United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 2008 No. 95

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 10, 2008.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL R. MCNULTY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 25 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m.

GAS PRICE RELIEF FOR CONSUMERS ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, last month, I had the opportunity and the pleasure to work with the bipartisan majority of 221 Democrats and 103 Republicans, including the entire Wisconsin delegation, to pass the Gas Price Relief for Consumers Act of 2008. This will in time decrease gas prices for everyone and will make certain that no one is able to manipulate oil prices and to control the free markets.

One year ago, crude oil was selling for $65 a barrel, and all of us were paying around $3 per gallon at the pump. We thought things were bad then. The cost per barrel for crude oil has more than doubled since last year while, this week, we are forced to pay in northeast Wisconsin over $4 per gallon. Yet this is taking place during a recession when demand for oil is down. This is not the way of the free marketplace.

Like you, I was more than a little surprised to learn that, during this past January of 2008, we had so much oil right here in the United States that American oil companies were exporting 335,000 barrels of diesel per day to Europe and to Mexico. Enough is enough.

The Gas Price Relief for Consumers Act that we passed would allow us to attack gas price manipulation, something we do not currently have the authority to do. It would authorize as well an antitrust task force within the Department of Justice to begin to root out any anticompetitive activities and price manipulation in the speculative and volatile futures markets. For the first time, it would instruct the Federal Government to evaluate the damaging effects of past oil company mergers and acquisitions and these effects that they have had on our families and on small businesses alike.

This is the first step in beginning to reestablish a free and open marketplace in the world's oil delivery, something that Teddy Roosevelt attempted in the early 1900s.

My friends, we are today no further advanced in establishing a free and open marketplace than we were in 1910, but all of us who live in Wisconsin are struggling to fill our tanks today, and we need relief as fast as possible, and that's why I and an overwhelming number of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle passed this act to begin to cut gas prices immediately, realizing it will require some time to reverse the failed energy policies of the recent past. If studies show we don't have enough oil refineries, then let's ask the question: Is it time that we build refineries on each side of the Rocky Mountains?

Skyrocketing gasoline prices are crippling family budgets and profits for small businesses everywhere in the country. Our long-term energy solutions, however, must include creating a new national energy policy, implementing provisions like those I fought to include in the new farm bill that will promote alternative sources of energy, leaving behind, once and for all, all of the losing ideas that we have had, namely, the drill-and-burn and drill-and-burn philosophy and policy of the Bush and Cheney administration. We cannot drill and burn our way out of this energy crisis.

Although there are many causes for today's record-high gas prices, we should not be afraid to take on specific steps today to ensure that prices for middle class families and small businesses come down. That is why we have given the Department of Justice these new tools to, in effect, put a cop back on the beat, making certain that those who are profiting from our pain at the pump will be held accountable.

With regard to the facts of the situation, let's look at some of the facts here, at the United States' oil facts. We, the people, have leased 42 million acres to oil companies, and of the 42 million acres, they are using 12 million. What else is going on?

Since the year 1980, we have lost over 200 refineries, decreasing our capability to produce more oil and diesel when we require it. What else is going on?

The outer banks. Everyone is talking about leasing the outer banks, the Outer Continental Shelf. Well, 82 percent of that property has already been leased, and they're not drilling. Some people have asked: Why aren't we drilling in ANWR? By drilling in ANWR, what are we going to get?

Printed on recycled paper.

This is an old idea. If we took all of the oil out of ANWR, it would drop, economists say, the cost at the pump by one to two pennies per gallon, and that would take place 10 or 20 years from now. Furthermore, there is no guarantee whatsoever that the companies bringing the oil out of ANWR would deliver it to the United States citizens. It may go to Japan or to Europe or to the highest bidder. So ANWR and drilling, drilling and burning is not the solution.

What is going on in our marketplace? Recent investigations and testimony here in the House and in the Senate have shown that there is a concentration where pension funds are now beginning to invest more and more since the year 2000 into our commodities futures market. So it is now time to ask the question: Isn't it appropriate that we ask you, if you're buying oil, to take possession of what you buy?

FRANKLIN L. ''JAKE'' FLAKE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) for 2 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, flags at the State Capitol in Arizona are flying at half-staff this week to honor the life of Jake Flake.

Jake leaves behind a legacy of service from school boards to irrigation districts to hospital governing boards to the Boy Scouts of America to the Farm Credit Association to countless other organizations. You name it; Jake Flake ran it; raised money for it; rescued it or improved it.

But it was in Arizona's State legislature that he became best known and loved across the State, particularly during his term as Speaker of the House. One of Arizona's last genuine cowboy legislators, his perspective, his insight and his counsel is simply irreplaceable.

To his wife, Mary Louise, Jake was a loving husband. To his 13 children, he was a devoted father. To his 55 grandchildren, he was an adoring grandfather. To his church, he was a faithful servant. To his community, he was a loyal advocate. To his beloved State of Arizona, he was a statesman.

To this lowly Congressman, he was a caring uncle and mentor, and I will miss him dearly.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 10 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, Your provident love is revealed today as it was revealed in the scriptures and in the early days of this Nation's history. Lord, after Your servant Moses had died, You spoke again to Your people and Joshua, the son of Nun. You said, ''Prepare now to cross the Jordan with all the people. Enter the land I stretch out before you. No one can stand against you as long as you live in My presence. I will be with you as I was with Moses. I will not leave you nor will I forsake you.''

In this millennium, we as a Nation need to cross over some turbulent waters and enter into a new terrain. Lord, we must face a new environment with a need for resourceful energy as we seek economic security and global peace.

Give us Your confidence as we once again hear Your words of promise: Be firm and steadfast so that you may lead this people to the secure and prosperous land which I promised to your ancestors. I will be with you as I was with Moses. I will not leave you nor will I forsake you, now or forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. HALL of New York 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.

DOMESTIC OIL DRILLING

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

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Speaker, over the weekend, gas reached the $4 national average for the first time in our Nation's history. The majority in Congress has worked to combat these prices by advancing new energy solutions and efforts to protect consumers. The standard refrain from the oil companies and their allies is, ''We need to drill for more oil here at home.'' I would ask them, ''Who is stopping you?''

The oil company myth is that we need to open up the Arctic refuge and give the oil company a free hand to go wherever and whenever they want to chase oil. The reality, however, is that about 75 percent of the oil in the United States is on land that is already open for production, but less than one-third of that land is actually being used by the oil companies.

They are literally sitting on 10,000 permits and millions of acres of leased land that would let them start pulling more oil out of the ground here at home. So I say to the oil company advocates, start drilling for more domestic supply. Start drilling on the lands that are already open, and stop posturing while American drivers are in pain at the pump.

REDUCE THE PRICE AT THE PUMP

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, you know that the price at the pump is what everyone is talking about. And in my district in Tennessee, moms are now spending over $100 more to fill up the tanks than they were when the Democrats took the gavel in both the House and the Senate. It costs over $100 a month more to fill up the tank of an average minivan. We have seen the price of a gallon of gas go from $2.26 to $4 a gallon.

