.S.-China relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 15, 2008, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Nuclear Terrorism: Providing Medical Care and Meeting Basic Needs in the Aftermath.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 15, 2008, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-502 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, to conduct an executive business meeting on Thursday, May 15, 2008, at 10 a.m. in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs’ Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 15, 2008, at 2 p.m. in order to conduct a hearing entitled, “National Security Bureau of Arms Control, Counterproliferation, and Nonproliferation Part I: The Role of the Department of State.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jenna Jones of my staff be granted floor privileges for the duration of today’s session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff of the Finance Committee be allowed on the Senate floor for the duration of the debate on the farm bill: Ayeshah Khanna, Bridget Mallon, Scott Guenther, Bruce Ferguson, Kelsey Hamilton, Libby Cohn, Nathan Ensmail, Ezana Teferra, Jeremiah Langston, and Thea Murray.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Caryn Long from my staff be granted the privilege of the floor for today and throughout the remaining time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENCOURAGING DISPLAY OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES ON FATHER’S DAY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2356 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2356) to amend title 4, United States Code, to encourage the display of the flag of the United States on Father’s Day.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2356) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS UNDER THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT AND THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3029 introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3029) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, on May 23, 2008, many of the Small Business Administration’s programs and authorities will expire.

Unfortunately, it has become commonplace for those in the small business community to face an expiration of the programs they depend upon. Since September 30, 2006, we have had to pass four temporary extensions to keep the Small Business Administration authorized. And here we are, yet again, trying to pass a temporary bill to continue these vital small business programs—this time through March 20, 2009.

Since Democrats took the majority over a year ago, the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship has worked hard to create a good climate for small businesses in this country. To that end, we have had 20 hearings, 6 roundtables, and passed 5 major bills out of committee to address the needs of the small business community, needs which have gone unmet in the past 7 years. During that time, we have often encountered obstruction from the administration and Republican congressional leadership. Despite the cooperation of the very supportive ranking member I have in Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE, who is cosponsoring this legislation, some on the other side have blocked the appointment of conferees, which leaves us unable to confer with the House and get much-needed legislation signed into law. The Republicans, now in the minority, fear what will happen in a conference. Rather than work through differences and accomplish something, it is easier to block legislation. Who suffers from all this needless obstruction? Small business owners and their employees.

Just today, we saw how it is possible to get things done. S. 163, the Small Business Disaster Response and Loan Improvements Act of 2007, was included in the farm bill conference report. This legislation, which was added as an amendment to the farm bill, was then negotiated with the House as part of the farm bill conference, allowing us to enact meaningful reforms in the way Small Business Administration comes to the aid of disaster victims.

My hope is that once we have this extension bill in place, the administration and the Republican leadership will realize that five temporary authorizations are too many and allow our committee to do what it has been attempting to do, which is to do a comprehensive reauthorization of the rest of the small business programs. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to pass this temporary bill and then give us the support we need for a comprehensive reauthorization of small business programs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 3029) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration", approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109–316; 120 Stat. 1742), as most recently amended by section 1 of Public Law 110–136 (121 Stat. 1453), is amended by striking "May 23, 2008" each place it appears and inserting "March 20, 2009".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on May 22, 2008.

SIGNING AUTHORIZATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, Senator REID, of Nevada be authorized to sign enrolled bills during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 18, 2008

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m., Monday, May 19; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 19, 2008, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:36 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 19, 2008, at 2 p.m.
TRIBUTE TO MRS. MARY ELLEN TOLLIVER

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater gift that one can give when they give of themselves and Mr. Speaker such was the life and such is the legacy of Mrs. Mary Ellen Tolliver.

Mary Ellen Tolliver was born on September 1, 1915 in Richmond, Virginia; to the union of the late Thomas Day and Georgetta Walker-Day. Mary Ellen Day was the oldest of four children.

On Tuesday, May 13, 2008 at 2:30 a.m., God called Mary Ellen Day home for she had done her part. “Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled neither let it be afraid” (John 14:27).

Mary Ellen Day moved to Pennsylvania as a young child with her family where she attended the public school system. Mary Ellen Day was married to John L. Toliver in 1935 and they attended Enon Tabernacle Baptist Church in Germantown, where she worshiped until her passing. John and Mary Toliver never had children of their own, but considered many in the community as their own family and provided them with values and traditions that will live on forever.

Mary Ellen Toliver dedicated her life to the field of mental health. She worked as a nurse at the Byeberry State Mental Hospital in Pennsylvania, also known as the Philadelphia State Hospital for 40 years from where she retired.

While at Byeberry, Mary Ellen Toliver became close to and took two long-term patients from Byeberry into her home in Germaintown. Julia and Sweeney were abandoned by their families, but felt at peace with Mary Ellen. Julia and Sweeney were adopted by Mary Ellen and they attended Enon Tabernacle Baptist Church family.

CONGRATULATING TOM HAMBY ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JO BONNER
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. BONNER. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Tom Hamby, on the occasion of his retirement from AT&T Inc.

A native of Social Circle, Georgia, Tom earned a Bachelor of Science degree in engineering at the University of Georgia. He was commissioned in the Army Corps of Engineers and went on to serve 10 years in the reserves and National Guard.

As the Birmingham News described Tom, he is “one of Birmingham’s most influential business leaders.” With a career spanning over 37 years, Tom has served in various assignments in the network, marketing, and regulatory departments in Georgia, Alabama, and Washington, DC, and was appointed to his current position, AT&T president—Alabama, in 1999.

In the early 1990s, Tom led the effort to bring caller identification and voice mail products to customers. During his tenure as president, the Alabama Legislature passed landmark telecommunication legislation, which led to greater competition, investment, customer choice as well as new services.

Tom is also well-known in Birmingham and throughout the State of Alabama as a leader in both the business and civic communities. He is chairman of the board of the Birmingham Museum of Art and the Greater Alabama Council of Boy Scouts of America. He is a past chairman of Birmingham’s Metropolitan Development Board, the Business Council of Alabama, and the Birmingham Regional Chamber of Commerce. He is a current director on the boards of Protective Life Corp. and the Birmingham Civil Rights Institute.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a dedicated community leader and friend to many throughout the State of Alabama. I know his family; his wife, Wyona; and his many friends join me in praising his accomplishments and extending thanks for his service over the years on behalf of the city of Birmingham and the State of Alabama.

Tom will surely enjoy the well deserved time he now has to spend with family and his first grandchild, who is due this summer. I wish him the best of luck in all of his future endeavors.

HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF HELEN MYERS

HON. JERRY McNERNEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. McNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mrs. Helen Myers as the Brentwood Chamber of Commerce’s Citizen of the Year. Helen is an extraordinary woman whose entrepreneurial endeavors, generous spirit, and deep commitment to the residents of Brentwood will benefit our community and businesses for generations to come.

One of seven children, Helen’s father passed away when she was only five years old. To support her family during this time of need, she began selling produce from her mother’s vegetable garden to neighbors. This entrepreneurial spirit carried into her adulthood, and she is now a successful small business owner of both Irene’s Dress Shop and The WeatherVane.

The only child in her family to graduate from high school, Helen went on to marry Bill Myers. Together they moved to California, and eventually settled in Brentwood in 1968 with their two children Corky and Helen.

Soon after moving to Brentwood, Helen joined the East Contra Costa Chapter of the Soroptimists International Club, of which she has proven to be both a valuable member and a tireless volunteer. She has not only been instrumental in raising funds for various community projects, she has also served on numerous boards and commissions, including the Delta Hospital Board, the City’s Art Commission, and the Art Society Board.

Helen’s friends and family describe her as someone who is always looking out for others. As an example of her kindness, friends often tell the story of the time Helen caught a young woman shoplifting in one of her stores. After soon learning the woman was homeless and living out of her car with her young child, Helen decided against calling the police, and instead provided the woman with food and clothing and contacted a social service agency to assist her with housing. A few weeks later, the young woman returned to Helen, thanked her for her compassion, and reimbursed her for the food and the clothing.

A woman who has given so much to her community, Helen has done so quietly and without fanfare, making her selection as the Brentwood Chamber of Commerce’s Citizen of the Year the long and distinguished career of Tom Hamby, on the occasion of his retirement from AT&T Inc.

It is for these reasons that I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Helen Myers, Brentwood Chamber of Commerce’s Citizen of the Year.
Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Conference Committee for its hard work on the Farm Bill, and for all of the improvements the final bill makes to existing nutrition, conservation, organic farming and other important programs. But I also must express my great disappointment that, in this year of record crop prices and soaring agricultural profits, we have let a precious opportunity go by to implement real reform to the extremely outdated commodity and price support programs in the bill.

The good news today fills a long list. According to the USDA, more than 11 percent of U.S. households are food-insecure, including more than $1 billion for The Emergency Food Assistance Program and more than $1 billion for the U.S. School Lunch Program. This bill also increases the minimum benefit for food stamp recipients and excludes retirement and education savings accounts from the assets to be considered in determining eligibility. And I am particularly pleased to see that it includes $5 million in funding annually for Community Food Projects grants, which funding I have previously urged Congress to maintain and which I engaged in a colloquy about with the gentlelady from Connecticut Ms. DeLAURO in connection with the Fiscal Year 2008 Agriculture Appropriations Bill.

Similarly, the bill before us today will authorize almost $8 billion in conservation funding, including increasing funding for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program by $3.4 billion, adding more than $1 billion in new funding for the Conservation Security Program, re-establishing the funding level for the Wetlands Reserve Program at $1.4 billion, and doubling funding for the Farm and Ranchland Protection Program. And I was especially pleased to see that the House-passed provision that would have restricted USDA conservation programs from encouraging farmers to reduce their use of toxic pesticides in implementing integrated pest management programs was removed from the final bill, and I would like to thank the two dozen Members who joined me in sending a letter to the Conference to request that the pesticides discrimination provision be removed.

The Farm Bill supports organic farmers by providing $22 million in funding for the USDA's organic certification cost share program, which defrays the costs that organic producers incur when seeking organic certification. It provides $5 million in funding for organic marketing data, and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments of up to $20,000 per year, capped at $80,000 over six years, to a producer for conservation practices related to organic production or the transition of non-organic production. This bill also supported facilitating the conversion to organic farming, and was delighted to have the support of this chamber when it voted in favor of my amendment to the Fiscal Year 2007 Agriculture Appropriations Bill to more than double the funding for the Organic Transitions Research program.

Therefore, although I will be voting in favor of this bill today, for all of the good that it will do, I note that there is still a substantial amount of good that it should have done, and will not. Although the commodity programs in the bill account for less than 13 percent of the Farm Bill funding, and represent a decrease of $60 billion compared to the last Farm Bill in 2002, we could have, and should have, done better.

First, although cuts to direct payments totaled $300 million, that represents a decrease of less than one percent to the $50 billion program. At the same time, subsidies for commodities such as soybeans and wheat have actually increased, despite the fact that prices for those commodities have also increased—by more than 100 percent and 200 percent, respectively, since 2002. The House-passed Farm Bill would have guaranteed $840 million in funding for the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program over five years, but in the final bill the program was cut to one tenth that amount—only $84 million. According to news reports, the amount of international food aid provided represents less than 1 percent of the Farm Bill’s total cost, while at the same time the bill preserves the trade-distorting subsidy programs that make it virtually impossible for farmers in developing nations to compete.

And finally, I was troubled to learn that an 11th-hour change was inserted into the bill by the Conference Committee, despite it not having been debated or voted on in either Chamber, that would negate a U.S. Court of Appeals, DC Circuit ruling mandating disclosure of USDA data relevant to producer compliance with subsidy programs. In reaching its decision, the Court stated that “there is a special need for public scrutiny of agency action that determines extensive amounts of public funds in the form of subsidies and other financial benefits.” No title of the Farm Bill has been more hotly debated than the commodity title, the original justifications for which have all but evaporated over time, and thus it troubles me that a provision that not only goes to the very heart of that matter but also appears to fly squarely in the face of a recent court ruling on the subject is being put before this body without debate or a specific vote on the merits. In fact, I intend to request a hearing on this last-minute language.

Therefore, this is one of those decisions that is not clear cut. On balance, I feel that the good news in the Farm Bill outweighs the bad, although not by much. I want to commend my colleague from Wisconsin Mr. KND for his continuing leadership in working to develop a Farm Bill that more equitably reflects our modern day needs and economic realities, and I want him to know that I look forward to working with him and others in the future to address the shortcomings of this bill.
KEEPRING SPORTS IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an excellent May 13th article by Steve Politi of The Star Ledger entitled “Spygate Shouldn’t Concern Congress.” It emphasizes the importance of Congress remaining focused on critical national issues such as economy, healthcare, education and the war.

(From the Star-Ledger, May 13, 2008)

SPYGATE SHOULDN’T CONCERN CONGRESS
(By Steve Politi)

If Congress really wanted to make a difference in our lives, it could hold hearings on how to make our annoying sports storylines go away. Start with the endless debate over Joba Chamberlain and his eighth-inning celebrations, then move to Roger Clemens’ cross personal life.

Then, and only then, should Washington tackle “Spygate,” which has dragged on through the season and has the legs to make it to training camp. No matter what Roger Goodell declares today after meeting with fired Patriots video assistant Matt Walsh, the NFL commissioner can’t get rid of this one himself.

Arlen Specter will see to that. The Pennsylvania senator plans to meet with Walsh this afternoon, and it’s hard to believe he’ll emerge from their conversation and tell the world that the matter is settled. Which means, sometime in the near future, Bill Belichick will be packing his hoodoo for a trip to Washington and another unnecessary sports-related hearing.

Specter is another politician who has figured out that the quickest path to easy publiclicity—and to getting noticed by his football-loving constituency—is to take on a sports issue. Why settle for C-SPAN when you can get on ESPN and a few hundred sports radio stations, too?

Congress can make an impact on a sports issue occasionally, as it did with steroids in baseball. With the possible early hearings, Major League Baseball would have continued to take its time cleaning up the sport and Mark McGwire might have mustered a bust in Cooperstown.

But what, exactly, would society gain from a hearing into the Spygate mess? Is it to set an example for kids who might steal signals at the season opener against them that way belongs to the NFL. Of course, but the responsibility for keeping the line of communication and the war.

Whether a mass on Roger Clemens’ Steroids is a legitimate public problem.

It is hard to believe that Specter’s motives are pure. Beyond the usual grandstanding for the camera, his secondary political contributor is Comcast, which is battling the NFL over fees for the NFL Network. Taps on the list? Comcast’s Washington lobbying firm.

Soaring cable bills! Now there’s a good topic for a Congressional hearing. We love a good conspiracy, but the only way Spygate resembles Spygate is that it has dominated the news. Bill Belichick is not Richard Nixon. He shouldn’t be heading to Washington.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JERRY WELLER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to enter into the RECORD votes I would have cast had I been present for rollcall votes 306 through 317. I am honored to commend to the House the personal reasons.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to enter into the RECORD votes I would have cast had I been present for rollcall votes 306 through 317. I am honored to commend to the House the personal reasons.

HON. JIM JORDAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I am honored to commend to the House the distinguished service of PFC Wilbur J. (Web) Fenbert for being named 2008 Veteran of the Year.

HONORING PFC WILBUR J. (WEB) FENBERT FOR BEING NAMED 2008 VETERAN OF THE YEAR
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HONORING PFC WILBUR J. (WEB) FENBERT FOR BEING NAMED 2008 VETERAN OF THE YEAR

HON. JIM JORDAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I am honored to commend to the House the distinguished service of PFC Wilbur J. (Web) Fenbert to the United States of America during World War II. PFC Fenbert will receive Veteran of the Year honors at an Armed Forces Day celebration breakfast this weekend.

During his time in the military, Web served in the 4th Armored Division which was the spearhead of the 3rd Army as it pushed into German territory. Web was an ambulance driver and moved casualties to field hospitals. In 1944, on Christmas Day, his division moved into Bastogne, and casualties had to be evacuated to the field hospital in Chaumont. Web bravely made seven trips through German artillery shell fire as he carried 22 wounded soldiers to the hospital.

Web’s closest call was in a combat offensive called Task Force Baum while involved in a mission to liberate the concentration camp at Hanneburg, Germany. The camp was sixty miles behind German lines. Web picked up five casualties from a battle at Schweinheim and took them back to the field hospital. Once there, he was ordered not to return. Although the Task Force reached Hanneburg, they ran into a Panzer Division on their return. All Task Force members were either killed or taken as prisoners of war.

Web has many war memories. One is of seeing General Patton and General Eisen-
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only to the Nation’s top college and university leaders. He spent the next academic year at Fairleigh Dickinson University in New Jersey.

Upon his return in 2005, he was named to the newly created position of Vice President for Governmental Affairs and University Outreach; the position he will leave on May 28, 2008. Making a strong impact from the start, Dr. Durnil oversaw the creation, direction and implementation of strategic activities focused on governmental, community, public and external relations for the university.

Through Dr. Durnil’s efforts, Roosevelt University gained national and international recognition as a major sponsor for the 2006 Gay Games, which were hosted by the City of Chicago. From serving as a registration site for the 140,000 participants to hosting a mayoral press conference on campus to providing housing for athletes, Roosevelt University was a major part of this event, thanks to Dr. Durnil. His hard work and penchant for developing productive and solid relationships in Springfield and Washington, DC, has resulted in a strengthened presence and recognition for the university with elected officials.

With deep appreciation and admiration for his efforts, I thank Dr. Durnil for his service to Roosevelt University and the city of Chicago and wish him well in his new endeavors.

CONGRATULATING JULIAN SMITH ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JO BONNER
OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. BONNER. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I rise to honor the long and distinguished career of Julian Smith, on the occasion of his retirement from Alabama Power Company.

With a career spanning over 34 years, Julian rose through the ranks of the Alabama Power Company. Julian joined Alabama Power in 1974 in the construction department at Greene County Steam Plant. In 1982, he transitioned to the governmental affairs department, and in 1991, he was promoted to vice president of governmental affairs. Julian assumed his current position, vice president of corporate relations, in 2000.

Julian has been active in Alabama politics his entire adult life. He served as corporate liaison to former Alabama Governor Don Siegelman. In 2001, he was appointed to the Delta Regional Authority as well as the Alabama Commission on Physical Fitness. Julian also served as corporate liaison for the creation of the Alabama Black Belt Community Foundation, leading Alabama Power to partner with Auburn University in their effort to establish a Regional Foundation for the Black Belt.

Julian serves on the board of trustees for Marion Military Institute. He is an alumnus of Leadership Birmingham. He served on the 1996 Birmingham Soccer Organizing Committee and numerous committees for the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce. In 1981, the Alabama Jaycees named Julian among the “Four Outstanding Young Men of Alabama.”

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a dedicated community leader and friend to many throughout Alabama. I know his family and his many friends and colleagues join me in praising his accomplishments and extending thanks for his service over the years on behalf of the State of Alabama.

Julian will surely enjoy the well deserved time he now has to spend with family and loved ones. On behalf of a grateful State, I wish him the best of luck in all his future endeavors.

HONORING LEE HUDSON OF NAPA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Lee Hudson, who is being honored by the Napa Valley Grapegrowers as their Grower of the Year on Friday, May 16, 2008. Mr. Hudson is being recognized for his outstanding contributions to the wine grape industry and the larger community of the Napa Valley.