Madam Speaker, there is a reason for this. And we on the Republican side have solutions for this problem. It is time to waive the gas tax. It is time to waive the ethanol mandates. It is time to waive the requirements for boutique fuels. And it is time for Americans to explore for American energy on American soil.

There is a way to address this. There are bills that are filed. There is action that can be taken. I encourage my Democrat colleagues, encourage your leadership to rise to the challenge, reduce the price at the pump.

BIG OIL NEEDS TO DRILL WHERE THEY HOLD LEASES

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

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, President Bush and congressional Republicans continue to blame today's record gas prices on our refusal to open more land up for drilling. They claim that if we allowed big oil to drill more, gas prices would fall. What Republicans neglect to say is that the number of drilling permits increased dramatically over the last 5 years from 3,800 permits in 2002 to 7,500 last year.

That's right. Big oil is actually getting access to more land to drill, but is doing nothing to bring down the price of gas. Big oil has access to millions of acres of Federal land. But for some reason, they have yet to do any drilling. According to a new Natural Resources Committee report, oil and gas companies hold leases to nearly 68 million

acres of Federal land that they are not currently drilling. If big oil really wants to drill more, why aren't they drilling?

Madam Speaker, Washington Republicans are wrong again to rely on big oil to bring down the prices at the pump. After all, while American consumers battle these record prices, big oil is laughing all the way to the bank.

THE CURE FOR PUMP PANIC

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, with all the gloom, doom and despair about the high gasoline prices, there is a remedy to this pessimistic pump panic. Before we start passing out bicycles to the multitudes or start going to Dr. Phil for therapy, we can and should obtain more crude oil here in America. Crude oil will still be the driving energy of this Nation for the foreseeable future until we find some alternative. And we don't need to line the pockets of OPEC and Third World dictators by begging them for more crude. We already give them $425 million a day!

The U.S. Geological Survey has released a report that says the ''sweet crude'' oil find in the Williston-Bakken Basin is larger than first believed. It is enormous. According to the report, it is over 500 billion barrels, and it is located in the Dakotas. It is 15 times larger than the oil in the Alaskan North Slope.

America needs to take care of America. We need to remove the silly restrictions that prohibit drilling. We need to drill in the Badlands of the Dakotas; remove the offshore drilling ban; drill in Alaska; and we can cure this pump panic disease.

And that's just the way it is.

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR THE FLOOD AND TORNADO VICTIMS IN IOWA

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

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my sincere sympathy for residents in my district and around Iowa who are currently experiencing severe flooding at record setting levels.

Just this weekend I went to two neighborhoods to help sandbag and protect homes. I spoke with a man who pointed to his home and said, ''This is the only thing I have.'' It was a very emotional setting. I was touched by the intensity and good spirits of many of the residents and volunteers despite the circumstances, and I commend them for their perseverance.

The Governor of Iowa has already issued emergency proclamations for many of Iowa's counties, and four counties have been declared Presidential disaster areas. I understand that the National Guard has been activated to assist in the flood control efforts. I am grateful for their assistance. I continue to stand ready to help my fellow Iowans in any way possible.

SOLUTIONS EXIST FOR HIGH GAS PRICES

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I feel sympathy for the folks paying these high gas prices. Here is a problem: On average, $3.98, take in climate change 50 cents and we'll be paying $4.48 a gallon.

Here is the solution: Outer Continental Shelf, which is off-limits by appropriation bills; moving coal-to-liquid technology, which has been blocked here on motions to recommit; expanding renewable fuels, which has been helpful, but still is not the panacea.

The New York Times, which is not one of our best supporters, says the counties were motorists spend the highest percentage of their income on gasoline tend to be poor, rural areas, which is what I represent. That is why I am on the floor monthly now talking about gas reaching $4 a gallon, refinery expansion delayed because of environmental attacks, the clean gas, $4 increase in price of natural gas bills.

Our consuming public cannot stand these high prices any more. Our manufacturing base cannot. We have to bring on more supply.

THE PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

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

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, 45 years ago today, President Kennedy signed a law to end what he called the ''unconscionable practice of paying female workers less wages than male workers for the same job.''

When President Kennedy signed the law, women earned 60 cents for every dollar earned by a man. In 2006, the woman's share is 77 cents. While we have made some progress in 45 years, it is scant at best. Since 1963 the ratio has narrowed by less than one-half cent per year. At this rate, my 13-year-old daughter will be close to retirement by the time President Kennedy's order is realized.

That is why I am cosponsoring H.R. 1338, the Paycheck Fairness Act, which adds teeth to previous laws.

Equal pay for equal work is as American as a principle can be. This is not about men versus women, but basic fairness. And its ramifications affect everyone. Paying women less hurts men who aren't hired because hiring a woman is cheaper. It hurts families by devaluing the work of women and mothers who are already paying out of pocket for child care so they can pursue a career. In short, it hurts all of America, and it must end right here, right now.

YOU CAN'T GET OIL FROM A DRY HOLE

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, more smoke and mirrors that we are hearing this morning from the majority party about, oh, there is plenty of land to drill in, the big oil companies just aren't drilling. Let me just straighten that out just a little bit. Ninety-seven percent of the Federal offshore drilling sites are off-limits. Ninety-four percent of the federally owned onshore areas are off-limits. Fifty-two percent of the area that oil companies drilled in between 2002 and 2007 were dry holes. We need to allow these oil companies to drill in areas where there actually is oil.

I don't know the economics that the majority party has, but if there is no oil, why would you drill there? That does not make sense. If the government would sell companies leases that have oil in them instead of selling them places that turn out to be dry holes, then we would have more oil produced in this country. We imported over 600 million gallons of gasoline last year. We need to add to our refinery capabilities, also.

□ 1015

ANOTHER MONTH OF JOB LOSSES: CONGRESS SHOULD EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, every month this year our economy has shed more jobs than it has produced. Last month was no exception; 49,000 jobs were lost nationwide and unemployment rose from 5 percent in April to 5.5 percent in May. That is the largest 1 month increase in 20 years.

As job losses continue on a monthly basis, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the unemployed to find jobs, and it is expected to get even worse. That is why last month this Congress passed legislation to extend unemployment benefits for an additional 13 weeks.

Today, more than 1 million people have exhausted all of their benefits. Washington should provide these workers some additional relief as they continue to pursue a job through these rough times. Yet President Bush and congressional Republicans oppose the unemployment insurance extension, even though they supported a similar extension in 2002 when economic conditions were not nearly as hard as they are today.

Madam Speaker, the May jobs report should serve as a wake-up call to President Bush and congressional Republicans to support our efforts to extend unemployment insurance.

URGING THE PRESIDENT TO DECLARE AN EXPEDITED MAJOR DISASTER AREA IN THE STATE OF INDIANA

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, across Indiana, Hoosiers are picking up the pieces from a week of extraordinary weather. My own hometown of Columbus is in the midst of a cleanup of the worst flooding since the Great Flood of 1913, and I come to the floor today to urge the President of the United States to take immediate action and declare an expedited major disaster area in the State of Indiana as a result of these severe storms, tornadoes and torrential downpour.

Following the harsh impact of tornadoes 1 week ago today, on Saturday parts of my district experienced approximately 10 inches of rain in a matter of hours. This is more rainfall than Hoosiers typically see in 2 months during this time of year, and the results have been catastrophic.

I commend the President for his action on Sunday evening speeding relief to community governments, but this government must act and act now to bring relief to Hoosier families, small businesses and family farms. We need additional declarations like those requested by Governor Mitch Daniels of the President, support from FEMA and the Department of Agriculture, and we need it now.

Hoosier families and communities are hurting, and they deserve to know that help is on the way. I urge this administration and all of my colleagues to focus their attention on this urgent Midwestern need for emergency relief.

CONGRATULATING SHAWN JOHNSON: 2007 WORLD GYMNASTIC CHAMPION; 2008 NATIONAL CHAMPION

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

Mr. BOSWELL. Madam Speaker, last November I stood here to congratulate a native of Iowa, a young woman from our district who has demonstrated amazing discipline and spirit of American ambition. In September of 2007, Shawn Johnson won the 2007 World Artistic Gymnastic Championship. She is one of four American women to hold this esteemed title.

Today, I congratulate Shawn on her most recent win. On Saturday, June 7, Shawn successfully defended her title as the National Champion in women's gymnastics. Next weekend she will compete in Philadelphia for a spot on the elite six-member U.S. Women's Olympic Gymnastic Team.

Shawn not only exudes the hard work necessary to achieve her dreams, but also the character of a natural role model. Even with all her gold medals and new-found fame, Shawn continues to compete with humble pride and gratitude.

I thank Shawn for all of the wonderful things she has done around the State of Iowa and the Nation. Since winning the world championship, she has used her fame to bring awareness to breast cancer and other cancers that affect women.

Once again, Shawn, congratulations on winning the National Championship again, and good luck in Philadelphia.

REPUBLICANS ARE READY TO ACT ON ENERGY NEEDS

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, my constituents and Americans are asking, where is the bill? When will House Democrats bring forward a real plan for families being hammered by record gas prices?

Today, the majority will spend hours considering no less than 10 nonbinding resolutions. Yet this Democrat Congress will do nothing, nothing, about outrageous energy prices. We fill the day with recognitions and commemorations, but there is no urgency for struggling Americans.

It is shameful that with energy prices rising 70 percent on their watch, House Democrats remain stubbornly opposed to offering any ideas to increase supply and lower gas prices. All we see from this majority is brazen neglect.

Republicans, on the other hand, have brought forward an energy action plan. We are ready to act. We are ready to increase American-made energy resources. We are ready to provide a broad mix of energy options. We are ready to streamline regulations allowing for increasing refining capacity. We are ready to help.

Madam Speaker, we are ready. Americans are begging to know, when will this Democrat majority be?

THE TROUBLED STATE OF OUR WORLD'S OCEANS

(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, I rise today to speak about the troubled state of our world's oceans. Last month, I attended an ocean science summit in Monterey, California. Also there were State and Federal policymakers and scientists concerned about our oceans and the lack of attention our Federal Government has given them.

This year's summit marked the 10-year anniversary of the Year of the Ocean and the oceans conference in Monterey attended by President Clinton and Vice President Gore. In the intervening 10 years, the Federal Government has done little to address the oceans' growing problems, ranging from overfishing to pollution to coastal development and global warming. California and Massachusetts have had to step into the breach, but problems as big as our oceans can't be addressed by a few States.

Fortunately, there is a solution. Oceans 21, introduced by Representative FARR and moving through the Natural Resources Committee now, establishes a national oceans policy and a framework for national and regional management of our shared ocean resources.

I strongly urge my colleagues to sponsor Oceans 21. Join us, and help provide stewardship for this vast resource and protect it for future generations.

REMEMBERING THE HEROES OF WORLD WAR II

(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. Madam Speaker, 64 years ago this week, my father and approximately 2 million of his fellow soldiers from the United States, Great Britain, and Canada were moving into the area of France, which began the liberation of Europe. Sixty-four years ago they sacrificed in ways almost unimaginable for us. Had they not done that, had they not succeeded, we would not enjoy the freedoms we have today.

Yet it was little remarked nor remembered on the pages of our newspapers across our country and on our television sets. And the fact of the matter is these brave, gentle warriors are dying at over 1,000 a day. We soon will not have the opportunity to thank them for the sacrifices they made.

So today as we deal with these problems that face us, let us remember that America has always been a can-do country. We have never shirked from challenges. We have figured out how to do it. And remember in the words of those people in that movie not too long ago, to ask ourselves what our fathers asked themselves; are we worthy? Did we lead a good life? Did we do what we had to do?

DEMOCRATS ARE FIGHTING TO IMPROVE THE LIVES OF VETERANS

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

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Speaker, while the Iraq war has stretched our military thin and our troops continue to struggle with multiple deployments,

House Democrats are fighting to improve the lives of soldiers when they return home.

Last month we passed a new and improved GI Bill that restores the promise of a full 4-year college scholarship. The original GI Bill sparked economic growth and expansion in America after World War II. This new bill will be an integral part of rebuilding our failing economy. It will also make military service more attractive and improve the quality of recruits as we work to strengthen our military. The new GI Bill goes further than current law, which only covers a small portion of public and private college education.

Madam Speaker, the education of our Nation's veterans should be considered a cost of the war which they rightfully have earned after completing their military service.

Madam Speaker, the U.S. has never gone wrong when it properly invests in education and rewards our veterans. I would only hope that President Bush would reconsider his opposition to the new GI Bill. It is the right thing to do for both our military and our economy.

DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY NEEDS NEW ENERGY POLICY NOW

(Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, with high gas prices soaring, moms and dads across East Tennessee and across America are struggling to put a budget together at the kitchen table. They are worried how they are going to pay for their health care, how they are going to buy enough gas to get their kids to school, how they are going to pay for their children's education.

Families and small businesses across America are hurting. Earl Humphreys, for example, in Bristol, Tennessee, owns Lawn Boyz Lawn Care Service. He has told me he may have to go out of business.

It is time for solutions, time for no more excuses. High gas prices are not only an economic security issue, they are a national security issue. We are too dependent on foreign countries, countries that hate us and hate our freedoms and, quite frankly, hate our religion.

We need an energy policy now. I call on the Democrat majority to offer legislation that will provide for lower gas prices, better economic security, better national security, and I ask them to do it now. We need to use American energy. We need solutions.

REPUBLICAN LEADERS OPPOSE EFFORTS TO LOWER RECORD HIGH GAS PRICES AT THE PUMP

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

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, for 7 years now, Washington Republicans have allowed Big Oil to run our Nation's energy policy. From the very first days of this administration, Vice President CHENEY was meeting in secret with energy executives to develop its energy proposal. Today we see the results of that secret policy that was approved by a rubber-stamp Republican Congress. When President Bush took office, the average price of gas was $1.47. Today, it has more than doubled to an average hovering around $4.

Since taking control of Congress last year, Democrats have rejected the failed Republican policies that are responsible for these record high prices. We are working to lower prices by cracking down on price gouging, holding OPEC accountable for price fixing, repealing subsidies for profit-rich oil companies, and instead investing in renewable energy.

Each of these efforts have received some partisan support, but the Republican leadership of this House and the President continue to oppose our efforts.