Hudson Vineyards has established itself over the last 25 years as one of the truly great vineyards of the Napa Valley. Mr. Hudson found his love for winemaking early on, receiving his B.S. in Horticulture from the University of Arizona and continuing his education in Viticulture and Enology at the University of California, Davis. Mr. Hudson’s dedication and passion to his craft shows in the number of critically acclaimed wines that Hudson Vineyards has produced and continues producing today.

Throughout his career, Lee Hudson has set a lofty standard for farming in the Napa Valley. These high standards are reflected not only in the quality of his fruit and clients, but also in the loyalty of his employees. In recent years, Mr. Hudson has brought significant benefits to some of his field-based employees by offering after-hours English courses and low-cost housing options on the ranch.

Mr. Hudson is a great role model for other growers in the industry through his innovation, progressive farming techniques, and managing vineyards and surrounding land with a “systems approach.” This “systems approach” makes Hudson Vineyards stand out among the rest in land stewardship and land conservation. Mr. Hudson sets a tremendous example with his strong advocacy for the preservation of agriculture in the Napa Valley, as well as his active involvement with the Napa Valley Grapegrowers.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, it is appropriate at this time that we thank Mr. Lee Hudson for the incredible work he has done on behalf of the Napa Valley. As a respected grape grower he has advanced the reputation of Napa Valley grapes and wine, and has been a model citizen and superb steward of the land.

HONORING MS. CRYSTLE STEWART, MISS USA 2008

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, Today is National Peace Officers Memorial Day. Just outside this chamber, are thousands of law enforcement officers, here to honor the fallen.

Freedom is not something we can take for granted. Police officers understand their role in this and take it seriously. For 33 years, I wore the badge of the King County Sheriff’s office, and understand the sacrifice, and the pain of losing a partner.

My good friend Mr. Poe has a resolution honoring these brave men and women who sacrificed all while protecting our communities and keeping our children safe. The House Oversight and Government Reform Committee passed the resolution on May 1st and yet the Majority has failed to bring it to the floor. Why? The House has honored our peace officers and passed this resolution every year since 1999. This is the first time in 5 years the resolution has failed to come to the floor during National Police Week.

Madam Speaker, on this National Peace Officers Memorial Day, I ask this body to reconsider, and pass the resolution honoring these brave men and women.

TRIBUTE TO MS. CRYSTLE STEWART, MISS USA 2008

HON. NICK LAMPSON
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, on April 11, 2008, Crystle Stewart, 26, of Missouri City, Texas was awarded the coveted Miss USA crown. I am honored to recognize her on this tremendous accomplishment.

Miss Stewart graduated from the University of Houston with a degree in consumer science and merchandising and now runs her own company “Inside/Out.” This remarkable company aids young women in building self-esteem and volunteers with many organizations in the community. Her ability to juggle academics, her company, and work at a modeling agency is a testament to her amazing discipline and strong desire to succeed.

In the process of obtaining her crown, Miss Stewart made history; she is only the second African-American woman to win the title of Miss Texas and the first in more than a decade. I commend Miss Stewart for being a trailblazer, scholar, and success story to young women throughout the country, and I wish her luck as she competes for the title of Miss Universe in Vietnam this June. I know she will continue to bring pride to the state of Texas and the United States of America.
The Green Schools Act of 2008

H.R. 6065

Hon. Mark Steven Kirk of Illinois
In the House of Representatives
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, I am proud to stand here today to introduce legislation with Congressman CHRISTOPHER CARNEY (D-PA) which will provide healthier and more productive environments for our students.

As energy prices soar and state budgets shrink, schools around the country need more assurance than ever to keep afloat. Congress can provide a commonsense way to help schools achieve fiscal sustainability by helping them to reach energy sustainability through energy efficient and other green improvements.

According to the independent U.S. Green Buildings Council which established a nationally recognized green school certification program, the LEED data system, green schools on average save $100,000 per year. This is enough to hire two new teachers, buy 500 new computers or purchase 5,000 new textbooks. In fact, if all new school construction or school renovations went green, energy savings alone would total $20 billion over the next ten years.

Green schools also provide better environments for our children, improving student achievement and health. Students at LEED certified schools perform twenty percent better on reading tests and twenty-four percent better on math tests than the average student.

The bill would also reauthorize the Qualified Zone Academy bonds program, which is used to fund renovations and repairs at schools in low-income neighborhoods. The bill would require that any improvements or rehabilitations be energy efficient. Since its establishment in 1997, the QZAB program has provided nearly $1.7 billion for school improvements projects.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill to improve the health and education of our children and provide financial security to schools.


Speech of Hon. Peter J. Visclosky of Indiana
In the House of Representatives
Wednesday, May 14, 2008

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, I have supported and cosponsored 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.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (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 re-allocation of unused acreage allocations among states. However, the 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.

The 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. Additionally, the effects of the pilot project and fruit and vegetable 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.

Honor Peter J. Roskam of Illinois
In the House of Representatives
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 307, I was detained in traffic while returning to the Capitol. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Hon. Jim Jordan of Ohio
In the House of Representatives
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor LTC John R. DeHaven of Findlay, OH, on being named 2008 Veteran of the Year at the Armed Forces Day Celebration on Tuesday, May 17, 2008, in Findlay, OH.

A graduate of Findlay High School, John was drafted in 1941 to train and taught trainees to use rifles in Texas Training Camp. In 1942, he passed the exam for the Army Air Corps and took his Basic Flight Training in Randolph Field in San Antonio, TX. During his training, he flew the BT-6 single engine biplane. Later in 1942, he graduated and stayed in Victoria as a flight instructor.

During World War II, John was assigned to the Chinese-American Composite Wing to fight against the Japanese. Before his move to China, he trained in Mitchell Field on Long Island. His mission was to fly P-40’s from Karachi, India to Kunming, China. While in Karachi, John trained American and Chinese Pilots for the 5th Fighter Group.

As the struggle in China against the Japanese intensified, John showed incredible bravery. His unit was constantly re-deployed and they eventually ended up in Zhejiang, a mountainous area where flights were incredibly dangerous.

His main mission was to strike the Japanese, often going after eight to ten aircraft per mission. He also escorted B-25 bombers to Japan. On one mission, John was returning to base and got separated from his squadron. It got dark and John was lost and running out of fuel. He had to fire his machine gun over a town, causing all the town’s lights to go out. Then he saw the searchlight in the distance and followed it to base.

As the war drew to a close, John returned to the United States to train pilots in Texas. When the war ended, he remained in the Air Force Reserve and rose to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. After his retirement, he remained active with the military, serving as a liaison for the Air Force Academy interviewing and recommending Academy applicants.

I am honored to join the chorus of well-wishers as the State of Ohio again recognizes his distinguished service to Ohio’s Veterans. He is a shining example of our mutual responsibility to serve those who devoted their lives to protecting the freedoms we enjoy.
In Honor and in Memory of Brian D. Shrader of Hueytown, Alabama

HON. JO BONNER
Of Alabama

In the House of Representatives

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. BONNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a young man from Hueytown, Alabama, who recently made the ultimate sacrifice while serving as a firefighter for the United States Department of Defense in Mosul, Iraq.

A 1994 graduate of Pleasant Grove High School, Brian’s childhood dream was to become a career firefighter. Brian had even interviewed with Mobile Fire-Rescue by telephone from Iraq and would most likely have received a position in the upcoming class of recruits.

In a fitting tribute, the Mobile Fire-Rescue Department honor guard escorted the funeral procession down Interstate 65 from Hueytown to Mobile. The procession was met by the Mobile County Sheriff’s Office at the Mobile County线hears, and the hearse carrying Brian’s casket passed under a 30-foot-by-50-foot flag hung from extended ladders of two Mobile Fire-Rescue trucks on its way to the Mobile cemetery where he was laid to rest.

Among its many virtues, the establishment of the Ag Preserve proved that responsible land stewardship and a thriving economy were not mutually exclusive values. Indeed, the Napa Valley owes much of its economic prosperity and special quality of life to the preservation of its agricultural and open space lands.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, it is my distinct pleasure to honor Napa County Supervisors Dewey Anderson, Jack Ferguson, and those former Supervisors who are with us in spirit Henry Wigger, Julius Caiocca and Pete Clark for having the foresight to protect the land so that future generations could enjoy the majesty of the Napa Valley. We also salute those who are working today to preserve and protect agricultural land and open space in Napa County.

FINANCIAL NET WORTH

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.
Of Wisconsin

In the House of Representatives

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, through the following statement, I am making my financial net worth as of March 31, 2008, a matter of public record. I have filed similar statements for each of the 29 preceding years I have served in the Congress.

Single family residence at 690 Ft. Williams Parkway, City of Alexandria, Virginia, at assessed valuation. (Assessed at $1,502,816). Ratio of assessed to market value: 100% (Unencumbered). Condominium at N76 W14270 North Park Drive, Village of Menomonie Falls, Waukesha County, Wisconsin, at assessor’s estimated market value. (Unencumbered) $153,700.00.

Undivided 25/44ths interest in single family residence at N52 W2304 Maple Lane, Village of Chenequa, Waukesha County, Wisconsin, at 25/44ths of assessor’s estimated market value of $1,760,300.00—$1,000,170.04.

Total Real Property—$2,656,686.40.

2008 DISCLOSURE

Common & preferred stock # of shares $ per share Value

Abbott Laboratories, Inc. 12200 55.15 672,830.00
Alcoac-Lucent 135 7.60 776.40
Allstate Corporation 370 48.06 17,782.00
AT&T 535,012.00 88.30 204,162.17
JP Morgan Chase 4397 42.75 194,950.05
Benton County Mining Co. 333 0.00 0.00
BP PLC 3601 60.65 218,582.60
Cendant Energy 300 14.32 4,281.00
Celanese 634 12.29 7,959.00
Darden Restaurants, Inc. 1440 32.55 46,877.00
Delphi Automotive 215 19.05 4,099.25
Discover Financial Services 156 37.75 5,753.00
Dunkin Brands, Inc. E.I. DuPont de Nemours 1090 118.08 130,568.00
Eastman Chemical Co. 270 62.45 16,861.50
Eastman Kodak 1080 17.67 19,063.40
El Paso Energy 156 26.64 4,106.24
Exxos Corp. 9709 84.58 232,794.24

2008 DISCLOSURE—Continued

Common & preferred stock # of shares $ per share Value

Fairpoint Communications, Inc. 26 9.02 234.52
Gartner Group 651 19.34 12,590.34
General Dynamics Corp. 1,560,017.00 53.18 77,356.00
General Mills, Inc. 2280 59.88 136,526.40
General Electric Co. 304 19.05 5,751.20
Hosico 1200 42.77 51,739.40
Hess 67 3.64 243.88
Inxomat Corp. 99 22.74 2,251.26
IBM 5000 193.00 159,050.00
Kellogg Co. 3250 52.56 168,182.00
Kimberly Clark Corp. 1740 64.55 112,317.00
L Brands, Inc. 3401 22.66 7,625.00
LN Company 20509 79.15 1,588.00
Lowe’s Companies, Inc. 215 19.87 4,343.85
Monsanto Corporation 29523,313.11 111.50 3,180,033.12
Moody’s 2500 34.83 87,075.00
Morgan Stanley/Dean Whitter 312 45.70 14,258.40
NCR Corp. 97 22.83 2,154.44
Newmont Corporation 1367 22.87 31,530.12
JP Morgan Liquid Assets 718.76 1.00 718.76
PacifiCorp 290 26.21 5,242.00
PG&E Corp. 175 16.82 4,644.50
Pfizer 22211 20.93 464,876.23
Quartet 571 4.53 2,566.63
Real Time Energy 300 23.65 7,055.00
RH Donnelley Corp. 300 30.31 5,150.00
Sadleir & Young accounts 26 1.00 26.00
Salusia 82 14.00 1,144.00
Tenneco Automotive 189 7.94 5,005.08
Teradata 68 22.06 1,505.00
Unum, Inc. 167 14.32 7,391.80
US Bank Corp. 3081 32.36 96,701.16
Vonage 1344 63.82 5,424.66
Vornado 327 3.31 5,331.73
Weenegees Wisconsin En 1022 43.99 45,978.27

Total common & preferred stock and bonds $6,656,430.29

Bank & savings & loan accounts Balance

JP Morgan Chase Bank, checking account 13,952.37
JP Morgan Chase Bank, savings account 2,174.14
M&I Lake Country Bank, Hartland, WI, checking account 9,958.76
Burke & Herbert Bank, Alexandria, VA, checking account 1,570.17
JP Morgan Chase Bank, savings account 129,939.66

Total bank & savings & loan accounts $18,163,974.94

Miscellaneous Value

1994 Cadillac Deville—retail value $3,500.00
1989 Cadillac Fleetwood—retail value $2,000.00
1986 Buick Lesabre—retail value $6,000.00
1991 Buick Century automobile—retail value $1,600.00
Office supply equipment (estimated) $1,000.00
Furniture, clothing, & personal property (estimated) $180,000.00
Stamp collection (estimated) $10,000.00
Interest in Wisconsin retirement fund $40,031.69
Deposits in Congressional Retirement Fund $182,301.98
Deposits in Federal Thrift Savings Plan $310,853.87
Traveler’s checks $78,000.00
17 ft. Boston Whaler boat & 70 hp Johnson outboard motor (estimated) $6,500.00
20 ft. Pontoon boat & 40 hp Mercury outboard motor $12,500.00
Total miscellaneous $1,276,450.34
Total Assets $1,316,419.79

LIABILITIES—None.
Net worth—$11,340,419.79.

2008 DISCLOSURE

STATEMENT OF 2007 TAXES PAID

Federal income tax—$124,247.00
Wisconsin income tax—$37,582.00
2007 DISCLOSURE

Chenequa, WI property tax $2,415.42
Chenequa, WI property tax—$2,415.42
Alexandria, VA property tax—$2,415.42

I further declare that I am trustee of a trust established under the will of my late father, Frank James Sensenbrenner, Sr., for the benefit of my sister, Margaret A. Sensenbrenner, and of my two sons, F. James Sensenbrenner, III, and Robert Alan Sensenbrenner. I am further the direct beneficiary.
May 15, 2008

TRIBUTE TO THE PASSING OF SCOTT S. STUART

HON. RON PAUL
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a man who recently died at a tragically young age. I am appending his official obituary to this extension of remarks. In addition to the things listed in his obituary, I would like to point out that Scott was very involved in community and political events. This, for him, was essential to share his concern for his country. Scott held a deep and abiding belief in the rights, freedom and dignity of human beings.

May He Rest In Peace.

Stuart, Scott S. Stuart of Baltimore, Maryland, and Canton, Connecticut, passed away peacefully in his sleep on Wednesday, May 7th. He was 43 years old. Scott was and is director of alumni relations at Loyola College since June of 2007. Prior to this position, he was the director of alumni relations for his alma mater Niagara University. Scott also had a number of corporate experiences as an executive in the banking industry and as a fund-raising director in the nonprofit sector. He held the position of vice president, director of marketing, for OBA Bank in Washington, DC. In this post, he formulated corporate growth strategies and directed and identified marketing programs and opportunities, helping to “re-brand” America’s oldest thrift institution. Earlier, he spent several years working for the Boy Scouts of America in Boston, Mass., and Washington, DC, as district executive, district director, development director, and director of major gifts.

After graduating from Niagara University in 1986 with a bachelor’s degree in commerce/marketing, Scott worked his way up the corporate ladder at M&T Bank to assistant vice president. Scott enjoyed traveling, backpacking, skiing and winter camping. But his primary mission, F-15 flight training, on the leading edge of innovative training technology and prestigious F-15 schoolhouses in the United States for Air Force and Air National Guard fighter pilots.

The 173rd Fighter Wing serves as one of only two professional F-15 training wings in the world. The 173rd Fighter Wing will long be remembered for Tom Schiess’ leadership. Tom Schiess has dedicated his career to leading a world class training facility of more than 3,500 sorties for the training mission as well as training opportunities for the Combat Air Force. The Wing has received a Lockheed Martin award for its generation of 20,000 accident-free F-15 sorties since it converted to the F-15 in 1998.

The Wing, under the command of Colonel Schiess, has not only distinguished itself as a world class training facility, but has also proven itself to be a significant international ambassador, deploying to Plovdiv, Bulgaria to participate in Sentry Lion, an air-to-air exercise with the Bulgarian Air Force. Subsequently, the 173rd Operations Group hosted six Bulgarian pilots and the 173rd Operations Group hosted six Bulgarian pilots.

The Wing consistently earns outstanding ratings in accomplishing its mission. The high morale and job satisfaction of Colonel Schiess’ team are reflected in extremely high retention rates, reenlistment rates, and innovative training results.

Colonel Schiess and his team have endeared themselves to the community, rendering over 45,000 volunteer hours annually. Each year they welcome the community onto the base with their Sentry Eagle Exercise open house or hosting an outstanding air show. The men and women at Kingsley Field are not visitors to the Klamath community; they are active and deeply involved neighbors who do a great deal to make the Klamath Basin the very special place that it is.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my praise of Colonel Tom Schiess and his exceptional team not only represents the gratitude of the local community, but of a nation well served and protected by highly trained and highly motivated individuals. The time that Colonel Schiess has dedicated in commanding the 173rd Fighter Wing will long be remembered as a period of unmatched accomplishment and stellar service at Kingsley Field. Tom has achieved his goal of seeing that the men and women of the 173rd Fighter Wing are citizen airmen who are second to none, and are constantly ready, reliable, and relevant in answering America’s needs through brave, confident, and unselfish service.

My colleagues, please join me in thanking Colonel Tom Schiess for his dedication, his commitment, and his tremendous success in a very big and important job.

H.R. 5872, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICAN CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 2008

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5872, the Boy Scouts of America Centennial Commemorative Coin Act. This bill directs the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue up to 350,000 $1 silver coins in 2010 to commemorate the centennial of the founding of the Boy Scouts of America. The $1 surcharge required for each coin will be paid to the National Boy Scouts of America Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been honored to be associated with the Boy Scouts of America. I am the proud father of an Eagle Scout and of five trusts, but have no control over the assets of either trust. My wife, Cheryl Warren Sassenbrenner, and I are trustees of separate trusts established for the benefit of each son.

Also, I am neither an officer nor a director of any corporation organized under the laws of the State of Wisconsin or of any other state or foreign country.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL TOM SCHIESS

HON. GREG WALDEN
OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, on the occasion of the change of command this weekend at the 173rd Fighter Wing at Kingsley Field in Klamath Falls, Oregon, I rise to share with you and our colleagues my pride in an outstanding officer and a great American: Colonel Tom Schiess, United States Air Force, Commander of the 173rd Fighter Wing at Kingsley Field. I will have the honor of attending the change of command ceremony in Klamath Falls this weekend, and before Colonel Schiess relinquishes his command I want to express our nation’s gratitude for his service. My comments today echo the admiration of residents of the Klamath Basin community and the respect and admiration of the men and women who serve in his command. Colonel Schiess is the type of leader who makes a difference in any endeavor he pursues, and he has made a tremendously positive impact at Kingsley Field.