RESPONSIBLE ENERGY POLICY NEEDED

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today America is drilling for ice on Mars, yet we cannot drill for oil in America. We have billions of gallons of crude oil in America that we can't even tap into because of a failed policy by the majority. We can't drill for oil. Just yesterday, I filled up my car and paid $3.99.9 a gallon.

It is crazy that we can't drill for oil. We have to have responsible energy policy that gives us more supply. It is not about wind or electricity or taxing oil. The Democrats want to put a 50 cents a gallon tax on every gallon of diesel and gasoline in America. That is inane. That is not energy policy.

We have to drill for oil now. We have to streamline the permitting process for refineries. We have to supply more gas to people. It is a national security policy, it is an economic policy that we cannot continue that the majority has given us today. We need a responsible energy policy.

DEMOCRATS TAKE ACTION ON RECORD HIGH GAS PRICES AT THE PUMP

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, as the price of gas continues to hit record highs almost every day, House Democrats continue to work on passing legislation that creates a cleaner and smarter energy policy that will provide consumers some real relief.

This year, the House has passed nine bills, many of which the President has vetoed, that should help lower prices at the pump.

Last month we passed a final farm bill that makes an historic investment in expanding biofuel production, largely from non-food crops such as cornstalks, wood chips and switchgrass. The bill also provides support to farmers growing energy crops and entrepreneurs building refineries to convert biomass into fuel. Without biofuels, gasoline prices would be about 50 cents higher per gallon than they are right now.

The farm bill should be going to the President's desk any day now, but he plans to veto it. Fortunately, we should have enough bipartisan support to override that veto when the bill comes back to Congress.

Madam Speaker, investing in biofuels is critical to our energy future. The farm bill is just one more example of how this Democratic Congress is working to lower prices at the pump.

□ 1030

INCREASE THE SUPPLY OF OIL AT HOME

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, President Bush recently went to Saudi Arabia to ask the gulf kingdom to increase its oil production to help bring down gas prices. Instead of flying all the way to the Middle East, perhaps he should have made the short trip down Pennsylvania Avenue for a visit with Congress to ask the lawmakers here to increase the supply of oil right here at home.

According to the Department of Interior, 86 billion barrels of oil are available in the Outer Continental Shelf, added to the 53 billion barrels available in land. According to the Bureau of Land Management, we have 139 billion barrels of oil right here at home. That's more than the oil-rich countries like Kuwait, Venezuela and Russia have. Last year we imported over 6 billion gallons of refined gasoline into the United States.

One might ask, considering these numbers, why aren't we attempting to access more of our fuel right here at home? The Democrat leaders have a roadblock to every bill to drill for oil, natural gas, shale oil, right here in the U.S.

How long is it going to take them to learn?

AMERICAN FAMILIES ARE PAYING THE PRICE

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

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, today American families are paying the price for 7 years of failed economic policies

by this administration. This year alone, our economy has lost more than 300,000 jobs. It's important to remember that in order to just keep up with the population growth, our economy must create at least 150,000 jobs per month.

These statistics are devastating to millions of unemployed Americans who are increasingly competing against each other for the very few jobs that have become available. Yet President Bush continues to sit on the sidelines hoping that the economic situation will correct itself without additional governmental intervention.

The Democratic House believes the government must act, and it must act now. That's why we passed legislation last month that would extend unemployment insurance to workers who have exhausted their benefits. We also plan to move a second economic stimulus package that should help create jobs. I hope both President Bush and congressional Republicans would finally realize that this is the right thing to do.

DEMOCRATS HELP REBUILD THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, with so many Americans fearing the loss of their jobs and their homes and worrying about the rising cost of basic needs like food and gas, it is clear that Washington must act.

The House had led the way in working to jump-start the economic recovery by putting hundreds of dollars in the hands of more than 130 million American families with the economic stimulus package. That is only the first step. It is going to take time to reverse the 7 years of the Bush failed economic policies that have favored the wealthiest few to the detriment of the middle class.

Congressional Democrats are working to address the record high cost of gasoline with the passage of a renewable energy tax incentive that will lower prices at the pump and create thousands of green jobs. With 325,000 jobs lost over the last 5 months, this Congress extended unemployment benefits last month, so that those having a hard time finding a new job have access to 13 additional weeks.

The Bush economy is hurting middle-class families in my home State of New Jersey, across the Nation, and we must give them relief.

DELIVER FUEL SOURCES TO THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, gas prices have finally hit $4 a gallon. That's $1.71 higher than when we first met as a Congress, and the Speaker said she had a secret plan to lower those costs.

Yet rather than talking about energy issues, we are talking, spending time to find scapegoats to blame for those costs, not realizing that for every dollar that goes up in energy costs, jobs are lost, income is reduced, our social programs are harmed and people simply suffer. We should be fighting for these issues, for the 1,100 people that worked for American Airlines but were fired because they couldn't afford the gas for 100 planes; for the Washington, D.C., cabbie who, for the first time in his life, cannot greet his kids at home when they come home from school because he has to work 2 hours a day longer for the same amount of money; for the Virginia father who can no longer attend his father-and-son outing because he can't afford the gas to go there.

People are suffering, and, instead, we are here on the floor dealing with congressional minutia. We must be dealing with legislation to improve conservation, improve production and improve innovations of how we deliver those fuel sources to the people. Otherwise we will become, as John Adams said, one useless man is disgraced, two are a law firm, and three or more become a Congress.

The people have had this Congress.

DEMOCRATS TAKE ACTION ON RECORD HIGH GAS PRICES AT THE PUMP

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

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I, for one, welcome this opportunity to engage in a debate with my friends across the aisle about who truly stands with the American consumer versus standing with Big Oil.

Over the weekend, the average price for a gallon of gas hit $4 per gallon. It's $4.50 per gallon at the pump closest to this debate. These outrageous prices are taking their toll on all of us, and the average American driver now pays more than $2,200 per year for gasoline, up from about $1,400 a year in 2001 at the beginning of the Bush administration.

Since January 2007, when this Democratic Congress came into the majority, we have been committed to changing the Nation's energy policy so we can lower prices at the pump. Last year, this Democratic Congress passed the landmark law that will make cars and trucks more efficient, which will eventually save American families somewhere between $700 to $1,000 each year. We have followed this up this year by passing bills cracking down on price gouging by Big Oil.

NATURAL GAS IS THE CLEAN, GREEN FUEL

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, today natural gas opened at $12.65 per 1,000 Btus. That is an almost 100 percent increase from this time a year ago.

Natural gas is the clean, green fuel that powers our manufacturing economy, accounts for 23 percent of the energy consumed in America and heats 52 million of our homes. Yet as prices continue to skyrocket and companies move offshore because America has the highest natural gas prices in the world, this Congress has done absolutely nothing to increase production.

Tomorrow, I will offer an amendment to the Interior appropriations bill that will lift the congressional moratorium on offshore production from 50 to 200 miles, which happens to be the safest and most environmentally friendly place to produce energy. There is no need to beg the Saudis for more oil and Canada for more natural gas.

We have vast reserves here in America. We need to produce American energy with an American labor force and give Americans energy they can afford.

COLLUSION AND PRICE GOUGING

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, you have got to admit it's a great system. The oil companies fill the Republican coffers with campaign contributions, and the Republicans pretend that they care about consumers while the Republicans stonewall steps to rein in price-gouging market speculation.

Remember the Enron loophole? That's 50 cents a gallon at the pump today. Ken Lay is dead, but it lives on.

They are protecting OPEC against World Trade Organization complaints that the President refuses to sign. He goes over and holds hands with the Saudi princes, but he won't file a complaint against market collusion.

Refineries, you are right. We have got a shortage. ExxonMobil says they are doing just fine. They have no plans to build a refinery. They are making obscene profits, 6,492 leases, no development. Eighty percent of the Outer Continental Shelf reserves are available, no plans to drill. Naval Petroleum Reserve, it is 8 years since Clinton leased it, zero percent production. There is a sea of oil under it.

Market forces, 11 bucks in 1 day for a barrel of oil, while consumption is way down in the U.S. It's not market forces, it's collusion and price gouging. The Bush-Cheney Republican caucus and the OPEC cartel are doing just fine the way things are. They pretend they want change, but they don't.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6003, PASSENGER RAIL INVESTMENT AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2008

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1253 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1253

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6003) to reauthorize Amtrak, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 6003 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H. Res. 1253 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 6003, the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008. The resolution provides 1 hour of general debate controlled by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and makes in order 8 of the 10 amendments submitted for consideration.

From coast to coast we are seeing the effects of rising fuel prices. Energy prices have been a regular topic here in Congress, in the newspapers, and at family dinner tables.

The average price of a gallon of gas in Sacramento just climbed to $4.41. My constituents are feeling this burden every single day. Driving to work and school is becoming more difficult and more costly for everyone.

The City of Sacramento also just started a major construction project on I–5, which cuts through the heart of my district. The already congested streets are going to become even more crowded.

□ 1045

That is why I am glad we are here considering such an important bill to reauthorize and invest in Amtrak. Our constituents are in desperate need of alternative modes of travel to combat both increased congestion as well as rising gas prices. Now is the time to capitalize on the renewed interest in passenger rail.

Millions of Americans from Atlanta to Sacramento are getting out of their cars and onto public transit. Many of these riders will be getting on rail for the first time. We must not let the opportunity to invest in our rail system pass us by.

From Greece to Paris to Tokyo, we have seen the economic benefits of intercity rail. Let's now bring these benefits to our Nation, our States, and our hometowns.

The Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act takes great strides to improve Amtrak and give our constituents the flexibility they need to travel.

Amtrak was created in 1970 to preserve and reinvigorate intercity passenger rail service throughout the country. Since 1981, it has been the Nation's sole provider of regularly scheduled intercity passenger rail service.

In fiscal year 2007, Amtrak carried more than 25.8 million passengers, the fifth straight fiscal year of record ridership. Increased ridership numbers occurred across all of Amtrak's services in both corridor and long-distance routes. On average, more than 70,000 passengers ride on Amtrak every day.

Amtrak's financial performance has also improved in recent years, posting record gains in ticket sales. My region has seen the positive effects and benefits of having efficient transportation options. The Capitol Corridor line in California is showing that record numbers of Californians are choosing to use passenger rail. Ridership on the Capitol Corridor line is up 14 percent and revenue is up 21 percent from last year. On-time performance was also up from last year.

We can all agree that Amtrak needs to be brought into the 21st century. This legislation provides a comprehensive framework to improve Amtrak across the country. It increases capital and operating grants to Amtrak, helps bring the Northeast Corridor to a state of good repair, and makes various capital improvements.

H.R. 6003 also creates a new grant program for intercity passenger rail capital projects. Our urban centers will see tangible benefits and a commitment to getting cars off the streets by promoting alternative and efficient modes of transportation.

H.R. 6003 takes great strides to relieve rail congestion. It provides important congestion grants and works to resolve disputes between commuter and freight railroads. It also provides significant funding for high-speed rail corridors, including $1.75 billion for construction and equipment.

Simply put, this bill will reduce congestion and facilitate ridership growth.

I want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR and Ranking Member MICA for coming together on this important bipartisan legislation. I am proud that this Congress is taking this important issue and tackling it, and look forward to supporting this legislation.

Madam Speaker, passage of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act is an important step to demonstrating our commitment to infrastructure investment. This is long overdue, and I encourage everyone to support the rule and the underlying legislation to provide the country with a safe and alternative mode of travel.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today and want to thank my friend from California, a member of the Rules Committee, for yielding this time to me to discuss the proposed rule for consideration of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act.

I rise in opposition to this rule, and to the legislation, neither of which will meet the Democrats' campaign promises about how they said they would run the House in a fair and transparent manner, nor the American taxpayers'

expectations how the Federal Government should manage tax revenues that it takes from hardworking Americans.

The Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 would reauthorize Government spending on Amtrak over the next 5 years at a cost of almost $15 billion without requiring any meaningful reforms in Amtrak's governance or operations and without allocating taxpayer dollars based on a demand for the service.

As we know, Amtrak is a private corporation that continues to receive large Federal operating subsidies, despite laws passed by Congress requiring after 2002, over 5 years ago, that they should be able to run their operations without Federal grant funds.

Despite the fact that the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee approved this legislation, I am not alone in believing that Amtrak should conduct its operations without picking the pockets of American families who are already being asked to do this by the do-nothing Democrat Congress to pay for record prices for energy, and can little afford to subsidize the inefficiencies of a transportation system that many of them will never use.

Like me and many of my Republican colleagues, President Bush has urged this Congress to pass legislation that would: (1) create a system driven by sound economics where services are provided based primarily on consumer demand; (2) promote competition; (3) focus Amtrak on core operating competencies; (4) establish funding partnerships with States; and, (5) improve investment in and management of the Northeast Corridor.

I include for the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy for H.R. 6003.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Washington, DC, June 9, 2008.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 6003—PASSENGER RAIL INVESTMENT AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2008, (REP. OBERSTAR (D) MINNESOTA AND 41 COSPONSORS)

The Administration believes that a significantly reformed intercity passenger rail system has the potential to play a role of growing importance in providing transportation options in the United States, including helping to reduce congestion along heavily traveled intercity corridors. However, the Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 6003, which would reauthorize the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) for five years, because it would authorize an appropriation of more than $14 billion without requiring any meaningful reforms in Amtrak's governance or operations and without allocating resources based on the demand for passenger rail service. *For this reason, and others set forth below, if the bill were presented to the President in its current form, his senior advisors would recommend he veto it.*

Amtrak is a private corporation that continues to receive large Federal operating subsidies, despite longstanding existing law requiring that, after 2002, ''Amtrak shall operate without Federal operating grant funds appropriated for its benefit.'' H.R. 6003 authorizes an unprecedented level of funding but does not include basic measures to hold Amtrak accountable to taxpayers for its spending decisions. For example, H.R. 6003 provides scant opportunity for competition on existing Amtrak routes and does not include provisions that would condition Amtrak's funding based on progress on reforms. Measures to address these areas are included in S. 294 and should be adopted before Congress completes its work on this measure.