Colonel Schiess, who is approaching 5,000 flight hours, spent eight and a half years in the United States Air Force before joining the Oregon Air National Guard in 1991. His active duty assignments include: Tyndall AFB as a T-33 Instructor Pilot; McDill AFB as an F-16 student pilot; Hill AFB, UT; and AL Minhad AB, United Arab Emirates as an F-16 Pilot. He flew 34 combat missions in Operation Desert Storm while deployed in support of the war effort. While stationed at Kingsley Field, he has been Chief of Wing Standardization and Evaluation, 114th Fighter Squadron Operations Office; 114th Fighter Squadron Command, 173rd Operations Group Commander, and 173rd Maintenance Group Commander. Colonel Schiess excelled in each of these roles.

As Madam Speaker, in the course of his unselfish service to his country and the State of Oregon, Colonel Schiess has earned many awards, including the Meritorious Service Medal, Aerial Achievement Medal, Air Medal, Air Force Commendation Medal, Air Force Achievement Medal, Combat Readiness Medal, Air Force Longevity Award, National Defense Service Medal, Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, Global War on Terrorism Medal, Kuwait Liberation Medal, Southwest Asia Campaign Medal, and Oregon Faithful Service Medal with “M” device.

Colonel Schiess has clearly distinguished himself with awards and recognitions, Madam Speaker, but he is most proud of the collective accomplishments of the 173rd Fighter Wing, which he has led so ably. With the motto of “Land of No Slack,” Colonel Schiess leads a world class training facility of more than 1,000 Oregon Air National Guard personnel and state and contract employees at Kingsley Field.

As Wing Commander, Colonel Schiess is essentially the Officer and top leader of a very large and highly successful organization. Colonel Schiess is responsible for the production of F-15 sorties to generate student-flying training to graduate the best air-to-air F-15 pilots in the world. The 173rd Fighter Wing serves as one of only two professional F-15 schoolhouses in the United States for Air Force and Air National Guard fighter pilots.

The 173rd Fighter Wing accomplishes its primary mission, F-15 flight training, on the leading edge of innovative training technology and technical excellence and is the standard for military training centers worldwide. The Wing flawlessly provides over 4,700 hours and over 3,500 sorties for the training mission as well as training opportunities for the Combat Air Force. The Wing has received a Lockheed Martin award for its generation of 20,000 accident-free F-15 sorties since it converted to the F-15 in 1998.

The Wing, under the command of Colonel Schiess, has not only distinguished itself as a world class training facility, but has also proven itself to be a significant international ambassador, deploying to Plovdiv, Bulgaria to participate in Sentry Lion, an air-to-air exercise with the Bulgarian Air Force. Subsequently, the 173rd Operations Group hosted six Bulgarian pilots.

The Wing consistently earns outstanding ratings in accomplishing its mission. The high morale and job satisfaction of Colonel Schiess’ team are reflected in extremely high retention rates, reenlistment rates, and innovative training results.

Colonel Schiess and his team have endeared themselves to the community, rendering over 45,000 volunteer hours annually. Each year they welcome the community onto the base with their Sentry Eagle Exercise open house or hosting an outstanding air show. The men and women at Kingsley Field are not visitors to the Klamath community; they are active and deeply involved neighbors who do a great deal to make the Klamath Basin the very special place that it is.

Madam Speaker, I know that my praise of Colonel Tom Schiess and his exceptional team not only represents the gratitude of the local community, but of a nation well served and protected by highly trained and highly motivated individuals. The time that Colonel Schiess has dedicated in commanding the 173rd Fighter Wing will long be remembered as a period of unmatched accomplishment and stellar service at Kingsley Field. Tom has achieved his goal of seeing that the men and women of the 173rd Fighter Wing are citizen airmen who are second to none, and are constantly ready, reliable, and relevant in answering America’s needs through brave, confident, and unselfish service.

My colleagues, please join me in thanking Colonel Tom Schiess for his dedication, his commitment, and his tremendous success in a very big and important job.

H.R. 5872, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICAN CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT
I have been proud to support the Occoneechee Council of the Boy Scouts in North Carolina through volunteer work and vital fundraising. I have been honored to receive the Silver Beaver, the Scouts’ highest award for volunteering.

Scouting has contributed to the fabric of American life for nearly 100 years. The Boy Scouts of America was incorporated on February 8, 1910, and chartered by Congress in 1916. The Boy Scouts of America’s original mission was to provide an educational program for boys and young men to build character, train in the responsibilities of participating in citizenship, and to develop personal fitness.

You know, North Carolina and America and indeed the entire world have changed a great deal since 1910, yet the Boy Scouts endure. The Boy Scouts remain a mainstay of American life because the message of this organization is timeless: developing American citizens who are physically, mentally and emotionally fit.

The leadership and service skills learned as a Boy Scout have enabled men to become leaders in all walks of life: government, business, sports, science and the arts. These include such distinguished individuals as: President Gerald R. Ford, our first Eagle Scout to become President; Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates; and my friend, Richard Gephardt, the former Majority Leader of the U.S. House of Representatives, and Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer.

Taylor began to thrive when residents succeeded in petitioning for their own city. The community of Taylor first began as a Township when residents succeeded in petitioning for their own city of Taylor. The roots as a community date to the mid-19th Century. What began as a largely agricultural town grew into a prosperous and diverse city which features ample retail and industry for employment and safe neighborhoods for her citizens.

The first provision is in response to the long lines that voters have been forced to endure throughout the country that may have deterred significant numbers of voters and would require States to permit counties or other subdivisions upon request to begin voting prior to the scheduled date of an election. During the 2004 election, some subdivisions had voting machines that were modern and plentiful, while other jurisdictions in the same State were burdened with scarce and out-of-date machines, resulting in long lines. In the pivotal state of Ohio, which determined the outcome of the close 2004 presidential election, the controversy was deepened by reports that lines were particularly long in counties where there were large minority populations compared with largely white counties. One reason for the disparity is that many States, voting machines are purchased by counties or other jurisdictions.

The second provision of my bill adds a section to HAVA that responds to calls my office received regarding absentee ballots sent in that inadvertently did not include postage, or had insufficient postage. My bill would require officials to accept such absentee ballots. Postage mistakes may be made depending on the number of issues on the ballot and the resulting size and weight of the envelope containing the ballot. The cost to authorities, if any, is de minimis. The public interest in counting every ballot voters have cast outweighs the incidental, virtually immeasurable cost, if any.

A third provision amends HAVA to eliminate the confusion that arises when voters go to the incorrect voting sites because they are first-time or infrequent voters or their usual voting site has been changed. To encourage participation, my bill would allow voters registered in an area to use a provisional ballot and have it counted and verified. However, voters would be told the correct polling site to allow the option of going to the correct site and thereby avoiding any doubt that their ballots would be counted.

The 2000 presidential election was a calamity of such historic proportions that it cast doubt on the validity of the election of the President of the United States and led to the enactment of HAVA. The continuing problems in the 2004 elections were very serious, unacceptable, and controversial. Although that election was also razor thin close, its problems took longer to surface and there was no delay in the certification and settlement of the final result through the Supreme Court in Bush v. Gore in 2001. However, the 2004 elections were another close call that yielded bitter controversy. Beyond the recent election controversies, the voting franchise is precious enough for us to want and endeavor to protect its full operation. It is incumbent upon the Belarusian authorities to ensure that Mr. Zeltser's health is not subjected to further physical abuse and degrading treatment—consistent with its international legal obligations and basic human rights standards.

CONCERN ABOUT TREATMENT OF U.S. CITIZEN IN BELARUSIAN DETENTION

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, as Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I would like to draw attention and concern to the case of Mr. Emanuel Zeltser, a U.S. citizen who was detained March 12th upon his arrival in Minsk, Belarus, charged with “use of forged documents.” In the entire time that Mr. Zeltser has been detained, he has only been allowed visits by the U.S. Embassy twice, on March 21st and April 25th. Upon the latter visit it was noted by the U.S. consul that Mr. Zeltser had been beaten several times and appeared in greatly weakened health. Mr. Zeltser suffers from Type 2 diabetes and a severe form of arthritis. Though his condition causes him severe pain and has further deteriorated during his incarceration, the authorities in the detention facility where he is held have reportedly denied him necessary medications. Without proper medications, Mr. Zeltser may not be able to survive the harsh conditions of his detention. Furthermore, according to his lawyer, Belarusian authorities have recently extended the period of Mr. Zeltser’s term of detention.

It is incumbent upon the Belarusian government to provide Mr. Zeltser full consular access, proper medical care, and ensure that he is not subjected to further physical abuse and degrading treatment—consistent with its international legal obligations and basic human rights standards.

Time is of the essence in Mr. Zeltser’s case, as further delays could lead to further deterioration of his health to the point of endangering his life.

Madam Speaker, I call upon the Belarusian authorities to ensure that Mr. Zeltser immediately receives the medication his doctor has prescribed, and is protected from further ill treatment, given access to U.S. consular representatives and any medical attention he may need. On April 25, the State Department requested the Government of Belarus to release Emanuel Zeltser on humanitarian grounds. I urge the Belarusian Government to favorably consider that request.
As the auto industry continued to expand, Taylor grew as well. At the time of incorpora-
tion as a city in 1968, Taylor had a population of over 70,000 and was one of the largest cit-
ies in southeast Michigan. Residents like to say that “all roads lead to Taylor,” a statement
justified by the many major transportation arti-
cles that flow through the city. Taylor has
taken wonderful advantage of this fact by be-
coming not only a community that it is nec-
essary to drive through, but also a community
that is necessary to stop in and enjoy.

Taylor continues to thrive today as a result of
active involvement and partnerships from its
corporate and individual citizens alike. Taylor
is home to numerous industries and busi-
nesses, a large and impressive new
buildings and community centers. Of particular
pride to the city and the region, Taylor is the
annual host of the Junior Little League World Series—a week-long tournament that features
teams from across the globe.

Madam Speaker, I ask that all of my col-
leagues join me in honoring the City of Taylor
on its 40th Anniversary. The City of Taylor is
home to vibrant and stable neighborhoods,
significant industrial production, world-class youth sports, and numerous commercial busi-
ness opportunities.

In celebrating Taylor’s 40th Anniversary, we
are honoring a city that truly represents the
best of American history and progress.

HONORING DR. CARROLL L. ESTES OF HEALDSBURG, CALIFORNIA

HONORING MARIAN LOFTIN AND THE CHILDREN’S TRUST FUND OF ALABAMA FOR 25 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE CHILDREN OF ALABAMA

HON. JO BONNER OF ALABAMA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. BONNER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Marian Loftin and the Chil-
dren’s Trust Fund of Alabama for 25 years of dedicated service to protecting the children of Alabama.

Created in 1983 by the Alabama legislature, the Children’s Trust Fund was created to re-
duce the incidence of child abuse and neglect. The Children’s Trust Fund was unique in the fact that it specifically focuses on solving the problem of child abuse before it occurs.

This state agency, which has its own board, funding and staff dedicated solely to pre-
venting child abuse, is the state of Alabama’s only agency designated to preventing child ne-
glect and maltreatment.

Through education initiatives and community involvement, the Children’s Trust Fund has worked to increase awareness, prevent the abuse and neglect of children, find new and effective solutions for preventing child abuse before it occurs, and strengthen Alabama fa-
lies to prevent such tragedies in the future.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in congratulating both Marian Loftin and all of those at the Children’s Trust Fund on 25 years of service to the children of Ala-
bama and their families. For all their accom-
plishments and heartfelt thanks for their
dedicated service to the children of Ala-
bama, the First Congressional District, and the state of Alabama.

HONORING DR. CARROLL L. ESTES OF HEALDSBURG, CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today along with my colleagues
Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER, Congress-
woman LYNN WOOLSEY, and you as Speaker
of the House of Representatives, to honor the contributions of Carroll L. Estes, PhD. Dr. Estes
is one of our country’s most highly ac-
claimed leaders in the field of aging, who has combined distinguished scholarship with a sustained commitment to public sociology.

Dr. Estes was raised in Texas by her moth-
er, Carroll Cox Estes, an artist and writer, and her father, the late U.S. District Judge Joe E. Estes. She received her AB in Sociology from Stanford University, her MA in Sociology from the University of Southern Methodist, and her PhD from the University of California, San Diego.

Her first book, The Decision Makers: The Power Structure of Dallas, published in 1963, gained notoriety on both local and national levels at the time of President Kennedy’s as-
sassination.

Over her 40 year career, Dr. Estes has been passionately devoted to improving the health and economic security of vulnerable and underserved populations, with special concern for women, older persons, and ethnic and racial minorities. Through research, teaching, and public service, she has steadfastly worked to advance the public good and the in-
terests of America’s most powerless and disenfranchised populations. She is an inter-
nationally recognized policy advisor in the field of social insurance, Social Security, Medicare, and long term care.

Dr. Estes has authored and co-authored eight books and more than 150 scientific arti-
cles and coedited 15 books. Her research, in-
cluding her groundbreaking book, The Aging Enterprise (1979), has contributed to under-
standing of the impact of social policy on the elderly. Her latest book, Social Insurance, So-
Social Justice and Social Change will be pub-
lished in 2009.

Dr. Estes’s current scholarship is focused on the social movements surrounding the pri-
vatization of social insurance programs for the elderly. She is also working on the missing feminist revolution in old age policy and studies of the long term care ombudsman program and access to elder mental health services.

In 1979, Dr. Estes cofounded the Aging Health Policy Center, and in 1985 it was ap-
proved by the University of California Board of Regents as the Institute for Health & Aging (IHA). Dr. Estes was appointed its first director and served for nearly two decades. She was also chairperson of the Department of Social & Behavioral Sciences in the School of Nurs-

Dr. Estes’s service extends far beyond aca-
demia. She was a consultant to U.S. Commis-
sioners of Social Security and the U.S. Senate and House Committees on Aging and was a member of Federal commissions, committees of the Institute of Medicine and the National Academy of Sciences, and private foundation boards. She is past president of the Geronto-
logical Society of America (GSA), the Amer-
ican Society on Aging (ASA), and the Associa-
tion for Gerontology in Higher Education (AGHE), and past national vice-president of the Older Women’s League. Dr. Estes is a long-time member of many advocacy organi-
izations including: the Gray Panthers, Respon-
sible Wealth, the Older Women’s League (of which she was national vice president). She worked directly with both Tish Sommers and Maggie Kuhn, who continue to inspire her ac-
tivism.

In 2006 Dr. Estes received the Lifetime Achievement Award from the National Com-
mitee to Preserve Social Security and Medi-
care, where she is currently vice chair. She is also a current member of the Sonoma County Council on Aging.

Most important among Dr. Estes’s many contributions is that of mother and grand-
mother to her daughter Duskie Estes, her son-
in-law John Stewart, and her precious grand-
daughters Brydie and Mackenzie.

Madam Speaker, it is appropriate that Dr. Carroll L. Estes, PhD, is being honored at a University of California, San Francisco, sym-
posium celebrating her 40 years of policy re-
search and leadership in health and aging. We
are grateful for her many contributions as a distinguished scholar, inspiring teacher, influ-
ential policy advisor, institution builder and ad-
vocate for the most vulnerable in our Nation.

A TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH SELLERS, JR.

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY OF PENNSYLVANIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Joseph Sellers, Jr., President and Business Manager of Sheet Metal Workers Local 19 Union. Throughout his career, Mr. Sellers has exemplified exceptional labor leadership for the Sheet Metal Workers, the city of Philadelphia, and beyond.

Mr. Sellers began his career as a sheet metal worker apprentice in 1980, and became a journeyman four years later. In the years since, Mr. Sellers has been honored with a number of leadership positions within the Sheet Metal Workers Local Union 19. He was first appointed Training Coordinator in 1996, and was then elected to the position of Busi-
ness Representative four and a half years later. Just two years after that, he was unani-
mously appointed by the Local 19 Executive Board to his current position as President and Business Manager. He was overwhelmingly elected to the same position in 2003 and 2006, and is currently serving a three-year term.

During his current tenure, he also holds a number of prominent leadership positions, in-
cluding President of the Pennsylvania and New Jersey State Councils of Sheet Metal Workers, Vice-President of the Philadelphia AFL-CIO, President of the Mechanical Trades District Council of Delaware Valley, President for the Metropolitan Association of Presidents and Business Representatives, and many other prestigious positions. Mr. Sellers has also been active on behalf of a number of charities throughout his career, and is a long time supporter of the Unico Salute to Labor.

Mr. Sellers’s unwavering dedication to orga-
nized labor is commendable, as are his enthui-
siasm and proficiency in leadership. He truly
embodies the Unico motto, “Service Above Self.”

RECOGNIZING COOPER BARNES, TUCKER BARNES, CONNOR MAGID, AND STEVEN PARKER OF VENETA, OREGON

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. DeFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Cooper Barnes, Tucker Barnes, Connor Magid, and Steven Parker of Veneta, Oregon. These Veneta Elementary School students are 2008 National ExploraVision winners. The team earned first place in the grade 4-6 division for designing an underwater energy generator to harness the power of ocean waves.

The team accepted the challenge of this extracurricular activity with enthusiasm, determined to create a technology for clean energy generation that was simple and cost-effective. They were supported and encouraged by their teacher and project coach, Michelle Beller, and Mentor Scottie Barnes. Their working prototype, the Wavemaster, successfully fused science, technology, and imagination, and it worked!

ExploraVision, now in its sixteenth year, is sponsored by the National Science Teachers Association and Toshiba. The competition highlights the natural curiosity and creativity of kids. The student projects showcase their innate desire to explore, experiment, invent, and ask really good questions.

Congratulations to Steven, Connor, Tucker, and Cooper for their outstanding achievement. I am proud to represent these young Oregon scientists and excited about the potential of the Wavemaster.

HONORING THE WORK OF WELCOME HOME TROOPS

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of the efforts of the Welcome Home Troops, a Southern California based organization dedicated to “Returning the Hearts of Our Soldiers to our Homeland.”

Welcome Home Troops is a non-profit organization based in Lake Elsinore, California. Its efforts extend beyond California to Texas, Kentucky, and future expansion to additional states. Dedicated to the reintegration of The Global War on Terrorism veterans back into the community, Welcome Home Troops provides support services to help servicemembers transition comfortably from combat to home, restore personal relationships, and encourage a productive and positive life after military service.

Welcome Troops sponsors job fairs, college fairs, financial aid counseling, relationship counseling, drug abuse counseling, Vets to Vets mentoring, and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) counseling. According to the National Center for PTSD, at least 18% of those serving in Iraq and at least 11% of those serving in Afghanistan will suffer from PTSD. Welcome Home Troops aspires to provide services that will lessen the effects of war time stresses.

In honor of Memorial Day, Welcome Home Troops will involve the community with a Military Appreciation night in Lake Elsinore, California on May 24, 2008. This full afternoon and evening will be filled with assistance outreach opportunities and family fun activities to be capped with an evening game of baseball. Madam Speaker, I ask you to please join me in congratulating Welcome Home Troops for their dedication this Memorial Day and beyond to our returning servicemembers and their families.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF CEDAR HILL CITY SECRETARY FRANKIE LEE

HON. KENNY MARCHANT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Frankie Lee on the occasion of her retirement as City Secretary for the City of Cedar Hill.

Frankie Lee began her service to the City of Cedar Hill on September 20, 1977, when she joined the City as the Purchasing Agent/Secretary. She is currently the longest serving employee of the City of Cedar Hill, holding a 30 Year Service Certificate. Frankie was Appointed City Secretary on April 1, 1984, upon the retirement of then-City Secretary Marie Vincent.