The Administration also would strongly object if bonding authority were added to the bill. Language in the introduced version of H.R. 6004, the Rail Infrastructure Development and Expansion Act for the 21st Century, permits State issuance of $24 billion in bonds, including but not limited to tax credit bonds. In particular, the use of tax credit bonds to finance the construction of high-speed rail capital projects would be expensive and highly inefficient, and costs would be borne by taxpayers, not system users.

To move Amtrak towards a sustainable business model, the Administration urges Congress to pass legislation that reflects the following core reform principles consistently articulated by this Administration: (1) create a system driven by sound economics where services are provided based primarily on consumer demand; (2) promote competition; (3) focus Amtrak on core operating competencies; (4) establish funding partnerships with States; and (5) improve the investment in and management of the Northeast Corridor.

The Administration appreciates that H.R. 6003 includes measures to promote private sector development of the Northeast Corridor and other potential high-speed routes. Making use of the private sector's operational and financial management capabilities could help new rail services to perform at a high level for the traveling public. However, the Administration is concerned that the authorized funding levels for high-speed rail in H.R. 6003 send the wrong message; any expansions of rail service should be based on a sustainable business model.

Titles III and V would establish certain capital grants programs requiring workers employed with funds obtained under these programs be paid pursuant to Davis-Bacon Act requirements. Thus, Titles III and V would expand Davis-Bacon Act coverage, which is contrary to the Administration's long-standing policy of opposing any statutory attempt to expand or contract the applicability of Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage requirements. This expansion could undermine the effectiveness of the enumerated programs.

This statement, which outlines these goals for the improvement of Amtrak, makes clear that the President's senior advisers would recommend his veto of today's legislation that falls far short of this mark.

During testimony in the Rules Committee last evening, it was represented to the committee that the legislation would allow some minimal privatization of a few routes, and that some additional studies and the rearrangement of some management duties at Amtrak were included in the bill to improve its efficiencies. I appreciate these efforts, and although I do not think that they go nearly far enough, because as we speak Amtrak continues to hemorrhage money due to labor disputes, energy costs, and the requirement that they maintain service on very lightly used, long-haul routes through rural areas of the country.

Unfortunately, through their inaction, the Democrat majority has already demonstrated its lack of interest in doing anything serious to address this issue as well as soaring energy costs. Through its flurry of constant action on behalf of big labor bosses, they have demonstrated that they are equally unwilling to do anything to address that problem for Amtrak, its riders, or the American public.

That means that the only opportunity that Members have to reform Amtrak in this bill is through cutting the fat from these underused, rural long-haul lines that are often subsidized at a cost of multiple hundreds of dollars per ticket by American taxpayers.

To address this problem, I have offered an amendment that is very similar to my efforts in the past on this issue, but is this time even more direct in its approach.

In March 2007, I offered an amendment to the Rail and Public Transportation Security Act that would have prohibited Amtrak from subsidizing its 10 worst revenue losing long-distance routes, as determined by its own September 2006 monthly performance report unless the Secretary of Homeland Security determined that the route was critical to our homeland security needs. Unfortunately, this commonsense and fiscally responsible amendment failed.

So today, I will be offering an amendment that is even more direct in its purpose and even more clear in its intent, an amendment that will simply prohibit taxpayer subsidies from flowing to the absolutely worst, most wasteful, most expensive long-distance route that Amtrak runs, according to its own performance report as of March 2008, unless this route is deemed to be critical to our Nation's homeland security.

My amendment simply seeks to prevent further good taxpayer dollars from being thrown after bad by limiting the cost of Amtrak's number one least profitable route; the number one least profitable route, that's all we are asking in this bill.

Madam Speaker, if Members cannot support this simple, security-conscious amendment on behalf of fiscal discipline, I don't know if there is anything that we can possibly do to help the American taxpayers any more.

I ask all of my colleagues to vote against this rule which does not match the Democrats' rhetoric about running the most honest, open and transparent Congress in history. I also ask them to oppose this underlying legislation which even if my amendment were included does not go far enough to protect the hard-earned money of American taxpayers from wasteful spending at Amtrak.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, before I yield to the next speaker, I just want to remind my colleagues that all of the

Nation's major transportation systems receive significant Federal investment, with good reason. Investment in rail infrastructure creates jobs, helps with congestion, decreases our dependence on oil, and offers viable alternatives for many of our citizens, including the elderly and disabled.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI), a member of the Rules Committee and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman OBERSTAR, Chairwoman BROWN, and Ranking Members MICA and SHUSTER for their bipartisan leadership on the Amtrak legislation we will consider today, and as they showed yesterday in the Rules Committee, for their passionate advocacy on behalf of this great bill.

There has been much discussion about the condition of our Nation's transportation system and the growing pressures it faces from all sides: skyrocketing costs of fuel and maintenance; increased congestion from growing demand; and global climate change.

H.R. 6003 will take tremendous strides toward addressing these pressures by continuing our commitment to Amtrak and passenger rail service. Maintenance costs will continue to hinder us, but expanding and improving passenger rail service has the potential to relieve congestion both on our highways and in the skies by offering passengers a viable alternative. A shift toward rail can reduce the harmful CO_2 emissions generated by the transportation system.

For too long Amtrak has been the symbol of partisan politics in Washington. If we are to have a robust and successful system that users can rely on, then we must make a bipartisan commitment to supporting Amtrak. We cannot waiver on this commitment and expect to keep pace with the national rail systems of other developed countries around the world.

Partisan bickering has hurt Amtrak's overall state of repair. In fact, the Department of Transportation's inspector general concluded that, ''Despite multiple efforts over the years to change Amtrak's structure and funding, we have a system that limps along, is never in a state of good repair, awash in debt, and perpetually on the edge of collapse.'' That must change.

Amtrak's maintenance backlog is a major impediment to its success. In recent years, Amtrak's ridership has grown at a modest but continuing rate, and Amtrak's on-time performance has declined down to an on-time arrival rate of 67.8 percent.

The Department of Transportation's inspector general has stated that Amtrak's continued deferral of maintenance increases the risk of a major failure on its system. Currently, Amtrak has an estimated $6 billion in backlogged capital maintenance needs, including $4 billion on the Northeast Corridor, its most profitable line.

I would gladly take the train home to my Upstate New York district, or from my home in Utica to New York City, but currently that is not a viable option because of the minimal Amtrak service. And even when there is service available, it is unreliable. Deferred track maintenance, especially in Upstate New York, has required lowering the speed limits on significant portions of the track. In addition, competition with freight carriers for priority on tracks causes Amtrak trains to become seriously delayed, to the point where train schedules are simply unreliable. The on-time arrival rate between Albany and Buffalo is a mere 42 percent, meaning that less than half of the trains arrive on time.

□ 1100

Unfortunately, for hardworking Americans, passenger rail is the only option for travel because of record high fuel prices, making air and car travel less viable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. ARCURI. I thank you for the additional time.

Improving passenger rail service must be part of our long-term transportation strategy if we expect to effectively decrease our Nation's reliance on finite fossil fuels, and allow Americans to get to and from work on time without breaking the bank each month.

The Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act will aggressively address these concerns. I encourage my colleagues to vote for this rule and the underlying bill and continue to support the viable passenger rail option in our Nation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from New York, my friend, really made a great argument on exactly what I've been trying to say. But we've got to get our friends to come around the corner and see that if we would get Amtrak to do the things that are in their mission statement, rather than running all across the United States trying to do things that are not cost effective, are not within their main core mission, then we could find the money that would be available for them to support, as the gentleman said, the Northeast Corridor, to spend the money within the corridor to make them safer.

But, instead, what happens is Amtrak is not held accountable, not by this Congress. We tell them, just go ahead and do whatever you choose to do, rather than focusing on their mission which they have, which is that which is required for traffic on the coasts, the west coast and the east coast.

So, Madam Speaker, once again, we can't expect Amtrak to do the things that would be in the best interest if they won't stick to their mission, if this Congress will not hold them accountable for the taxpayer dollars that they are utilizing.

Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, the distinguished gentleman, Mr. BROWN.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. I thank my great friend from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today in strong support of H.R. 6003, the bipartisan Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008.

I want to applaud Subcommittee Chairwoman BROWN and Ranking Member SHUSTER, along with Full Committee Chairman OBERSTAR and Ranking Member MICA, for crafting a bipartisan reauthorization package that is focused on both improving Amtrak's capital assets, while also providing for development of new corridors in partnerships with States.

I am most pleased to see a major commitment to high speed rail contained in this bill, something that is absent in the Senate's bill. This legislation calls for more than just paper plans for high speed rail projects; it actually calls for dedicated funding and private sector involvement to move these projects forward.

Specifically, I am pleased that this legislation contains a provision that will improve the ability of future high speed rail corridors in the Southeast to best meet the changing population patterns and tourist demands along the cost.

With America facing $4 gas and airlines seeing fuel costs 100 percent higher than last year, we must look to develop in ways that will ensure that new travel options such as high speed rail are directed where they are most needed.

High speed rail can play an important role in reducing congestion in places like the Grand Strand in my State, which sees 14 million tourists a year, and Charleston, which is the most congested small city in the country. And I am glad that this bill takes the next step towards addressing the transportation needs of these communities.

Another important element of this bill moves us towards planning for rail transportation the same way we plan for highways. Again, as we face historically high gasoline and diesel fuel costs, we must ensure that our transportation system is planned out to provide the connectivity that we need for increased passenger rail use and to take advantage of freight rail's ability to move a ton of freight 436 miles on a gallon of fuel. When combined with the investment this bill makes in high speed rail, and by allowing freight and passenger railroads to negotiate access to freight-owned tracks, the Committee's reauthorization proposal will go a long way towards an improved rail system in the future.

But that future may not be possible, Madam Speaker, if America continues

to face $4 gasoline at the pump. I urge the majority to bring to the floor one of the many pieces of legislation introduced to open up domestic sources of energy, or else we won't be able to catch even an on-time train.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I'd just like to say that this bill creates a new State Capital Grants program for intercity passenger rail projects. These grants will help fund new facilities and equipment for intercity passenger rail and help move commuters off the roads and pollution out of the air.

The bill also authorizes $1.75 billion to develop 11 high-speed rail corridors. These corridors will help remove cars from the highway and reduce pollution.

With that, I would like to reserve my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 5 minutes to the ranking member of the subcommittee, the Republican from Pennsylvania, the gentleman, Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I want to start today by saying that it's a shame that this Congress and that the majority party, for 18 months, has failed to do anything to alleviate our energy problems in this country. We've had ample opportunity to pass legislation that will deal with this rising cost of energy this country, and as I've said, we've done nothing. The American people are crying out for us to do something.

And what we can do, it's obvious, in the short-term it's supply. It's look for new sources of oil, explore in different parts of this country, offshore. That's the answer in the short-term.

The long term-we have other technologies, clean coal technology, nuclear energy. We have to start doing something here. The American people, as I said, are crying out.

Gas in my district is $4 a gallon. In my 7 years in Congress, I've been approached by people to tell me they disagree with me on this issue or that issue. But I've never had people come up to me and at the gas pump and yell at me publicly about this Congress doing absolutely nothing.

The time is now. We have to act. We've already, 7, 15 years ago we should have been acting. But we have to move today. As I said, it's just a shame that we haven't done anything sooner.

That being said, I think that this bill that we have before us today, The Passenger Rail Investment Improvement Act, does something positive when it comes to energy in this country. It's a small step. It's a positive step, but it's a step I think it's important for us to take today.

The last time that we authorized Amtrak was 1997. Gas was $1.27 a gallon, and today, as I said, in Central Pennsylvania it's hovering around $4 a gallon.

We also have, in this country, in 2005, we passed the 300 million mark in population. It took us 65 years to go from 200 million to 300 million. It's only going to take us 35 years to go from 300 million to 400 million. And that population isn't all going to move out into the West and to the middle of the country. That population will move around some, but those corridors around the country that are densely populated, the Northeast Corridor, Chicago, the west coast, throughout Texas, Florida, up and down the east coast, those corridors are going to become even more, the population is going to become denser.

So it's important that we do things to encourage people to use other forms of transportation, and passenger rail is one of those modes of transportation. It is one of the, if not the most efficient modes of transportation to move people, move large quantities of people. And I think that that's an extremely important reason for us to move forward.

As we watch fuel prices escalate, as we watch the population continue to grow, and as I said, the American people are desperate to escape gas prices, long commutes that define their work days, and I think this is a way for us to move forward.

Now, in the bill there are some important provisions, and one of the reasons that myself and the Ranking Member MICA signed on to it, and there are some private sector initiatives. First, we authorize in this bill for Amtrak, the IG and the Department of Transportation to identify the least of the underperforming, significantly underperforming lines in this country; identify at least two of them. That we then turn to the private sector and allow them to bid to take those lines over, and to allow them to run them and see if we can't turn them into efficient operations.

The second privatization initiative is to take a line in this country that Amtrak has stopped using, has abandoned because of high cost or whatever reason, and allow the private sector to take it over, re-establish it and run it efficiently and profitably, we hope.

And third is the Northeast Corridor. It is the most used corridor in the country. We need to establish high speed rail in this country, and the Northeast Corridor is where we need to do it, from Washington to New York; to get private sector companies to come to the table to give real bids on how much it's going to cost to establish high speed rail in this country. Not pie in the sky, not throwing darts, as we've done over the years, but to have real numbers, if it's $10 billion, $20 billion, $60 billion, how much is it going to cost us to have true high speed which we need in this country, because of the population growth, because of energy costs that we have in this country.

High speed rail is extremely important in this authorization. And for the past 20 years we've had a theoretical debate on this floor about can the private sector run a railroad, can the public, is it the public responsibility, and can the public do it better than the private sector?

Well, I believe that the private sector can run a passenger rail system. And I just have to look back to history. From 1850 to 1950 the private sector ran a profitable passenger rail system.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SHUSTER. For 100 years the private sector operated passenger rail profitably. But what happened to it wasn't mismanagement, it was aviation, the airplane that came about. It was the interstate highway system that we built in this country. So people got off the trains and got into their cars and into airplanes. That's what happened to passenger rail.

And for the last 30 some years, as the government's tried to run it, it's not done it efficiently. So this is an opportunity for us to have some real successes, some private sector successes, and we can end this debate.