During her tenure with the City of Cedar Hill, Frankie has been associated with seven Mayors, four City Managers and numerous Council Members. She has been a first-hand witness to the growth and progressiveness of Cedar Hill, growing from a population of approximately 6,800 in 1980 to 46,000 in 2008.

In her early years as City Secretary, Frankie was in charge of Human Resources, insurance, payroll and zoning. Her current role as City Secretary includes Official Meeting Notices, Minutes, City Public Information Coordinator, Records Management Officer and numerous other duties. For several years she was one of Cedar Hill’s Alternates Members of the North Central Texas Housing Finance Corporation.

She has also been responsible for the City’s general and special elections and has worked closely with the Dallas County Elections Department to insure the proper management of ballots, early voting, Election Day Voting, and results. It is estimated that in her over 24 years as City Secretary, Frankie has overseen approximately 50 elections.

Frankie has been an active Member of the Texas Municipal Clerks Association, North Texas Municipal Clerks Association, and International Institute of Municipal Clerks. Through the years she has attended many Training and Certification Conferences and Professional Seminars presented by these organizations, as well as the Texas Attorney General and Secretary of State.

In 2005, she was a Texas Municipal Clerks’ Honor Roll “Honoree.” Frankie attended the University of Texas at Arlington and is a Graduate of the Leadership Southwest Class of 1996–97.

She is an active Member of the Cedar Hill Lions Club, serving on the Board of Directors, and has Chaired the Annual Pancake Breakfast for the past three years. Lion Tamer-Elect for 2008–09, she was recently Honored at the Lions District Convention as the Cedar Hill Lions Club “Grace Roots Lion for 2007–08.

A Member of First United Methodist Church of Cedar Hill, Frankie has two grown daughters and one grandson.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I would like to commend and congratulate Frankie Lee on all of her accomplishments. Her numerous years of service and dedication to Cedar Hill is worthy of recognition. It is an honor to represent Frankie Lee in the 24th District of Texas and I wish her continued success in the years to come.

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

SPEECH OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 2008

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2419, the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act. It has been a long road to this point, and while I must say that I am not entirely pleased with the final bill, I do believe that it now makes important progress to re-forming the priorities of our farm policy.

Michigan has had a tough go of things lately—and farming is no exception. Just last spring and summer Michigan experienced severe weather and droughts that caused enormous damage to local farms, leading the USDA to designate 83 Michigan counties as disaster areas. I have long said that farming is an inherently risky enterprise and with the recent downturn in the economy and fickle Michigan weather, it is clear to see why.

I will be frank and say that this bill is far from perfect. Personally, I would have liked to see greater reforms in the areas of conservation and fruit and vegetable programs, however, I do think Michigan will benefit from the bill. Like the farm bill the House passed last summer, I am pleased to note that most of our farmers in the 15th District of Michigan will not see any significant negative changes if the farm bill is enacted. All of the safety net programs from the 2002 farm bill are maintained with minor changes—including direct payments and the counter cyclical and the marketing loan programs.

However, the conference report does take measures to curb wasteful spending and distribute our resources to those in need. This bill places a cap on payments to those with an adjusted gross income (AGI) of $750,000 or more, and sets a limit on the sum that farmers can pass on to landholders for farm income at $750,000 for fixed direct payments. In addition, the bill would eliminate the “3-entity” rule that allows producers to collect payments for multiple ownership interests.

As a diverse agricultural state, Michigan has the second-widest variety of farm products after California, this legislation will provide great support for specialty crops. In 2006 Michigan produced 825,470 tons of fresh market and processing vegetables and the state
ranks 5th in exports of fruits and 8th in exports of vegetables nationally. This bill creates a brand new section dedicated to fruit and vegetable producers and allocates a total of $1.3 billion for new specialty crop programs including $466 million over ten years for the specialty crop block grant program, which provides support projects for research, marketing, education, pest and disease management, production and food safety.

The conference agreement will also create a pilot program that will allow farmers to switch base acres to specified fruits or vegetables for processing for 2009 through 2012 crop years. This pilot project is limited to seven Midwestern States, including Michigan which is allocated 9,000 acres. This planting flexibility pilot program provides an important opportunity for specialty crop producers and I am pleased Michigan is included. More importantly, this will help the 1.26 million Michiganders that are currently using food stamps.

Continuing Michigan’s economic situation, I have advocated that a second economic stimulus package include an increase in food stamp benefits, and I am pleased that the Farm Bill has increased funding commitments for the Food Stamp Program and the Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP). The conference agreement increases $1.8 billion for the Food Stamp program and would raise and index inflation for the program’s standard deduction and minimum benefit. This is the first time since the program was created 40 years ago that the Food Stamp Program would fully account for changes in the cost of living. According to the Congressional Budget Office, this will help 11 million low income people.

TEFAP, a program that has provided assistance to approximately one million people in Michigan, will see $1.26 billion in funding that will benefit food banks and food pantries across the country. More importantly, this bill will increase annual funding for commodity purchases from $140 million to $250 million allowing organizations to meet the increasing demand for food services and the rising food prices. Estimates that this alone will receive $45 million in additional TEFAP funding from fiscal year 2008 to 2017. This is critical to organizations in Southeastern Michigan such as Gleaners Community Food Bank, who just over the last holiday season provided over 34,000 meals using the TEFAP program.

Now while this conference agreement contains many benefits for my home state, as a lifetime conservationist I am extremely disappointed in the conference title. I was pleased that the Conservation Reserve Program was lowered to 32 million acres. Both the Senate and the House had reauthorized the current enrollment level of 39.2 million acres. Lowering the cap would result in a cut of almost 7 million acres. Each year this program helps produce 13.5 million bushels of corn and 2.2 million ducks. As the largest land retirement program, lowering the cap will be devastating.

And while the Wetlands Reserve Program is continued through 2012, it is done so at a lower level than in the 2002 Farm Bill. This is extremely disappointing because 50 percent of Michigan’s threatened or endangered species require healthy and functional wetlands. Michigan currently has enrolled 125 easements of over 16,000 acres and has a backlog of close to 25,000 acres. This reduction will be extremely detrimental as it is the only conservation program solely dedicated to restoring wetland habitat.

In addition, I have real concerns about the wisdom and merit of the agricultural chemicals tax credit provided in Section 15343 that allows a tax credit up to $2,000,000 per year until 2012 for eligible agricultural businesses to pay for and offset the costs of security measures taken to protect pesticides and fertilizers that will be used in agricultural operations. Fortune 500 companies that manufacture or retail agricultural pesticides and fertilizers should not need the taxpayer to help offset the costs of employee security training, installation of security lighting, computer security measures, locks and fences to protect their facilities, and other such security measures.

Finally, Section 7524 amends current law to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to issue a permit to the Department of Homeland Security to transfer live foot-and-mouth disease virus from Plum Island to research facilities in the mainland United States. The majority of research at Plum Island is concentrated on foot-and-mouth disease, which is very highly contagious, and which Federal law has for more than 50 years restricted to Plum Island. An accidental release of this infectious virus to the general public could have grave implications for the livestock industry and for the national economy. This issue is highly controversial, yet it has not been the subject of hearings nor open debate. I believe that it is a mistake to proceed with this until Congress has fully examined whether the USDA and DHSS have adequately assessed the health and economic risks, environmental impacts, and cost-benefit of this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not a perfect one, however, it has bipartisan support. I know from my years in this institution that compromise is necessary in order to be successful, and I know the conferees worked night and day to come to this agreement. I feel confident Michigan farmers and producers will benefit from this final bill, as will the folks in Michigan, who work hard for their families, which is why I stand today to lend my support.

IN HONOR OF ARMED FORCES DAY
HON. NANCY E. BOYDA
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor all branches of the military this Armed Forces Day. I speak for Kansas and for the United States when I say that the men and women who make our country safe have earned our respect and our appreciation.

Many are called upon to protect our towns, our businesses and our homes in times of crisis. When Mother Nature strikes, the National Guard absolves the blow and ensures that life goes on. Each year nearly 400,000 personnel has been tasked with the defense of our Nation. When terrorism, tyranny and injustice strike, the National Guard, the Army, the Navy, the Marines, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard absorb the blow so that we can remain free. To enjoy our values, to pursue our hopes and dreams.

These service men and women have been asked to travel to Iraq or Afghanistan, to be away from their spouses, their children, their jobs—that’s a lot to ask of anyone. Yet they go and they fulfill their responsibilities to their State and our country. Today we recognize these brave men and women. Every day we recognize those who serve. I want to thank them for their vital role in making this Nation the land of the brave and the home of the free.

TRIBUTE TO BOB REGNIER
HON. DENNIS MOORE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Bob Regnier, who recently was named Philanthropist of the Year by the Kansas City Council on Philanthropy. I was honored to attend a luncheon on May 9th at which he received this very well-deserved award. It is fitting that Bob Regnier’s lifetime of service to Johnson County and the entire Kansas City metropolitan area. Bob is the living embodiment of the anonymous saying, “Those who can, do. Those who can do more, volunteer.”

I have been privileged to know Bob Regnier for many years. He embodies the observation of leadership consultant Don Blohowiak: “A balanced life is the centered intersection of your values, time and action. That’s where integrity resides.” Starting in 1970 as a safe deposit clerk and teller at Baltimore Bank in Johnson County, he rose within the Boatmen’s Bank organization and, in 1988, he left that organization following a merger and founded the Bank of Blue Valley, meeting with his first customers in a doublewide mobile home. The Bank of Blue Valley developed from its initial asset base of $2,150,000 to an organization with total assets in excess of $700 million total loans in excess of $550 million and total deposits in excess of $550 million.

Just as importantly, however, Bob Regnier has been a tireless volunteer and source of strength to the Kansas City metropolitan area. As he said in a 2006 column in the Kansas City Business Journal, “There is no question that Kansas City is a good place to live and raise a family. The question for all of us is, will this be a ‘great’ place to live? The choice is up to each one of us.” Phrased differently by Dr. Seuss, the keystone of Bob Regnier’s service to our community is based upon this idea: “Unless someone like you cares a whole awful lot, nothing is going to get better. It’s not.”

Madam Speaker, a cursory review of the many, many ways Bob Regnier has served our Kansas City community as a dedicated volunteer simply would not do him justice. Below I’ve listed his past civic commitments and current civic activities, as well as the numerous other public recognitions he has earned over the years. He embodies the good works. I thank you and the U.S. House of Representatives for joining me in taking note of this distinguished history.

CIVIC—PAST COMMITMENTS
PAYING TRIBUTE TO MRS. MARY BAILEY WHITTINGTON ‘WHITT’ DAVENPORT

HON. MAURICE D. HINCHLEY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. HINCHLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor posthumously Mrs. Mary Bailey Whittington ‘Whitt’ Davenport for her invaluable contributions in the areas of education, the arts and historic preservation in Ulster County, New York. For more than 70 years, Whitt Davenport was the epitome of generosity and benevolence. Her pioneering spirit is directly responsible for the creation of a consolidated school system in the Rondout Valley and the construction of Marbetown Elementary School. One of her most notable efforts was advocating for the establishment of Ulster County Community College, where her husband went on to serve as its first president.

Whitt Davenport was born in Greenwood, Mississippi on June 3, 1911 to William and Anna Whittington. Her father, a cotton planter, also had the distinct honor of being a member of the U.S. House of Representatives for 28 years. Whitt met Kenneth Davenport during her tenure as a student at Vassar College in Poughkeepsie. They married shortly after her graduation in September 1933.

Once the Davenport’s took up residence in their historic home in Stone Ridge, Mrs. Davenport quickly became an active member of her newly adopted community. As a native Southerner, she retained her distinctive accent and brought a sense of Southern charm to all of her endeavors. Over the years, she opened her home for the many parties needed to support her philanthropic efforts and was often honored for her volunteerism.

Whitt Davenport was well known for her interest in books and volunteered at the Stone Ridge Library, going on to serve as both a librarian and president of the library board. Her commitment to the arts remains unparalleled, and she has even been called “Queen of the Arts.” She served on the board of the Ulster Performing Arts Center, Music in the Mountains, and the Hudson Valley Philharmonic. After the death of her husband in 1982, she, along with her family, established the Kenneth Davenport National Competition for Orchestral Works.

Her drive and determination helped save the landmark Luke Kiersted House in Kingston’s Stockade District from the threat of Urban Renewal demolition and she planned the restoration of the gardens at the Senate House Historic Site. Mrs. Davenport gave her time to many other organizations, lending them her sense of purpose, strength, and wisdom.

Madam Speaker, I had the pleasure of knowing Whitt Davenport over the course of many years. Her work on behalf of her community was inspiring and commendable. In fact, Whitt Davenport was a force to be reckoned with. It is with sorrow that we mark her passing and with pride and gratitude that we remember her grand accomplishments.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES OF H.R. 4040, CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY MODERNIZATION ACT

SPEECH OF
HON. CLIFF STEARNS
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 2008

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first state that it was a pleasure, in my former capacity as Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection, to work with my good friend from New York, Chairman Rush, in crafting this important legislation. H.R. 4040, the Consumer Product Safety Commission Reform Act, will greatly enhance the ability of the CPSC to secure the proper funding and sufficient number of employees to ensure that the products we import from abroad and manufacture here at home will not harm those who purchase them.

Millions of Americans are concerned with the safety of toys and other children’s products due to lead contamination found in millions of toys imported from China. I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for coming together and taking action to safeguard consumers from lead exposure, and to provide the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) with the tools and funding it needs to safeguard the public.

The House on December 19, 2007, overwhelmingly approved H.R. 4040, a bill that will change current law and add more stringent lead paint and lead content standards, making them the toughest in the world. It also requires testing of children’s products in accredited labs, and tracking labels on all children’s products.

Furthermore, the bill authorizes increased funding for the CPSC to hire more personnel, expand the use of a new state-of-the-art laboratory, and the institution of an expedited release of information on health safety risks to the public. All of which will make the CPSC more effective.

The House Committee on Energy and Commerce worked tirelessly to produce this bipartisan legislation and I now ask my colleagues to vote “yes” on this Motion to instruct conferees and support this bipartisan House passed legislation and call for this bill to remain unchanged through the conference negotiations with the Senate.
Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today along with my colleague from California, Congressman DENNIS CARDOZA to pay tribute to the distinguished public service of Barbara Goodwin. After working nearly 40 years with the County of Fresno, she has decided to retire this year.

During her tenure, Barbara worked tirelessly to improve Central California’s transportation system. At retirement, she held the position of Executive Director of the Fresno County Council of Governments. We have had the pleasure of working with Barbara frequently and her dedication to the community is to be commended.

Due to her vast knowledge and attention to detail, Barbara was frequently called upon by State agencies to represent the Valley on transportation issues at forums and meetings. Over her distinguished career, Barbara has served on multiple statewide committees such as the University of California’s advisory panel on transportation planning, and the task force on State transportation improvement program reform. In 2007 she was appointed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger to the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley.

Throughout her career with Fresno County, Barbara Goodwin has proven to be a highly effective leader who was always committed to excellence in public service. As she gets ready to spend much more time enjoying other relaxing activities, my colleague and I wish her continued success and best of luck for the future.

HONORING TIAA–CREF’S 90TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. KING. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of TIAA–CREF’s 90th anniversary and to recognize the important contributions that this company has made to New York and across the country. TIAA–CREF is a company with a rich and distinguished history. As a trustee of Cornell University in my home State of New York, philanthropist and businessman Andrew Carnegie was appalled by how many college professors could not afford to retire. He then established the Carnegie Foundation to support pension plans for professors. Soon, he realized the Foundation’s endowment was too limited for the increasing number of qualified professors and, in 1918, established the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association with an initial million-dollar subsidy from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. At the time, TIAA was the only large, portable, fully-funded private pension system in the country.

In 1952, TIAA created CREF, the College Retirement Equities Fund, the world’s first equity variable annuity and today the largest equity mutual fund. The editor of Fortune magazine wrote, “This is the biggest development in the insurance-investment business since the passage of the Social Security Act.”

Now, TIAA–CREF is a Fortune 100 company serving 3.4 million active and retired employees of more than 15,000 institutions. TIAA–CREF is also one of the largest employers in the United States, employing almost 1,200 individuals in New York and over 7,000 Americans nationwide.

Headquartered in New York City, TIAA–CREF provides financial services for over 10,400 participants with assets totaling over $1.3 billion in my home district and administers plans for 1,784 nonprofit educational, research, and health care institutions across New York State.

The important work that this company does in helping Americans plan for retirement and to save for a quality education is unparalleled. I am proud to be honoring them today and wish TIAA–CREF continued success.

HONORING THE 18TH ANNUAL DC BLACK PRIDE CELEBRATION

Ms. NORON. Madam Speaker, Memorial Day Weekend, May 21-26, is the 18th Annual DC Black Pride celebration in Washington, DC.

DC Black Pride is an exciting six-day event complete with dynamic workshops, receptions, cultural arts activities, small and large night club events, that culminates in the world’s oldest, most inclusive Black Pride Festival. Many consider DC’s festival one of the world’s pre-eminent Black Pride celebrations. The Festival consistently draws more than 30,000 people to the Nation’s Capital. Attendees come from every major urban area in the United States as well as Canada, the Caribbean, South Africa, Great Britain, France, Germany, and the Netherlands. The Black Pride Festival features activities for the entire family, including performances by national recording artists, 200 exhibition booths, book signings from noted writers, performances from teachers, and other local social organizations, and arts and crafts.

Black Lesbian and Gay Pride Day, Inc. (BLGPD), the celebration’s organizing body, chose the theme “Official 18: Empowered and Poppin’” to encourage the Black lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) communities to vote, to contribute to our communities, to promote health and wellness, to strengthen their communities, and to inspire Black LGBT people everywhere to live their lives with pride.

Black Lesbian and Gay Pride Day, Inc., a non-profit organization with a volunteer Board of Directors, coordinates this annual event. BLGPD’s 2008 Board of Directors consists of: Courtney R. Snowden, President; Ray T. Daniels, Jr., Vice President; Christopher Lane, Corresponding Secretary; Khalid Parker, Recording Secretary; Marjorie Swain, Treasurer; and the following Members at Large: Lisa Washington, Sterling A. Washington, and Shanika Whitehurst; and these Members Emeritus: Earl Fowlkes, James W. Hawkins, Eric E. Richardson, Clarence J. Fluker, and Cheryl Dunn, who lead BLGPD in its mission to build knowledge of and to create greater pride in the Black LGBT community’s diversity, while raising funds to ameliorate and prevent health problems in this community, especially HIV/AIDS.

I ask this House to join me in welcoming all attending the 18th Annual DC Black Pride celebration in Washington, DC, and I take this opportunity to remind the celebrants that United States citizens who reside in Washington, DC are taxed without full voting representation in Congress.


Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Conference Report of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008. I’d like to thank the conferees who worked diligently, day and night for weeks, to craft this bipartisan agreement. This bill provides an adequate safety net for our farmers and guarantees an affordable and nutritious food supply for the youngest and most vulnerable among us, all in a fiscally responsible way. This bill also helps producers of all commodities stay on the land they hold and love so they may continue with their livelihood, and encourages conservation of natural resources and land for use by future generations.

The bill before us today addresses many of the needs of those in southwest Georgia and Georgia’s Second Congressional District, which I represent. The peanut rotation program in the conference agreement, which we paved the way for in the House bill last summer, will bring peanut growers into the next generation of agriculture by encouraging a cleaner, greener method of planting while ensuring an affordable and accessible supply to the markets that rely on U.S.-grown peanuts.

I’m also pleased that Congress has seen fit to include $100 million for Pigford Claims. This funding will begin to make up for USDA’s historical inability to govern our Nation’s agriculture programs in a fair, equitable, and non-discriminatory manner.

Many in this legislative body believe this bill is not perfect; truth be told, I am among them. I have concerns about the ability to completely serve our family farmers in the face of skyrocketing fertilizer and diesel costs, an unstable commodities market that could
see prices plummet just as easily as it saw prices skyrocket, and increasingly unpredictable weather patterns that decimate entire crops in mere seconds. Despite those worries, I am even more concerned by those who view this bill as not having reformed our commodity programs enough.

No, not every single reform requested by President Bush has been met. No, we haven’t reduced the AGI to $200,000, or completely rearranged the accounting in this bill to deal with the changing baselines and budgetary gimmicks touted by the White House.

But, there has been meaningful compromise on behalf of the lawmakers to whom this legislation is most important. This legislation meets the White House demands by more than half way; this legislation represents billions of dollars to not just rural America, but to people living in every corner of this country.

And, if we can spend billions of dollars fighting a war and rebuilding another country, including supporting that country’s land use and agriculture programs, I think we ought to be able to study sustain our means here in Congress to support American agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, we must pass this conference report today, and we must do it by a sizable margin to send a message to the President that we will not be bullied by his negotiating tactics.

Today, I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle “Let us not let the ‘perfect’ be the enemy of the ‘good.’” Let us pass this conference report today for our farmers and the others across this great Nation who rely on a safe and domestically grown food source.

STATEMENT FOR INTRODUCTION

NASA AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

HON. MARK UDALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing the “NASA Authorization Act of 2008”, a bill to reauthorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2009. I am pleased that Science and Technology Committee Chairman BART GORDON, Ranking Minority Member RALPH HALL, and Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee Ranking Minority Member TOM FEENEY are joining me as original cosponsors. Their cosponsorship demonstrates the bipartisan nature of the support for NASA in this Congress, and I want to thank them for their efforts in helping to develop this legislation.

In addition to providing funding and programmatic direction for fiscal year 2009, this bill is also intended to provide congressional guidance for the next Administration relative to NASA. I believe that it is critically important for Congress to do so. Without a clear statement of congressional priorities and policies for the Nation’s civil space and aeronautics enterprise, we run the risk of wasting both time and scarce resources during and after the transition from one Administration to the next. I want to avoid such an outcome if at all possible.

Madam Speaker, 2008 marks the 50th anniversary of the birth of the U.S. space program and the establishment of NASA. NASA has accomplished a great deal in both space and aeronautical R&D over those past five decades, and we can all take pride in what has been accomplished. However, we cannot become complacent. If we fail to invest adequately in NASA now, it is unlikely that we will be able to do our part to maintain our leadership over the next five decades—at a great opportunity cost to the Nation.

That is because NASA’s programs are strongly relevant to addressing the Nation’s needs. In short, our rapidly balanced and focused NASA portfolio can pay large dividends to our society as well as to our standing in the world, and maximizing the value of the NASA portfolio to the Nation is one of the main goals of the NASA Authorization Act of 2008.

Thus, the bill emphasizes a number of important areas—areas that demonstrate the role that NASA can and should play in improving the quality of life of our citizens, enhancing our economic vitality, demonstrating American leadership in the international arena through the pursuit of challenging scientific and technological goals, and helping to advance knowledge.

To that end, the NASA Authorization Act of 2008 establishes a role for NASA in leading a cooperative international effort on Earth observations and research, and applications, especially with respect to climate change. It is one of the major challenges facing our generation. It builds on the recommendations of the National Academies’ Earth sciences and applications decadal survey to outline a robust and challenging agenda for NASA to pursue that will help us understand the causes and impacts of climate change as well as other Earth system phenomena. It is an agenda that will also maximize the opportunities for transitioning those research results into applications that can benefit our society in a myriad of ways.

NASA’s aeronautics research program is one of the most relevant activities that NASA undertakes as it impacts both public safety and our national economy, and the bill provides guidance to ensure that that aeronautics and universities and our commercial sector. However, I would be remiss if I didn’t mention the important way in which NASA’s basic and applied research activities help advance America’s competitiveness and promote innovation as well as helping inspire and educate the nation’s next generation of scientists, technologists, engineers, and mathematicians.

That is why I and many of my colleagues consider NASA to be just as much a part of America’s innovation agenda as the other agencies called out for support in the “America COMPETES Act” that was enacted into law last year. This bill puts NASA on the same path as those agencies.

However, NASA will not be able to contribute effectively in the ways I have just outlined unless we not only invest adequately in NASA’s programs but, equally importantly, direct those investments in ways that maximize their utility. Thus the bill contains a number of provisions focused on each of NASA’s main mission areas to ensure that NASA can make the best use of its capabilities to advance the nation’s space and aeronautics programs and the role that NASA can...
play in delivering significant benefits to the American people. I believe that the NASA Authorization Act of 2008 that I am introducing today will go a long way towards positioning the agency for a productive future when the next Administration takes office, and I hope that Members will support it.

CONGRATULATING DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD RECIPIENT DALE ENQUIST OF MICHIGAN, INDIANA

HON. JOE DONNELLY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Dale Engquist of Michigan City, Indiana for receiving the Distinguished Service Award for his dedicated work for the National Park Service.

Dale Engquist has been with the National Park Service for 19 years. He has proven his dedication to the Park Service for 19 years. He has proven his dedication to the National Park Service.

Engquist has also been recognized by his colleagues and superiors within the Park Service for his exceptional leadership and service. His dedication to the Park Service and his commitment to protecting and preserving our nation's natural and cultural resources has been unwavering.

Due to his extended commitment to the Park Service and his exceptional service, he has been recognized with numerous awards and honors, including the Distinguished Service Award.

I therefore rise today to honor Dale Engquist for receiving the Distinguished Service Award and to congratulate him on his many years of dedicated service to the National Park Service.

NATIONAL TRAIN DAY

SPEECH OF
HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 2008

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support of H. Res. 1176, expressing the resolution of the House in support of the National Train Day, as a Member who appreciates and recognizes the vital role of trains in our economy and as a passenger who commutes between New York and Washington, DC, on the Amtrak Acela.

I find my commute by train a convenient, efficient and relaxing way to travel that enables me to read and work in comfort and arrive refreshed, usually on time, and downtown, closer to the Capitol. Today, I would like to express my support of H. Res. 1176, expressing the resolution of the House in support of the National Train Day.

Trains have played a vital and historic role in this country, transporting cargo and passengers since the early 19th century, when the first steam locomotive was built by engineer George Stephenson. Without the creation of the steam engine, the Industrial Revolution would not have occurred and our great country would not have been able to prosper as much as it has. In 1869, the first trans-continental railroad was completed. Known as the "golden pike," it connected both the east and west coast of the United States, linking our Nation and bridging the geographical divide like never before.

Although there is a greater number of modes of transportation—planes, cars, buses—than there were in the early 1800s, trains still run on tracks and transport large amounts of freight and millions of people every day. They have reduced congestion in major cities, helping to reduce pollution connecting people in rural areas to urban centers.

The history of trains has come a long way, from burning coal and going only 130 km/h to high-speed trains that can go from 200 km/h to 350 km/h and are electrically driven by overhead cables. Trains are constantly changing and improving with new technology and greenhouse effects. Trains now run more fuel efficiently, emitting only 0.2 percent of the travel industry's total greenhouse gases.

I support National Train Day because the train industry has been an important part of America's story and its economic development, as well as a large part of Americans' day-to-day lives.

TRIBUTE TO HARVEY SCHECTER

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my dear friends of more than 30 years, Hope and Harvey Schechter. They are being honored at the 7th Annual Hillel 818 Dinner Celebration for their generous support and outstanding contributions Los Angeles Valley College and to our community.

I have had the pleasure of working with Hope and Harvey throughout the years on many important issues of concern to the San Fernando Valley, the State of California and our Nation. I value their counsel, respect their knowledge and appreciate the help they have given me in my career.

Harvey is a remarkable individual who has dedicated his life to protecting our civil rights and combating anti-Semitism and racial discrimination. From 1952, when he began his impressive career with the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), until 1993 when he retired as Western States Regional Director of the ADL Foundation, he has been at the forefront of critical humanitarian issues of concern to the ADL, the Jewish community and the world at large. Harvey has been a mentor, confidant, friend, teacher and inspiration to others during his career. His speeches, writings, and incomparable wit have enriched all who have had the good fortune to know him.

Following Harvey’s retirement from the ADL, he rediscovered the joy of learning at Los Angeles Valley College. He touched the lives of hundreds of students as he shared with them the knowledge he has gained in his 84 years.

Hope is an outstanding example of the American dream. Born in a small mining town in Arizona to Mexican-American parents who spoke no English, she overcame tremendous challenges to achieve great success. After dropping out of high school, she worked at menial jobs, including as an underpaid garment industry worker. Her personal experience with the injustices to unskilled workers led her to a career as a union organizer for the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. She helped improve the quality of life for hundreds of workers by her determination to raise the attitude and resilience. Her career includes many significant contributions to our community, including Community Service Organizer, fighting for safe neighborhoods, establishing the first Head Start Operation in Los Angeles County, and as a volunteer racial minority member of the Board of Directors of the Council of Mexican American Affairs and many more. She became a Certified Court Reporter, established her own firm and was the first woman elected President of the General Court Reporters Association. During my brief period in law practice, Hope was my court reporter of choice.

Beyond her community contributions, Hope has been a valuable asset to the California Democratic Party, serving for many years on the California Democratic State Central Committee in a number of leadership positions and volunteering her time and efforts to numerous political campaigns. Hope's dedication and tireless efforts on behalf of our community are an inspiration to us all.

Hope and Harvey recently celebrated 53 years of a wonderful marriage. Although they have no children of their own, they have been “adopted” as parents by more than one hundred young people they have met on the campus and in the community.

I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring two special people who’s caring and contributions have benefited so many.

THE NEW RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT

HON. CLIFF STEARNS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, on May 7th, Dmitri Medvedev was sworn in as the new Russian President. It remains to be seen if he will be more than just a puppet controlled by Prime Minister Putin, but if the President’s victory speech is any indication, we should expect a “direct continuation” of Putin’s iron-fisted policies.

As Russia desires to regain its stance as a major world power, the new Russian President, Mr. Medvedev, will stop at nothing to achieve this. As Americans, we should be wary of Putin’s legacy of government corruption, diminished democracy, and antagonistic stance.
Tribute to 2008 Athena Award Recipients

Hon. Timothy Walberg
Of Michigan

In the House of Representatives
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, it is my special privilege to recognize the 2008 Lenawee County Athena Award recipients Durstyne Farnan, O.P., and Dr. Nancy Kelly, DVM, and Parthenon Award recipient United Bank and Trust. It is with great admiration and pride that I congratulate these individuals and this company on behalf of all of those who have benefited from their demonstrated excellence in their professions and dedicated service to Lenawee County and the State of Michigan.

Athena International was founded in the early 1980s by Martha Mertz, who while serving as the sole woman on the board of directors of the Lansing Regional Chamber of Commerce, was inspired to recognize female business leaders in her community whom she felt had largely been overlooked. Thus, the first Athena Award was presented in 1982 and 5,000 more have been awarded since to honor men and women across the globe for their professional excellence, community service, and active role in enabling women to achieve success as business and community leaders.

Durstyne Farnan, better known as Sister Dusty, has devoted much of her life to promoting international peace. An advocate for women’s liberties worldwide, Sister Dusty has traveled to countries around the globe assisting women in other cultures achieve independence and promote peace. Additionally, she has educated students at Siena Heights University on the serious subject of the trafficking of women and children.

Dr. Nancy Kelly has faithfully served Lenawee County as a successful veterinarian and trusted mentor for many years. She is the on-call veterinarian for the Adrian, Madison, and Fairfield Township Fire Departments and holds an impressive record of extensive community service in the area. In addition to assisting veterinary students secure highly beneficial externships, she selflessly devotes much of her time to mentoring several local female students of veterinary medicine.

United Bank and Trust has a history of producing successful businesswomen and stands as a fine model to companies throughout Lenawee County. As a company committed to providing training and development opportunities to all employees, United has a track record of promoting women to leadership positions. United Bank and Trust has earned respect as a hometown bank for their tailored service to the Lenawee community and for encouraging each of their employees to volunteer within the community.

This year’s Athena Award for Lenawee County was presented to Sister Dusty, Dr. Nancy Kelly, and United Bank and Trust for demonstrating excellence, creativity, and initiative in their respective fields in encouraging women in realizing their full leadership potential. The 2008 winners join an international network of men and women who work together to create leadership opportunities and encourage the empowerment of women leaders.

Madam Speaker, today I honor the recipients of the 2008 Athena Award for their invaluable service to the Lenawee community. May others know of my high regard for their commitment to promoting women around the world, as well as my best wishes for them in the future.

Amended Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Reform Act of 2008

Speech of Hon. Donald A. Manzullo
Of Illinois

In the House of Representatives
Tuesday, May 13, 2008

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day. When others talk about a dysfunctional Congress or claim that members of different political parties can’t work together, they ought to look at this bill. Today, the House votes on the Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Reform Act of 2008 (H.R. 5196) that we debated on Tuesday. Subtitle A of Title I of H.R. 5916 has been in the making for the past 18 months when I first learned of the complaints from industry regarding the immense backlog of defense export license applications at the State Department. The Executive Branch, both sides of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, industry, and Non-Governmental Organizations, NGOs, interested in non-proliferation all had input into this legislation.

Last year, I joined with Representatives Joe Crowley of New York and Earl Blumenauer of Oregon to establish the Congressional Export Control Working Group. We educated Members of Congress and their staff on the importance of export control modernization efforts to both our national and economic security.

Export control modernization is extremely important to the constituents I am proud to represent in the 16th District of Illinois. This area of the country is one of the most heavily industrialized Congressional districts in the Nation. We make everything from nuts and bolts to the advanced electrical system for the new Boeing 787, the Dreamliner. Many of the products and technologies produced by the manufacturers I am so proud to represent are regulated under U.S. export control law.

When I was first elected to Congress almost 16 years ago, a manufacturer from northern Illinois came to me for assistance in navigating the regulatory process for selling their product overseas. Ever since that first experience, I have been dedicated to modernizing our Nation’s export control system. I am continuing to work on policies that will enhance U.S. national security, strengthen our defense industrial base, and boost U.S. competitiveness.

One piece of that puzzle is being considered here today. The Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Reform Act of 2008—which I am proud to have co-sponsored—consolidates the Defense Trade Controls Performance Improvement Act of 2008 into a single, comprehensive, bipartisan law entitled the Defense Trade Controls Performance Improvement Act of 2008. This legislation will reduce defense trade license processing times, create a spare part waiver for our closest allies, and make licensing of defense items more transparent and predictable. These process improvements will make U.S. defense manufacturers in every category, including space, more competitive in the international marketplace. No longer will they have to fear being shut out of foreign markets or products because of a taint from the International Traffic in Arms Regulations, ITAR.

The bill will modernize the Federal Government’s inefficient export control policy while strengthening national security and helping American companies sell more defense-related goods and services overseas to our allies.

H.R. 5916 requires the Directorate of Defense Trade Controls, DDTC, at the State Department to hire more staff to reduce the backlog of license applications that impedes legitimate trade with our allies without compromising national security. The last time I checked, the State Department had 42 licensing officers. By 2010, this legislation requires adequate staff and resources at the State Department to review and process defense trade licenses in a timely manner. This legislation creates a ratio of at least one DDTC officer for every 1,250 applications by 2010. The independent Congressional Budget Office, CBO, estimated that this provision would require the hiring of 35 additional licensing officers.

H.R. 5916 also requires DDTC to assign no less than 3 individuals by fiscal year 2009 to review applications for commodities jurisdiction determinations. This is one area of export controls that is extremely complex and time consuming—determining whether or not a particular widget is a commercial dual-use item or a munition. Having specialized personnel dedicated to this task will be extremely helpful in improving the processing of these determinations. The legislation also increasing the transparency of commodity jurisdiction determinations with the publication of those decisions on the Internet. This will help companies know in advance whether or not their particular product would fall into a commercial or munitions category.

The legislation also creates a series of performance goals for DDTC: No longer than 60 days to process a defense trade license; 30 days to process a defense trade license for close allies; and 7 days to process a defense trade license from our close allies in support of combat operations or peacekeeping or humanitarian operations with U.S. Armed Forces. This in no way implies forcing a premature decision, but instead provides simple goals that have already been written into the Executive Branch. All told, CBO scored these personnel enhancement as costing $6 million in 2009 and $31 million over the next 5 years,
which is a relatively modest price to pay to in-
sure a vibrant and growing U.S. aerospace ex-
port industry. In 2007, the U.S. exported near-
ly $97 billion worth of aerospace products,
producing a $60 billion positive trade balance in
an otherwise grim trade picture. Neverthe-
less, H.R. 5916 also requires a report within
90 days on possible means for DDTC to
achieve 100 percent self-financing.
H.R. 5916 creates a special licensing au-
thorization for U.S. manufactured spare and
replacement parts or components in connec-
tion with defense items previously lawfully ex-
ported to cause a reduction in authorized ma-
terials. This will help free up time of DDTC employees to
go after more significant threats to our national
security. Finally, the bill augments the input of
the private sector Defense Trade Advisory
Group, DTAG, into the State Department’s de-
fense trade agenda.
In conclusion, the Security Assistance and
Arms Export Control Reform Act of 2008 streamlines the export control process, re-
duces the application backlog, and allows
greater scrutiny on sensitive exports that could
cause harm to our national security. It also
better protects our Na-
tion while helping U.S. companies sell more
goods and services to our allies, creating
more jobs for Americans. I appreciate the For-
eign Affairs Committee’s bipartisan efforts on
this issue, particularly Chairmen Berman and
Sherman and their respective staffs, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5916.

HONORING MARCUS MATHEES OF
PASCO COUNTY, FLORIDA

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an
American soldier who gave his life in service
to our Nation.
Army Sergeant Marcus Mathes of Pasco County,
Florida, was killed Monday, April 28th outside
Baghdad, Iraq, when the equipment truck he was working on was struck by enemy
rocket fire. Sergeant Mathes is survived by his
mother and step-father, Sue and Mike Sawyer
of Sebring, his father, Ralph Mathes of Tampa, and two brothers, Kyle Mathes of Illi-
nois, and Zach Sawyer of Sebring.
A graduate of Zephyrhills High School, Ser-
gt. Mathes grew up in Highlands County
before moving to live with his father in Pasco County. While in high school, Sergeant Mathes joined the JROTC, and had dreams of
being a professional military member. Inspired
by the events of September 11, he enlisted in the
Army and left for boot camp on his 23rd
birthday. Serving in Afghanistan from October
2006 until March 2007, Sergeant Mathes was
sent to Iraq in November of 2007.
A devoted family man, Sergeant. Mathes
married his high school sweetheart Julia two
weeks after her graduation. The two were
planning to celebrate their six-year wedding
anniversary this June and had wanted to start
a family together. During a visit to his base in
Louisiana, Sergeant Mathes introduced his
sister-in-law, Julia’s sister Heather, to one of
his fellow soldiers. Two months later, Bryan
Harvey and Heather were married. One of his
best friends who served in his same unit,
Bryan was nearby when Sergeant Mathes was
killed, even picking up his torn Bible where it
was thrown from the truck.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVER-
SARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT
OF THE LA CROSSE, WISCONSIN
BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I rise today to
honor the city of La Crosse’s Board of Park
Commissioners for their 100 years of dedica-
tion to beautifying the largest city in western
Wisconsin. Through their unrelenting hard
work, a comprehensive park system consisting of
13 parks throughout the city was devel-
oped. Over the past century, countless fami-
lies have benefited from the opportunities
these parks have provided.
The Board of Park Commissioners was es-
established through an ordinance passed by
the Common Council in May of 1908. Mayor Wen-
dell A. Anderson, a spirited advocate for park
services, appointed Joseph M. Hixon, Edward
L. Colman, Lucien F. Easton, and Henry Gund
to the Board of Park Commissions. All 4 men
were dedicated to public service and guided
by a grand vision for the city of La Crosse.
This vision was made into reality after the city
hired landscape architect John Nolen, an un-
derstudy of the legendary Frederick Law
Olmstead.
For 100 years, La Crosse’s residents and
visitors have enjoyed the comfort and recre-
ation these parks offer. Having grown up on
the north side of La Crosse, I know that the
park system is an essential part of the com-

HON. PHIL HARE
OF ILLINOIS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, as a Member who
represents Illinois farmers and rural commu-
nities, I rise today in strong support of H.R.
2419, the Food, Conservation and Energy Act
of 2008.
The Food, Conservation and Energy Act,
which is endorsed by every major agriculture
group in my home state of Illinois, is good for
our farmers and maintains our ability to pro-
vide a safe, affordable and abundant food
supply.
This bill improves nutrition and conserva-
tion programs, and supports biofuel production at
great benefit to the Illinois farm economy.
Most importantly, it extends a critical safety net to help farmers manage production risks when facing unsustainably low prices or natural disasters.

Illinois receives the 4th most nutrition dollars in the nation. I was happy to see that nearly three-quarters of the spending will go toward food and nutrition programs including $50 million for food pantries to address the rising costs of food and food shortages.

The bill also increases conservation spending to safeguard agricultural lands from the pressures of urban and suburban development, and to protect our natural resources.

Finally, the bill makes critical investments in Illinois’ rural communities through biofuel production, telecommunications and wastewater infrastructure projects, and healthcare. In this time of economic hardship, we look to new industries to rebuild the economy of Illinois and the rest of the country. This bill puts $1 billion in programs that will leverage renewable energy industry investments in new technologies and feedstocks. It also provides $230 million for biorefineries producing advanced biofuels, and $90 million for the Bioenergy Program, which directly impact Illinois.

I urge my colleagues to support final passage of this comprehensive legislation that funds important programs for rural and urban constituents across Illinois and our Nation.

HONORING 11 OUTSTANDING BROWARD COUNTY CITIZENS

HON. ROBERT WEXLER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. WEXLER. Madam Speaker, today in Tamarac, Florida, 11 outstanding Broward county elders will be honored at the Annual Senior Hall of Fame Breakfast. These 11 seniors being honored have volunteered in their communities for over 40 years, and is currently serving the Aging & Disability Resource Center as the SHINE, Serving Health Insurance Needs of Elders, volunteer coordinator. In this role, Edith guides more than 25 volunteers committed to providing services to Medicare customers, their families, and caregivers. She also volunteers with Friends of the American-Research Library and Cultural Center, Florida Leaders.net, and the National Coalition of 100 Black Women, among many other organizations.

Velma Hawthorne of Fort Lauderdale is a Foster Grandparent volunteer, having raised three of her niece’s children and two grandchildren in addition to her three children. She continues to help elementary children learn how to read, reach, and assists the Broward County Library with after-school programs. During the summer, Velma also volunteers at Kids In Distress, and she enjoys teaching Sunday School and singing in the choir at Evergreen Baptist Church.

Reverend Grant Lynn Ford, Senior Bishop of the Sunshine Cathedral in Fort Lauderdale, has been providing dynamic and inspirational leadership for his congregation and multitudes of organizations, agencies and groups for nearly two decades. Reverend Ford was key in the planning and development of the Noble A. McArthur Adult Day Care Center, the first such program primarily designed for the needs of Broward gay and lesbian elders, and continues to serve the needs of the diverse cross sections of Broward communities through innovative programs, services and projects.

Lesley Sokol of Margate, along with her husband Jack, recognized the need in the community for a center to aid families caring for someone with Alzheimer’s disease and founded the Alzheimer’s Family Center to fill that need. Lesley serves on the Agency’s board of directors for 10 years and has devoted a tremendous amount of time and energy to the center, as she was instrumental in the development of fundraisers which have been held annually for over two decades now. Lesley sits on the Boards of God’s Little Acre, Senior Volunteer Services, and is active with the Margate Chamber of Commerce.

Polly Wilkie of Pembroke Pines is a veteran volunteer possessing both a firm grasp on the business and the passion to roll up her sleeves and work. Founder and current president of New Prestige Clubs, Polly has worked to improve the lives of children and homeless women throughout Florida. She has recruited others and inspired them to establish Prestige chapters elsewhere in Florida and in Atlanta, Georgia, and hosts networking breakfasts for business people and inspires them to volunteer. Polly is a board member of the Light of the World Clinic, the Ease Foundation Pantry, the James Jr. Fund, the Boys & Girls Club, and Crime Stoppers, and has served as commissioner for Volunteer Florida.

Madam Speaker, I would like to once again congratulate these 11 outstanding Broward County citizens who are being honored at the Annual Senior Hall of Fame, and thank them for their years of service to their fellow Floridians.

TRIBUTE TO RITA AND JACK SINDER

HON. HOWARD L. BERNMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. BERNMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to two dear friends, Rita and Jack Sinder, who are being honored by Valley Beth Shalom’s 60th Birthday of the State of Israel Dinner Celebration. They have been recognized for their lifetime of commitment to Israel, the Jewish people, and Valley Beth Shalom, VBS. In 1967, Rita and Jack made their first trip to Israel just prior to the Six-Day War. The outbreak of hostilities forced their early departure on the course of the war. The impact of their experience motivated them to mobilize the American Jewish community on Israel’s behalf.
Their dedication to Israel, however, began long before the State of Israel was created.

Born in Vienna, Rita was immersed in Judaism as a young child. During WWII, when Hitler invaded Austria, Rita’s father was shipped to Poland. He fortunately escaped and her mother remained in Austria. Rita was sent to London on Kindertransport and was reunited with her family until the war ended. The determination, positive attitude, tremendous resilience, and adaptability that helped her survive still guide her life today. Rita’s family was microwaved in the world, so when the war ended, they moved to Los Angeles where Rita attended Belmont High School and graduated from USC with a degree in business administration.

Jack, raised in the Orthodox tradition by his father, a prominent Rabbi in Michigan, earned a degree in mechanical engineering from Michigan State. He worked for a machine tool company that supplied parts to the big three automakers. He was asked by an associate to help send machine tools to the Jewish fighters in Israel, and together with his friends, he shipped tools which ultimately helped in the creation of the Jewish aircraft industry and the Israeli Air Force.

Rita and Jack have been an integral force in the Jewish Community, living up to the motto, “Give of yourself first and only then ask others to join you.” They have generously contributed their time and resources to VBS, the Jewish Federation, Israel Bonds, AIPAC and many other worthy organizations. They endowed the Midrasha Program at the VBS, where Jack formerly was a member of the board of directors and currently serves on the board of trustees and the steering committee. Rita has chaired many special events at VBS. She is past president of the San Fernando Valley Women’s Division of Israel Bonds and the Golda Meir Club, an active member of AIPAC, serving on its national executive board, and is past president and member of the executive board of the Women’s Alliance of Israel. Rita and Jack are founding members of the American Jewish University’s Wagner Program, university patrons and also patrons of the Wiesenthal Center.

Rita and Jack work together in their business, J&S Co., as a real estate developer and she as a real estate broker and property manager. They are the proud parents of Sherrill and Alan and adore their three grandchildren. Rita and Jack’s greatest joys are being with family and friends, boating and travel.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Rita and Jack Sinder, who have devoted their lives to working for the survival of the Jewish people and the State of Israel.

Mara Letica Saad’s experiences are unique, remarkable and in many ways, reflect her wonderful family’s success story. Mara was born in Germany during her father, Iljia Letica’s journey toward America after escaping communist rule in former Yugoslavia. Soon they reached their destination in Greenville, South Carolina. Mara met her husband in the local schools and her father began to work toward his vision for Letica Corporation, a plastic packaging company.

Mara attended The University of Michigan where she earned a bachelor’s degree in history. She traveled west to Seattle University to study law and remained in Washington for several years working as a prosecutor and a commercial litigator.

Fortunately, Mara did not stray long from Michigan. She returned to join the family business and after twenty years, Mara continued to successfully balance many roles as the corporation’s executive vice president, general counsel and secretary. Along with her father and other family members, Mara has helped build Letica Corporation, now headquartered in Rochester, Michigan, into a nationwide manufacturer of paper and plastic packaging with more than a dozen locations throughout the U.S.

Mara Letica Saad’s accomplishments are not limited to the business world. Throughout her life she has had a strong interest in her family’s birthplace, Croatia, and was actively involved in Croatia’s independence movement. With her father, she organized a group of attorneys in the U.S. to aid and supervise the 1990 elections in Croatia. Her efforts were recognized by President George H.W. Bush and she was nominated to be Ambassador to Croatia.

An active participant in the Detroit area community, Mara serves on the board of the Motor City Lyric Opera and until recently served on the board of the Mackinac Center for Public Policy. She resides in Bloomfield Hills, Michigan with her husband, Judge Henry Saad, and they have four grown children.

Mara Letica Saad has excelled in her profession and her touched many in southeast Michigan and beyond.

Mara Letica Saad is a loyal and loving family member with a passion for its history, culture, and human dignity. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mara Letica Saad, recipient of southeast Michigan’s “Most Influential Women.” She truly merits our respect and admiration.

Paying Tribute to Mara Letica Saad

Hon. Mike Rogers
Of Michigan
In the House of Representatives
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the accomplishments of Mara Letica Saad of Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, who has been honored by Crain’s Detroit Business Publication as one of southeast Michigan’s “Most Influential Women” over the past five years.

RECOGNIZING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF TIAA-CREF

Hon. Joseph Crowley
Of New York
In the House of Representatives
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, in keeping with my philosophy that “the man who dies rich thus dies disgraced,” Andrew Carnegie took an interest in distributing wealth, largely toward the goal of promoting education. When Mr. Carnegie became a trustee at Cornell University, in my home State of New York, he was appalled to learn how little professors earned and thought they deserved financial security. As a result, he donated $10 million to fund a system of pensions that today allows colleges and universities in the United States to offer some of the best retirement plans in the Nation.

In 1918, the Carnegie Foundation established the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, known today as TIAA, a fully-funded system of pensions for professors. By the end of its first year, 30 public and private institutions had signed on. After World War II, facing inflation and increased longevity, TIAA created the College Retirement Equities Fund, the world’s first variable annuity in 1952. As TIAA-CREF evolved over the years to meet new challenges, its noble mission bestowed on them by Carnegie never changed: to aid and strengthen the institutions they serve and to provide financial products that are suited to the needs of such entities, their employees, and their families on the best terms practicable.

In his autobiography, Carnegie wrote: “Many college pension fund beneficiaries and their widows have written to me to most affecting letters. These I can never forget, for if I ever have a fit of melancholy, I know the cure lies in re-reading these letters.”

TIAA-CREF continues to have a special relationship with those in higher education and also serves those who work in the medical, cultural, and research fields. Today TIAA-CREF celebrates its 90th Anniversary and continues to serve those whose life work advances the greater good.

STANSMON ON LIHEAP

Hon. Carolyn McCarthy
Of New York
In the House of Representatives
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call on colleagues to fully fund the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, also known as LIHEAP, during this year’s appropriations process, at the full $5.1 billion.

LIHEAP is a vital program that helps low-income Americans pay their heating and cooling bills.

Our nation is facing an escalating energy crisis. More and more, American families are being forced to make difficult decisions between putting food on their tables and paying their utility bills. If the current trend continues, LIHEAP will not have enough funding for the remainder of fiscal year 2008. Soaring energy prices combined with another heat wave this summer could be deadly if we don’t act now to fully fund this important program.

This presents a particular risk to our Nation’s most vulnerable, the elderly, infirm and children. Extreme temperatures can be incredibly dangerous to those with compromised physical conditions. They need to be protected and we have the ability to protect them by fully funding LIHEAP.

This month, utility shut-off moratoriums that have been offered by states are set to expire just as temperatures are rising. With past-due notices on the rise, there is no question that millions of Americans could be facing summers with no cooling options available. There is simply no time to waste. I urge all of my colleagues to act now to fully fund LIHEAP. American families cannot afford to sweat out Congress’s delays on this matter.
COMMEMORATING ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

HON. NICK LAMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, this May, all Americans take time to commemorate Asian Pacific Heritage Month. As a proud member of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I honor and celebrate the culture, achievements and valuable contributions of Asian Pacific Americans.

This May marks thirty years since the first ten days of May were designated Asian Pacific Heritage Week. This was extended to a full month once it became quite clear that a week would not be nearly enough time to do justice to the abundant contributions Asian Pacific Americans have made to our Nation, without which we could never have reached the heights we have today.

Asian Pacific-Americans are one of the most diverse, talented and successful ethnic groups in America today. There are nearly 16 million Asian Pacific Americans who call America home, representing more than 5 percent of the U.S. population.

In my district, they are without question the fastest growing ethnic group. In Fort Bend and Harris counties, the growth of Asian Pacific Americans has been dramatic. In many cases the growth of Asian Pacific Americans has been more than three times the growth of the overall population. Fort Bend now has the largest percentage of Asian Americans of any county in Texas. In particular, in Sugar Land and my home, Stafford, Asian Pacific Americans make up more than 20 percent of the overall population.

However, population growth is only part of the story. As the grandson of immigrants, I know true assimilation means preserving tradition while achieving success. I am in awe at how quickly the Asian Pacific-American community has mastered both. Asian Pacific Americans have quickly taken hold of many of the most prominent civic, industry, philanthropic and research-based positions in the Houston area.

I would specifically like to honor the trailblazing Asian Pacific American elected officials in my district. Natalie Ong, M.J. Khan, Thomas Abraham, Daniel Wong, Neeta Sane, Ken Mathew, Sonal Bhuchar, and Natasha Thomas Abraham, Daniel Wong, Neeta Sane, to name just a few.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I am honored this day to commend to the House the distinguished service of Sgt. William Patrick Treece for his sacrifices to his country on two different tours of duty. I would like to recognize Sgt. William Patrick Treece as his selection for Veteran of the Year 2008.

Sgt. Treece is a Findlay, Ohio resident. A 1988 graduate of Findlay High School, he has made a career of serving his country and his proud family of three children of the ages twelve, six, and three.


I am honored to be one of the many to add citations, honors, and medals awarded to Sgt. Treece as is long and distinguished as his active service to this Nation. He was awarded: the Marine Corps Good Conduct Medal, Coast Guard Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal (Iraq), Anusz Forces Expeditionary Medal (Iraq), Sea Service Deployment Ribbon, Southwest Asia Service Medal (twice), Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, Presidential Unit Citation, National Defense Service Medal, Kuwait Liberation Medal (Kuwait), and Navy Meritorious Unit Commendation.

I am honored to be one of the many to add my voice in recognizing, and commending, Sgt. Treece for his invaluable and distinguished service for his country. He is a shining example of our mutual responsibility to serve those who devoted their lives to protecting the freedoms we enjoy.

IN HONOR OF JUANA BORDAS

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Juana Bordas, President of Mestiza Leadership International, and in recognition of her dedication, advocacy, and promotion of leadership in the Hispanic Community.

Juana Bordas is a national speaker and trainer who has worked tirelessly to promote leadership skills in minority communities since the beginning of her illustrious career. Her vision enabled her to found several important organizations and programs. In 1977, she founded what is now considered a national model of women’s empowerment, Mi Casa A Home’s Center in Denver, Colorado, where she served until 1986. Mrs. Bordas is also the founding President and CEO of the National Hispanic Leadership Institute, the only program of its kind in the United States that prepares Latina women for national leadership. Through this program, Mrs. Bordas partners with Harvard’s JFK School of Government and Center for Creative Leadership to provide training for Hispanic women. She is also currently serving as President of Mestiza Leadership International, a unique company that focuses the promotion and fostering of leadership, diversity and organizational change.

A former Peace Corps volunteer, Mrs. Bordas has served as advisor to Harvard’s Hispanic Journal on Public Policy and the Kellogg National Fellows Program. She was also a former faculty member for the Center for Creative Leadership (CCL), where she guided and mentored students in the Leadership Development Program, which is considered the most utilized executive training program in the world. She is currently the Vice President of the board of Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership and a trustee of the International Leadership Association. Mrs. Bordas has inspired countless readers through many of her books and essays on passion and power, „Finding Personal Purpose”, an essay in „Reflections on Leadership” and is a contributing author to „Leadership in the 21st Century” in the book „Rethinking Leadership”.

She has been recognized for her innovative and impactful work on empowering members of minority communities by numerous organizations and institutions. She has been inducted into the Colorado Women’s Hall of Fame, is the recipient of the Wise Woman Award from the National Center for Women’s Policy Studies; the Franklin Miller Award from the U.S. Peace Corps and the 2006 Leadership Legacy Award from Spellman College’s Center for Leadership. She was one of fifty leaders chosen by the Colorado Legislature to design the state’s future plan and was selected by Colorado Business Magazine as one of the top one-hundred influential people in the state.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KUTZTOWN FIRE COMPANY NO. 1

HON. JIM GERLACH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. GERLACH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the Kutztown Fire Company No. 1 as they celebrate their 100th anniversary of service to their community. Organized on January 14, 1908 and incorporated on April 1, 1918, as a completely volunteer fire company, consisting of 10 officers and 10 charter members.

During the early years of the company, funds were raised by sprinkling the streets of the borough, holding band fairs, renting the hall out to outside organizations and operating a social quarters.

On October 22, 1931, the company purchased land adjacent to the Fire Dam to build
a swimming pool. The pool has been a source of income and was operated solely by the company until 1963 when the Borough Council had a new swimming pool erected along the Saucony Creek north of the Normal Avenue bridge.

Today, the Kutztown Fire Company runs approximately 450 calls annually and covers 40 square miles, which include residential and rural areas, light industrial section, a university and an interstate highway. The fire company truck crew has about 50 members which operate five pieces, under the leadership of President David J. Reimer Sr. and Fire Chief Troy Arndt. The Company will celebrate this great milestone on Saturday, May 17, 2008 with an Appreciation Banquet.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the brave men and women of Kutztown Fire Company No. 1 as they celebrate 100 years of protecting our communities. We can never thank our first-responders enough for all their dedication and sacrifices to protect the lives and property of their neighbors, and the Kutztown Fire Company No. 1 is a proud part of this great history.

CLARA WHITE MISSION—”MIRACLE ON ASHLEY ST.”

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize the Clara White Mission located in my district in Jacksonville, Florida.

Tomorrow, the Clara White Mission will be awarded the 2007 HUD Secretary’s Award for Excellence. This award, made in partnership with HUD and the American Planning Association, recognizes “model” programs that improve employment, education, and housing opportunities, and I cannot imagine any more deserving recipient than the Clara White Mission.

The Clara White Mission, which was founded in 1904, but traces its origins to 1880s Jacksonville, is committed to eradicating chronic homelessness in blighted areas. It should be noted that the Clara White Mission is unique in many ways, but most notably their passion for bettering not only the community but also the individual.

Tomorrow, at the Mission’s “Miracle on Ashley Street” event, community and corporate leaders will serve the homeless and community guests a gourmet lunch prepared by area restaurants and the Clara White culinary students in an effort to help raise awareness for the program.

The project assists homeless members of the community through a variety of programs. The Mission offers permanent housing, substance abuse mediation, mental health counseling, and help to those in need of developing marketable job skills tailored to the demands of the local job market.

The saying goes, “Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day; teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.” The Clara White Mission puts this principle in practice every day through the programming they offer those who have the greatest need.
MESSAGE HONORING 4TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS DURING NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT WEEK

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize and honor all law enforcement officials for the crucial and irreplaceable job that they do tirelessly for our communities’ benefit. When I meet with various officials throughout my district and see the job that they do, I am continually impressed by the sense of honor and the level of commitment with which they so selflessly serve. Many of them continually place their lives on the line in order to protect the families and individuals in our area. Some have indeed given their lives in the line of duty, and for that there is no measure of gratitude that can possibly rise to the level of what our community owes them.

These dedicated individuals give of their time, energy, and heart. They ask for little other than our support. They crave no spotlight or public applause. They serve out of a sense of deep love for their community and out of a sense of purpose in ensuring the citizenry is protected and justice is served.

I would like to especially recognize a fallen officer whose name was added to the wall on the National Police Memorial in Washington, D.C. this week, in a ceremony attended by Jacksonville Sheriff Rutherford.

Jacksonville Sheriff’s Officer Eric Bell was killed, on duty, on October 12, 2007 when a vehicle pulled in front of his patrol car. Officer Bell was returning from a call on Hecksher Drive when a van traveling on New Berlin Road collided with his cruiser.

Officers like Eric Bell embody the belief that there is no greater purpose than serving our fellow neighbors, and Officer Bell gave his life in this noble effort. In doing so, he and other law enforcement officials model character and integrity for generations to come. It is with a grateful heart and a sense of tremendous pride that I recognize and honor Jacksonville Sheriff’s Officer Eric Bell and each individual serving our community in a law enforcement capacity during this 2008 National Law Enforcement Week.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HEATHER WILSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, because I was unavoidably detained on Wednesday May 14, 2008, I missed rollcall votes 317, 318 and 319. Had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote 317, no on rollcall vote 318 and YES on rollcall vote 319.

MESSAGE HONORING THE 2008 ANNUAL BUSINESS OHIO BUSINESS WOMEN’S CONFERENCE

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 2008

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 2008 Annual Ohio Business Women’s Conference and Expo, and in honor of the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce for Ohio and the Hispanic Business Association for their work in the state of Ohio.

The Annual Ohio Business Women’s Conference is the largest event of its kind for women in business (and provides business owners with the information and tools necessary to expand their market. The theme for this year’s conference is “Bridging Success” and will feature over five hundred women business owners, entrepreneurs and corporate exhibitors. The mission, put forth by the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce for Ohio and the Hispanic Business Association is to promote women business enterprises through all stages of development. This unique and important event provides women business owners with the forum to display their products and services to America’s leading corporations and government agencies, who join the conference from across the nation as sponsors, exhibitors, and attendees. This year’s event will provide women business owners and entrepreneurs with networking activities, workshops, panel discussions, and matchmaking procurement sessions.

I also stand in recognition of the Hispanic Business Association (HBA) for their contributions and leadership in promoting and supporting women business owners in the Greater Cleveland Area. The Hispanic Business Association grew out of the vision of local Hispanic business owners in 1981 who were started by the low participation of the Hispanic community in the private and public sector. Since its official incorporation as a nonprofit in 1983, the HBA has worked to fulfill its mission of promoting Hispanic business interest and its economic development and expansion through strategic partnerships, technical assistance and advocacy.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in recognition of this year’s Annual Ohio Business Women’s Conference and Expo as well as in recognition of the Hispanic Business Association for their diverse and extensive service to business owners and entrepreneurs in the Greater Cleveland Area.
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Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, on Saturday, May 17, 2008, 102 Volusia County veterans from the Second World War will visit our Nation’s Capital as part of the Honor Air program. For each of these central Florida veterans this will be their first opportunity to see the World War II Memorial. As the Congressman from Florida’s Seventh Congressional District, it will be my privilege to assist in their visit. As part of their mission to Washington, DC, I will join them in laying a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington National Cemetery to honor those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice for our Nation. This will be a special occasion in the lives of our World War II veterans. It will be my pleasure to welcome the first Honor Air visit from central Florida. I ask that the United States House of Representatives join me in recognizing Our Greatest Generation from Florida’s Seventh Congressional District and wish them well as they gather in America’s Capital City.

It is my privilege to honor the service and sacrifice of those veterans who will be visiting our Nation’s Capital on May 17, 2008:

Berkley E. Adams; Robert W. Anderson; Melvin Arnold; Frank R. Balzer; George A. Bass; Jacob R. Beard, Jr.; Edwin L. Best; Vernon B. Bly; Imon F. Boarman; Alfred G. Boykin; Melvin Burgess; Kenneth P. Burnett, Jr.; Lewis H. Buzzell, Jr.; James Callahan; Charles Carafano; Duncan S. Chamberlin; John F. Cheney; Lawrence E. Cheshire; Ralph H. Chesser; Francis H. Clifton; Odbert H. Cornell; Edmund D. Covington, Jr.; Otis R. Daniels; William J. Dreggors, Jr.; Ernest S. Eckhardt; H. Leslie Ferrell; Charles Finlayson; Jack F. Fortes; Kenneth E. Fowler; Richard B. Fuquay; Homer Goff; Richard A. Gray; David F. Greenawalt; H. L. Guthrie; Hayden K. Hale.

Dorothy E. Halevy; Georgene E. Hall; Chester V. Hamilton; Edward M. Hampton; Edward L. Herendeen; Wayne Holby; George R. Holden; Paul Hornbaker; Lawrence J. Hubbard; Vera L. Hubler; Russell W. Hunt; Daniel Jarczynski; Eddie Jenkins; Erling Johnson; Irving Kolton; Joseph R. Killeen; Jess Knight; John A. Konrad III.

Claude G. Larbranche; Edwin L. Lazarus; Ernest Lee; William F. Litke; Richard Macak; Robert B. Marriett; Evelyn Mazurak; Clifford E. McAlley; William R. McKenzie; Evert Mills; Max W. Minear; Frank R. Nicolo; Chester W. Nixon.

John C. Nuttall; William Orr; Robert L. Orwig; Priscilla L. Pagano; Charles Palva; Earle H. Palmer; Harold Parson; William F. Patterson; Harold N. Pelton; Robert F. Perninngton.

Edward J. Perry; Omar Pritchett; James P. Ragan; John Rokop; John K. Ross; Sam Roth; James E. Sankey; John A. Seeders; Bill W. Sharp; Richard A. Shaw; Phillip Sheek; Leonid Slater; Margaret E. Snowden; Stephen M. Straight; Robert V. Talley; Margaret S. Terbeek; Angelo Todarello; John C. Toenjes; George V. Tucker; Alexander B. Veech, Jr. Gordon L. Ward; Richard H. Westervelt; Delmar E. Whipple; Donald W. Whynot; John W. Williams.

I know I join countless Americans who continue to recognize their heroism and their families’ incredible sacrifice to our Nation.
HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 2419, Food, Conservation, and Energy Act.

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4211–S4289

Measures Introduced: Ten bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3020–3029, and S. Res. 567–568. Page S4282

Measures Reported:

- S. 2511, to amend the grant program for law enforcement armor vests to provide for a waiver of or reduction in the matching funds requirement in the case of fiscal hardship, with an amendment.
- S. 2913, to provide a limitation on judicial remedies in copyright infringement cases involving orphan works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. Page S4282

Measures Passed:

FCC Rule Disapproval: Senate passed S.J. Res. 28, disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to broadcast media ownership. Pages S4267–70

National Governors Association Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 568, commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the National Governors Association. Pages S4271–72

Encourage Display of Flag: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2356, to amend title 4, United States Code, to encourage the display of the flag of the United States on Father’s Day, and the bill was then passed, clearing the measure for the President. Page S4288

Small Business Act Programs Temporary Extension: Senate passed S. 3029, to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. Pages S4288–89

Conference Reports:

Food, Conservation, and Energy Act—Conference Report: By 81 yeas to 15 nays (Vote No. 130), Senate agreed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 2419, to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012. Pages S4212–43

During consideration of this measure today, the Senate also took the following action:

By 74 yeas to 21 nays (Vote No. 128), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to waive section 203 of S. Con. Res. 21, FY08 Congressional Budget Resolution, with respect to the conference report. Pages S4227

By 62 yeas to 34 nays (Vote No. 129), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to waive Rule XLIV, paragraph 8, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, with respect to all provisions of the conference report. Page S4227

House Messages:

Budget Resolution—Motions TO Instruct Conference: Senate began consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to 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, disagreed to the amendment of the House, agreed to the request of the House for a conference, agreed to the motion to authorize the Chair to appoint conferees, after taking action on the following motions to instruct conferees on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the concurrent resolution to be instructed to insist on the inclusion in the final conference report the following motions proposed thereto: Pages S4247–67
Adopted:

Gregg Motion to Instruct Conferees to insist on the inclusion in the final conference report the point of order against the consideration of a budget resolution in the Senate that does not contain a section regarding gross federal debt disclosure as contained in section 223 of the concurrent resolution as passed by the Senate, and further, that the conferees be instructed to include a debt disclosure section in the final conference report that itemizes the overall debt increase and the per person debt increase assumed by the final conference report.

Page S4263

Gregg Motion to Instruct Conferees to insist that the final conference report include the individual points of order that empower the Senate to prevent future budget resolutions from raiding Social Security, enforces transparency during Senate consideration of the congressional budget by requiring disclosure of the gross federal debt held by the nation, strengthens the integrity of the reconciliation process, and provides an additional tool to thwart any net increases in deficits in the long term (four ten year periods after 2018), as contained in sections 226, 223/224, 202, and 201, respectively, of the concurrent resolution passed by the Senate.

Page S4263

Conrad Motion to Instruct Conferees to insist that the revenue levels in the resolution include the cost of providing relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax in 2008.

Pages S4261–63

Kyl Motion to Instruct Conferees to reject the House amendment that assumes $110 billion in tax increases as a result of having to offset the extension of tax policies that expired at the end of 2007 and will expire at the end of 2008 (including the AMT patch, the research and experimentation tax credit, the state and local sales tax deduction, the combat pay earned income tax credit, education tax credits, at the alternative energy tax credits) and insist that the final conference report include in the recommended levels and amounts in Title I reductions in revenues commensurate with extending these tax policies without offsetting tax increases.

Pages S4251–53

Gregg Motion to Instruct Conferees to insist on the inclusion in the final conference report section 311 of the concurrent resolution, the deficit neutral reserve fund to improve energy efficiency and production, as passed by the Senate, and that such section include an additional requirement that the legislation also encourages the removal of existing barriers to building new zero-emission nuclear power plants in the United States.

Page S4258

By 55 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. 132), Boxer Motion to Instruct Conferees that no legislation providing for new mandates on greenhouse gas emissions should be enacted until it effectively addresses imports from China, India and other nations that have no similar emissions programs.

Pages S4255–57, S4264–65

Rejected:

By 44 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 131), Gregg Motion to Instruct Conferees to reject the revenue levels in both the Senate-passed and the House-passed budget resolutions, both of which assume the largest tax increase in history, and include revenue levels consistent with extension of the tax rates currently in place.

Pages S4248–51, S4263–64

By 34 yeas to 61 nays (Vote No. 133), DeMint Motion to Instruct Conferees to insist that if the final conference report includes section 304 of the concurrent resolution, the deficit neutral reserve fund to invest in clean energy, preserve the environment and provide for certain settlements, as passed by the Senate, that such section shall include an additional requirement that legislation providing for new mandates on greenhouse gas emissions that would harm the United States economy or result in a loss of jobs should not be enacted unless similar mandates are enacted by China and India.

Pages S4253–55, S4265–66

By 44 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 134), Vitter Motion to Instruct Conferees to insist that the conference report include a reserve fund that requires the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Budget to adjust budget aggregates and the allocation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, if the Senate considers legislation that allows a governor, with the concurrence of the state legislature to petition for increased energy exploration on the Outer Continental Shelf and that allows for revenue sharing for such producing states on new areas of production and new leases made available, if the average price of regular gasoline in the United States reaches $5 per gallon.

Pages S4258–60, S4266–67

By 47 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 135), Gregg Motion to Instruct Conferees to insist that the final conference report include a level for 2009 budget authority not to exceed $1 trillion for non-emergency discretionary appropriations.

Pages S4257–58, S4267

The Chair was authorized to appoint the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Senators Conrad, Murray, Wyden, Gregg and Domenici.

Page S4267

Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the following motions to invoke cloture relative to H.R. 980, to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions, be withdrawn:

A motion to close further debate on the Reid (for Gregg/Kennedy) Amendment No. 4751, in the nature of a substitute.

Pages S4255–57, S4264–65

Pages S4248–51, S4263–64

Pages S4253–55, S4265–66

Pages S4258–60, S4266–67

Pages S4257–58, S4267

Page S4267

Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the following motions to invoke cloture relative to H.R. 980, to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions, be withdrawn:

A motion to close further debate on the Reid (for Gregg/Kennedy) Amendment No. 4751, in the nature of a substitute.
A motion to close further debate on the bill.

Signing Authority—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Majority Leader, Senator Reid, be authorized to sign enrolled bills during the adjournment of the Senate.

Messages from the House:

Executive Communications:

Executive Reports of Committees:

Additional Cosponsors:

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Additional Statements:

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Privileges of the Floor:

Record Votes: Eight record votes were taken today. (Total—135)

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:31 a.m. and adjourned at 8:26 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, May 19, 2008. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S4289.)

Committee Meetings

(Business not listed did not meet)

Committee on Appropriations: Committee ordered favorably reported a bill providing emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2008, with amendments.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following:

- S. 2685, to prohibit cigarette manufacturers from making claims or representations based on data derived from the cigarette testing method established by the Federal Trade Commission;
- H.R. 1187, to expand the boundaries of the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary and the Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuary, with amendments;
- S. 2281, to expand the boundaries of the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Underwater Preserve;
- H.R. 1006, to amend the provisions of law relating to the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Grant Program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 2997, to reauthorize the Maritime Administration, with amendments;
- S. 2699, to require new vessels for carrying oil fuel to have double hulls, with amendments; and

The nominations of Lily Fu Claffee, of Illinois, to be General Counsel, and William J. Brennan, of Maine, to be Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere, both of the Department of Commerce.

Oil Shale Resources Development

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine development of oil shale resources, after receiving testimony from Senators Hatch and Allard; C. Stephen Allred, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Land and Minerals Management; Colorado Governor Bill Ritter, Jr., Terry O’Connor, Shell Exploration and Production Company, and Steve Smith, Wilderness Society, all of Denver, Colorado; and James V. Hansen, Oil Shale Exploration Company, Farmington, Utah.

United States-China Relations

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee held a hearing to examine United States-China relations in the era of globalization, receiving testimony from John D. Negroponte, Deputy Secretary of State; Richard N. Haass, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, New York; and Kurt Campbell, Center for a New American Security, and Harry Harding, George Washington University, both of Washington, D.C.

Hearing recessed subject to the call of the Chair.

Medical Care in Aftermath of Nuclear Terrorism

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine nuclear terrorism, focusing on providing medical care and meeting basic needs in the aftermath of an attack, after receiving testimony from Irwin Redlener, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health National Center for Disaster Preparedness, New York, New York; Ira Helfand, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Leeds, Massachusetts; and Joseph C. Becker, American Red Cross, and John Ullyot, Hill and Knowlton, Inc., both of Washington, D.C.

State Department Role in Arms Control

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia concluded a hearing to examine the organizational structures of the Department of
State responsible for arms control, counterproliferation, and nonproliferation, focusing on the processes they have in place for optimizing national efforts, and how responsive those structures and processes are to the Executive Branch’s nonproliferation and counterproliferation policies, after receiving testimony from Thomas Graham, Jr., former Acting Director, Bethesda, Maryland, and Norman A. Wulf, former Deputy Assistant Director, Nonproliferation and Arms Control, Fairfax, Virginia, both of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and Andrew K. Semmel, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Nuclear Nonproliferation Policy and Negotiations, Arlington, Virginia.

NATIVE AMERICAN ISSUES
Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 1080, to develop a program to acquire interests in land from eligible individuals within the Crow Reservation in the State of Montana, H.R. 2120, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to proclaim as reservation for the benefit of the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians a parcel of land now held in trust by the United States for that Indian tribe, S. 2494, to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam, H.R. 2965, to transfer certain land in Riverside County, California, and San Diego County, California, from the Bureau of Land Management to the United States to be held in trust for the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians, and S. 531, to repeal section 10(f) of Public Law 93–531, commonly known as the “Bennett Freeze”, after receiving testimony from Jerry Gidner, Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; Richard Sherwood, Spokane Tribe of Indians, Wellpinit, Washington; Carl Venne, Crow Nation, Crow Agency, Montana; Mark Macarro, Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians, Temecula, California; Aaron Payment, Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan; Benjamin H. Nuvamsa, Hopi Tribe, Kykotsmovi, Arizona; and Raymond Maxx, Navajo Nation Council, Window Rock, Arizona.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following:
S. 2913, to provide a limitation on judicial remedies in copyright infringement cases involving orphan works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
S. 2511, to amend the grant program for law enforcement armor vests to provide for a waiver of or reduction in the matching funds requirement in the case of fiscal hardship, with an amendment;
S. 2565, to establish an awards mechanism to honor exceptional acts of bravery in the line of duty by Federal law enforcement officers, with an amendment;
H.R. 4056, to establish an awards mechanism to honor Federal law enforcement officers injured in the line of duty, with an amendment;
S. 2774, to provide for the appointment of additional Federal circuit and district judges;
S. 1738, to establish a Special Counsel for Child Exploitation Prevention and Interdiction within the Office of the Deputy Attorney General, to improve the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force, to increase resources for regional computer forensic labs, and to make other improvements to increase the ability of law enforcement agencies to investigate and prosecute predators, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
S. 1515, to establish a domestic violence volunteer attorney network to represent domestic violence victims, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
S. 2942, to authorize funding for the National Advocacy Center; and
The nomination of G. Steven Agee, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.
**Chamber Action**

**Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced:** 19 public bills, H.R. 6062–6080; and 8 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 351–352; and H. Res. 1201–1206 were introduced.

**Additional Cosponsors:**

**Reports Filed:** Reports were filed today as follows:

- H.R. 5803, to direct the Election Assistance Commission to establish a program to make grants to participating States and units of local government which will administer the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2008 for carrying out a program to make backup paper ballots available in the case of the failure of a voting system or voting equipment in the election or some other emergency situation (H. Rept. 110–637);
- H.R. 3819, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to reimburse veterans receiving emergency treatment in non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities for such treatment until such veterans are transferred to Department facilities (H. Rept. 110–638);
- H.R. 5554, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand and improve health care services available to veterans from the Department of Veterans Affairs for substance use disorders, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–639);
- H.R. 3889, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a longitudinal study of the vocational rehabilitation programs administered by the Secretary, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–640);
- H.R. 5664, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to update at least once every six years the plans and specifications for specially adapted housing furnished to veterans by the Secretary, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–641);
- H.R. 2790, to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the position of Director of Physician Assistant Services within the office of the Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Health, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–642);
- H.R. 5826, to increase, effective as of December 1, 2008, the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain service-connected disabled veterans (H. Rept. 110–643);
- H.R. 3681, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to advertise in the national media to promote awareness of benefits under laws administered by the Secretary, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–644);
- H.R. 5729, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide comprehensive health care to children of Vietnam veterans born with Spina Bifida, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–645);
- H.R. 5571, to extend for 5 years the program relating to waiver of the foreign country residence requirement with respect to international medical graduates (H. Rept. 110–646);
- H.R. 3480, to direct the United States Sentencing Commission to assure appropriate enhancements of those involved in receiving stolen property where that property consists of grave markers of veterans, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–647);
- H.R. 5856, to authorize major medical facility projects and major medical facility leases for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2009 (H. Rept. 110–648);
- H.R. 4841, to approve, ratify, and confirm the settlement agreement entered into to resolve claims by the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians relating to alleged interferences with the water resources of the Tribe and to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to execute and perform the Settlement Agreement and related waivers, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–649);
- H.R. 5687, to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency and accountability of Federal advisory committees, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–650); and
- H.R. 5787, to amend title 40, United States Code, to enhance authorities with regard to real property that has yet to be reported excess, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–651).

**Suspensions—Proceedings Resumed:** The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures which were debated on Tuesday, May 13th:

- **Saint-Gaudens Double Eagle Ultra-High Relief Bullion Coin Act:** H.R. 5614, amended, to authorize the production of Saint-Gaudens Double Eagle ultra-high relief bullion coins in palladium to provide affordable opportunities for investments in precious metals, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 415 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 325;

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To authorize the production in palladium of Saint-
Gaudens Double Eagle coins as ultra-high relief numismatic coins and bullion investment coins in order to provide affordable opportunities for investments in precious metals, and for other purposes.”.

Alice Paul Congressional Gold Medal Act: H.R. 406, amended, to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Alice Paul in recognition of her role in the women’s suffrage movement and in advancing equal rights for women, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 412 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 326;

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To award a congressional gold medal in recognition of Alice Paul’s role in the women’s suffrage movement and in advancing equal rights for women.”.

Boy Scouts of America Centennial Commemorative Coin Act: H.R. 5872, amended, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the Boy Scouts of America, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 403 yeas to 8 nays, Roll No. 327;

Star-Spangled Banner and War of 1812 Bicentennial Commemorative Coin Act: H.R. 2894, amended, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the writing of the “Star Spangled Banner” and the War of 1812;

Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Reform Act of 2008: H.R. 5916, amended, to reform the administration of the Arms Export Control Act; and


Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in honor of Peace Officers and their families.

Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008: The House agreed to the Senate amendment with amendments, made in order by the rule and printed in H. Rept. 110–636, to H.R. 2642, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008.

On a division of the question, the House agreed to the Senate amendment with amendment No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 110–636 by a yea-and-nay vote of 227 yeas to 196 nays, Roll No. 329.

On a division of the question, the House agreed to the Senate amendment with amendment No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 110–636 by a yea-and-nay vote of 256 yeas to 166 nays, Roll No. 330.

H. Res. 1197, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 221 yeas to 200 nays, Roll No. 324, after agreeing to order the previous question by a yea-and-nay vote of 224 yeas to 195 nays, Roll No. 323.

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:00 a.m. tomorrow, and further, that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday, May 19th for morning hour debate.

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate today appear on pages H3889, H4044.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Eight yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3902, H3902–03, H3903, H3904, H3905, H4044–45, H4045–46, H4046. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

Committee Meetings

AGRICULTURE/ENERGY COMMODITY MARKETS MOVEMENT

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management held a hearing to review the source of dramatic movements in community markets (agriculture and energy): a change in market fundamentals or influence of institutional investors? Testimony was heard from the following officials of the CFTC: Jeff Harris, Chief Economist; and John Fenton, Deputy Director, Market Surveillance Section; and public witnesses.

PROTECTING CHILDREN’S HEALTH COVERAGE ACT OF 2008

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on H.R. 5998, Protecting Children’s Health Coverage Act of 2008. Testimony was heard from Dayna K. Shah, Managing Associate General Counsel, GAO; Pete R. Orszag, Director, CBO; Morton Rosenberg, Specialist in American Public Law, American Law Division, CRS, Library of
Congress: Gary D. Alexander, Department of Human Services, State of Rhode Island; and a public witness.

NURSING HOME SAFEGUARDS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “In the Hands of Strangers: Are Nursing Home Safeguards Working?” Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: Lewis Morris, Chief Counsel to the Inspector General; and Kerry Weems, Acting Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services; Richard Blumenethal, Attorney General, State of Connecticut; Luis Navas-Migueloa, Long-Term Care Ombudsman, Commission on Aging and Retirement Education, City of Baltimore, Maryland; and public witnesses.

HELPING AGENT ORANGE VICTIMS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific, and the Global Environment held a hearing on Our Forgotten Responsibility: What Can We Do To Help Victims of Agent Orange? Testimony was heard from Scot Marciel, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs; and public witnesses.

WOMEN'S PEACE/SECURITY ROLE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight held a hearing on UN Security Resolution 1325: Recognizing Women's Vital Roles in Achieving Peace and Security. Testimony was heard from Swanee Hunt, former U.S. Ambassador to Austria; Donald K. Steinberg, former Ambassador to the Republic of Angola; and public witnesses.

HOMELAND'S SECURITY INTELLIGENCE

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing, and Terrorism Risk Assessment held a hearing on the Resilient Homeland: How DHS Intelligence Should Empower America To Prepare for, Prevent, and Withstand Terrorist Attacks. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CREDIT CARD FAIR FEE ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Task Force on Competition Policy and Antitrust Laws held a hearing on H.R. 5546, Credit Card Fair Fee Act of 2008. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

WEST COAST SALMON FISHERIES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans held an oversight hearing on the management of West Coast Salmon Fisheries. Testimony was heard from Rodney McInnis, Southwest Regional Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA, Department of Commerce; Michael Rode, Staff Environmental Scientist (Ret.), Department of Fish and Game, State of California; and public witnesses.

OVERSEAS GOVERNMENT CONTRACTOR INSURANCE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Ordered reported, as amended, the following measures: H. Res. 1144, Expressing support for designation of a “Frank Sinatra Day” on May 13, 2008, in honor of the dedication of the Frank Sinatra commemorative stamp; H. Con. Res. 1152, Honoring Arnold Palmer for his distinguished career in the sport of golf and his commitment to excellence and sportsmanship; H. Res. 1153, Celebrating Asian Pacific American Heritage Month; H. Con. Res. 138, Supporting National Men’s Health Week; and H. Con. Res. 334, Supporting the goals and objectives of a National Military Appreciation Month.

The Committee also held a hearing on Defense Base Act Insurance: Are Taxpayers Paying Too Much? Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Joseph P. Mizzoni, Deputy Auditor General, Acquisition and Logistics, U.S. Army Audit Agency; James Ginman, Deputy Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy; and James Dalton, Chief, Engineering and Construction, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; John K. Needham, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management Issues, GAO; Shelby Hallmark, Director Workers’ Compensation Program, Department of Labor; and William H. Moser, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Administrations Logistics Management, Department of State.

FOOD PRICES AND SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on Small Business: Held a hearing entitled “Food Prices and Small Businesses.” Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Ordered reported the following measure H.R. 5052, Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008; H.R. 2452, Raw Sewage Overflow Community Right-to-Know Act; H.R. 1353, amended, Civil Air Patrol Homeland Security Support Act of 2007; H.R. 135, Twenty-First Century Water Commission Act of 2007; H.R. 5770, To provide for a study by the National Academy of Sciences of potential impacts of climate change on water resources and water quality; H.R. 5599, To designate the Federal building located at 4600 Silver Hill Road in Suitland, Maryland, as the “Thomas Jefferson Census Bureau Headquarters Building”; H. Res. 1137, Supporting

ENERGY AND TAX EXTENDERS ACT OF 2008


COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 16, 2008

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate
No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House Committee Meetings
No committee meetings are scheduled.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of May 19 through May 24, 2008

Senate Chamber
On Monday, Senate will be in a period of morning business.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: May 21, to hold hearings to examine efforts to create jobs with climate solutions, focusing on the ways agriculture and forestry can help lower costs in a low-carbon economy, 2:30 p.m., SR–528A.

Committee on Appropriations: May 20, Subcommittee on Defense, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2009 for the Department of Defense, 11 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services: May 22, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of General David H. Petraeus, USA, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Commander, United States Central Command, and Lieutenant General Raymond T. Odierno, USA, for appointment to the grade of general and to be Commander, Multi-National Force-Iraq, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: May 20, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Steven C. Preston, of Illinois, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: May 20, to hold hearings to examine energy and related economic effects of global climate change legislation, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: May 22, to hold hearings to examine S. 1919, to establish trade enforcement priorities for the United States, to strengthen the provisions relating to trade remedies, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: May 20, to hold hearings to examine agreement on Extradition between the United States of America and the European Union (EU), signed on June 25, 2005 at Washington, together with twenty-two bilateral instruments which subsequently were signed between the United States and each European Union Member State in order to implement the Agreement with the EU. The Agreement includes an explanatory note which is an integral part of the Agreement (Treaty Doc. 109–14), extradition Treaty between the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Latvia, signed on December 7, 2005, at Riga (Treaty Doc. 109–15), extradition Treaty between the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Estonia, signed on February 8, 2006, at Tallinn (Treaty Doc. 109–16), extradition Treaty between the United States of America and the Government of Malta, signed on May 18, 2006, at Valletta, that includes an exchange of letters that is an integral part of the treaty (Treaty Doc. 109–17), extradition Treaty between the United States of America and Romania (the “Extradition Treaty” or the “Treaty”) and the Protocol to the Treaty between the United States of America and Romania on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters (the “Protocol”), both signed at Bucharest on September 10, 2007 (Treaty Doc. 110–11), extradition Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria (the “Extradition Treaty” or the “Treaty”) and the Agreement on Certain Aspects of Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria (the “MLA Agreement”), both signed at Sofia on September 19, 2007 (Treaty Doc. 110–12), treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Sweden on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Stockholm on December 17, 2001 (Treaty Doc. 107–12), mutual Legal Assistance between the United States of America and the European Union (EU), signed on June 25, 2005, at Washington, together with 25 bilateral instruments that subsequently were signed between the United States and each European Union Member State in order to implement the Agreement with the EU, and an explanatory note that is an integral part of the Agreement (Treaty
Doc. 109–13), and treaty between the United States of America and Malaysia on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed on July 28, 2006, at Kuala Lumpur (Treaty Doc. 109–22), 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

May 20, Full Committee, business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 2:15 p.m., S–116, Capitol.

May 20, Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South and Central Asian Affairs, to hold hearings to examine Pakistan’s Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) challenge, focusing on securing one of the world’s most dangerous areas, 2:45 p.m., SD–419.


May 22, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the International Convention Against Doping in Sport, adopted by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization on October 19, 2005 (Treaty Doc. 110–14), 9:30 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: May 20, to hold hearings to examine plant closings, focusing on workers rights and the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification (WARN)/Public Law 100–379 Act’s 20th anniversary, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: May 20, to hold hearings to examine financial speculation in commodity markets, focusing on institutional investors and hedge funds contributing to food and energy price inflation, 10:30 a.m., SD–342.

May 21, Full Committee, business meeting to consider the nomination of Paul A. Schneider, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, Time to be announced, S–216, Capitol.

May 22, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia, to continue hearings to examine improving the security clearance process, focusing on reform efforts to streamline, standardize, and update the process, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: May 22, to hold oversight hearings to examine the status of backlogs at the Department of the Interior, 9:30 a.m., SD–562.

Committee on the Judiciary: May 20, to hold hearings to examine global internet freedom, focusing on corporate responsibility and the rule of law, 10 a.m., SD–226.

May 20, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine protecting the constitutional right to vote for all Americans, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

May 21, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the skyrocketing price of oil, 10 a.m., SD–226.

May 22, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 2756, to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a permanent background check system, S. 2982, to amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to authorize appropriations, S. 1210, to extend the grant program for drug-endangered children, S. Res. 563, designating September 13, 2008, as “National Childhood Cancer Awareness Day”, and the nominations of Elizabeth C. Cook, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Policy, Department of Justice, William T. Lawrence, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Indiana, and G. Murray Snow, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, 10 a.m., SD–226.

May 22, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine closing the justice gap, focusing on providing civil legal assistance to low-income Americans, 2 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: May 21, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Cynthia L. Bauerly, of Minnesota, Caroline C. Hunter, of Florida, and Donald F. McGahn, of the District of Columbia, each to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission, 2 p.m., SR–301.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: May 21, to hold hearings to examine pending health care legislation, 9:30 a.m., SR–418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: May 20, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

Special Committee on Aging: May 22, to hold hearings to examine improving Medicare for the most vulnerable, focusing on senior citizens at risk, 10:30 a.m., SH–216.

House Committees

Committee on Appropriations, May 22, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, on Capitol Visitor Center, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Labor, May 20, Subcommittee Workforce Protections, hearing on ICE Workplace Raids: Their Impact of U.S. Children, Families, and Communities, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.


Committee on Energy and Commerce, May 20, Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality, hearing on H.R. 5632, To prohibit the importation of certain low-level radioactive waste into the United States, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

May 21, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 1157, Breast Cancer and Environmental Research Act of 2007; and H.R. 758, Breast Cancer Patient Protection Act of 2007, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.


Committee on Financial Services, May 20, hearing on examining the need for H.R. 2885, Credit Monitoring Clarification Act, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

May 21, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “The Impact of Credit—Based Insurance Scoring on the Availability and Affordability of Insurance,” 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.
May 22, full Committee, hearing entitled “Impact on Homebuyers and Housing Market of Conforming Loan Limit Increase,” 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

May 22, Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity and the Subcommittee on Domestic Policy of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, joint hearing entitled “Targeting Federal Aid to Neighborhoods Distressed by the Subprime Mortgage Crisis,” 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, May 20, Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific, and the Global Environment, hearing on Burma in the Aftermath of Cyclone Nargis: Death, Displacement, and Humanitarian Aid, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

May 20, Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight, hearing on City on the Hill or Prison on the Bay? The Mistakes of Guantanamo and the Decline of America’s Image, Part II, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

May 20, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade, hearing on Export Compliance: Ensuring Safety, Increasing Efficiency, 10 a.m., 2200 Rayburn.

May 21, full Committee, hearing on the Rise of Sovereign Wealth Funds: Impacts on U.S. Foreign Policy and Economic Interests, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

May 21, Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, hearing on the U.S.-Israel-Egypt Trilateral Relationship: Shoring Up the Foundation of Regional Peace, 1 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

May 22, full Committee, hearing on Rising Oil Prices: Declining National Security? 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

May 22, Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight, hearing on City on the Hill or Just Another Country? The United States and the Promotion of Human Rights and Democracy, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, May 21, hearing entitled “Diversity at DHS: Keeping Pace or Missing the Mark?” 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.


Committee on the Judiciary, May 20, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing on the Executive Office for United States Attorneys, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

May 20, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing on H.R. 3546, To authorize the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program at fiscal year 2006 levels through 2012, 11 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

May 20, Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, Refugees, Border Security, and International Law, hearing on Immigration Needs of America’s Fighting Men and Women, 2:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

May 21, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, oversight hearing of FBI Whistleblowers: Exposing Corruption and Retaliation Inside the Bureau-FBI Counterterrorism Agent, 1:30 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

May 22, Task Force on Competition Policy and Antitrust Laws, hearing on Retail Gas Prices, Part 2, Competition in the Oil Industry, 11 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, May 20, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, oversight hearing on The Future of the National Mall, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

May 21, full Committee, oversight hearing entitled “The Danger of Deception: Do Endangered Species Have a Chance?” 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

May 21, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, to markup the following bills: H.R. 2964, Captive Primate Safety Act; H.R. 5350, To authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell or exchange certain National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration property located in Norfolk, Virginia; H.R. 5451, Coastal Zone Reauthorization Act of 2008; and H.R. 5741, Shark Conservation Act of 2008, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

May 22, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, oversight hearing on The United States Geological Survey’s Earthquake Hazards Program-Science, Preparation, and Response, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, May 20, hearing on EPA’s New Ozone Standards, 1 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

May 20, Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service and the District of Columbia, hearing on Part-Time Reemployment of Federal Annuitants, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

May 21, Subcommittee on Domestic Policy, hearing on Neighborhoods: the blameless victims of the subprime mortgage crisis, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

May 21, Subcommittee on Information Policy, Census, and National Archives and the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs of the Committee on Natural Resources, joint hearing on Census Data: Special Issues Related to the U.S. Territories, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

May 22, full Committee, hearing on Accountability Lapses in Multiple Funds for Iraq, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

May 22, Subcommittee on Domestic Policy, hearing on Neighborhoods: Targeting Federal aid to neighborhoods distressed by the subprime mortgage crisis, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science and Technology, May 20, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, to consider H.R. 6065, National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2008, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

May 21, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing on H.R. 5618, National Sea Grant College Program Amendments Act of 2008, 10 a.m., 2325 Rayburn.
May 21, Subcommittee on Investigation and Oversight, hearing on EPA’s Restructured IRIS System: Have Polluters and Politics Overwhelmed Science, 11 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

May 22, Subcommittee on Investigation and Oversight, hearing on American Decline or Renewal?—Globalization Jobs and Technology, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, May 21, Subcommittee on Urban and Rural Entrepreneurship, hearing entitled “Competitive Bidding for Durable Medical Equipment,” 10 a.m., 1539 Rayburn.

May 22, full Committee, hearing entitled “RESPA and its Impact on Small Business, 10 a.m., 1539 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, May 20, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, hearing on Coast Guard and National Transportation Safety Board Casualty Investigation Program, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

May 21, Subcommittee on Water and Environment, hearing on Reauthorization of the Great Lakes Legacy Act, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, May 22, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, hearing on Examining the Effectiveness of VBA Outreach Efforts, 1 p.m., 334 Cannon.

May 22, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on Human Resources Challenges within the Veterans Health Administration, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, May 20, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing on the Department of the Treasury Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, 10:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming, May 22, hearing entitled “Oversight of the Bush Administration’s Energy Policy,” 9:30 a.m. room to be announced.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
2 p.m., Monday, May 19

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will be in a period of morning business.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
10 a.m., Friday May 16

House Chamber

Program for Friday: The House will meet in pro forma session at 10 a.m.
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