Is the private sector able to run a railroad, a passenger rail system? I believe they are, and I believe that these initiatives are extremely important for us to have some successes to point to as we move down the road and give the American people something they need, a passenger rail system that is profitable, that is successful.

And I want to end as I started. We need to do something on energy. This is one small step in the right direction. We can do more to solve our energy problems in this country. We should do more, and we must do more. The American people deserve that.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I just want to point out that one of the ways we are addressing gas prices is by giving constituents alternative modes of transportation, thereby reducing the number of cars on the road. Passenger rail will reduce our demand on foreign oil and help us become more energy independent.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, the MVP of the Republican baseball championship team, the gentleman, Mr. SHIMKUS.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate Congresswoman MATSUI managing the time. We've worked very hard on clean diesel issues and the like, so this is really appropriate to this debate though, because Amtrak uses big diesel engines. And what's happened in the Amtrak debate that we haven't heard yet, hopefully we'll hear it later on is, like, one of the biggest threats to Amtrak is the high cost of diesel fuel. In fact, the fiscal year 2007 budget for fuel was $125 million for Amtrak. The fiscal year 2008 budget for fuel for Amtrak is $215 million.

Now, how are we going to pay for that? I know how they're going to pay for it. They're going to raise prices on these commuters. And there are some commuters who use Amtrak. But again, I'll quote the New York Times article that says ''the counties where motorists spend the highest percentage of their income on gasoline tend to be in poor, rural areas.'' Amtrak doesn't go there. We don't have commuter rails. We have working trucks. We have big trucks. We haul feed. We haul beef. We haul pork. We need working trucks and they drive a large distance.

That's why this energy debate is critical. And here's the problem. All we're trying to do is bring, what's the problem, what's the solution. What's the problem. What's the solution.

Here's the problem. January 2001. $23 a barrel. January 2006, after the Democrats took control and promised to lower fuel prices, that's right here, where are we today? $123 a barrel.

What does that do for gas prices? From $1.45 to $2.33 to over $4 a gallon for gas hurts rural America, hurts my district.

□ 1115

Don't come to the floor without a solution. The Outer Continental Shelf, trillions of cubic feet of natural gas, billions of barrels of oil. We have in this Congress and Congresses of the past said ''off-limits.'' We're not going to explore this area. We're not going to recover.

Very similar to our position on ANWR. A position a size of the State of South Carolina. A drilling platform the size of an airport. And we are not going to drill there for billions of barrels of oil. President Clinton vetoed that in 1995. Had he not, that oil would be flowing to our country today. 1995 he vetoed the bill. President Carter put it off-limits for oil and gas exploration. That's why ANWR was originally set aside, but, no, we have that off-limits.

What is another solution? Coal-to-liquid technologies, diesel fuel that could help lower the price for Amtrak can be produced by taking U.S. coal, American energy, and turning it into fuel.

We're going to come to this floor talking about, oh, unemployment compensation.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. SHIMKUS. We're going to come to this floor saying, Oh, we've got to do something because energy heating costs are high; oh, we need to do something because people are losing their jobs.

I will tell you how we can get jobs back into the economy. Let's use American-made emergency. Let's open up the coal fields. Let's get mine workers the jobs. Let's build a coal-to-liquid refinery. Good building trade jobs. Let's have high-paying jobs operating those refineries. Let's build pipelines to get this fuel to the Amtrak station to put in the diesel engines, and let's help our budget airlines not go bankrupt because of the high cost of fuel. Not just our budget airlines. Here is one on Continental: Continental joins cut-back frenzy. Soaring fuel prices.

Why do we have a job problem in this country? Because we have an energy problem. Until we come to this floor to debate on bringing more supply to the American public, our economy is always going to be struggling. We're the only country that looks at energy resources not as an economic advantage but as an environmental disaster.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, first of all, at the end of the Clinton administration, oil was $27 a barrel. It is now $134 a barrel. A significant increase. And my friends on other side of the aisle are attempting to blame this newly elected Democratic Congress—I think someone on the other side said we have been here for 18 months—for this increase.

Furthermore, every bill that the Democrats bring before this Congress that attempts in any way, shape, fashion, or form to reduce the use and therefore the price of oil, the other side of the aisle votes ''no.''

The response to high oil prices was to give the big oil companies tax breaks. Well, that's not the priority of this Democratic Congress.

I want to talk about alternative energy. We want to invest in alternative modes of transportation like passenger rails which would take 8 million cars off the road. We want to reduce the dependence on foreign oil, the dependence on gas and on fossil fuels thereby making our country stronger both domestically and internationally.

The other side wants to talk about tax breaks for oil and gas companies. We're talking about investing in Amtrak and making our streets less congested, our skies cleaner, and our country less reliable on oil and gas.

What that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, if I could inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes. The gentlewoman from California has 18½ minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) for 3 minutes.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, 50 years ago President Eisenhower created the national highway system which changed the way we travel in this country. Today, we need to do the same thing with passenger rail and make the level of investment necessary for us to become the most successful in the 21st century. That is why I am so excited about House bill 6003, the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act, which was introduced by Mr. OBERSTAR, Ranking Member MICA, subcommittee Ranking Member SHUSTER, and myself.

Amtrak is extremely valuable to our country. It takes cars off the road that are already congested. It reduces congestion in the sky, and it's better for the environment.

In many areas of the country, Amtrak is the only mode of transportation available. They have shown major increases in ridership, too, as ridership has increased in 8 of the 9 last years and reached a record level of 25.8 million passengers just last year. And with the cost of gas potentially rising to $5 a gallon, there would be even more riders lining up for Amtrak.

Unfortunately, for many years Amtrak had been given just enough money to live alone, never getting the necessary funding to make serious improvement in the system. The hydraulic electric system is 70 years old, 65 percent of the bridges were built in the 1920s, and several tunnels which trains travel through every day were built in the 1800s.

In 2005, Amtrak conducted a comprehensive review of its capital needs. The review determined that Amtrak should invest $4.2 billion to bring their infrastructure to the state of good repair. Today, with the backlog of major bridges and tunnel work, the necessary investment capital has approached an estimated $6 billion.

As other countries continue to invest tens of billions of dollars each year to improve their passenger rail system, we are falling further and further behind by deferring much-needed improvements to our system. We must find a way to speed up Amtrak bylaws of repair work and bring its assets to a good state of repair so that Amtrak can concentrate on increasing capacity, increasing speed, developing new facilities, and planning for the future.

These major infrastructure improvements are also necessary to improve the safety and security of the system and its passengers and workers. Amtrak has and will continue to play a critical role in evacuation and transportation systems during national emergencies. Unfortunately, it is also a prime target for those who wish to harm us, and we must provide resources to make the system less vulnerable.

I'm looking forward to working with my colleagues in the House and the Senate to pass important legislation.

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

Ms. MATSUI. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. The United States used to have a strong passenger rail system. Now we're at the caboose, and they don't even use cabooses anymore.

The American people deserve better, and I believe that the Amtrak reauthorization bill will go a long way to bring the use to its rightful place as the world leader in passenger rail.

In closing, I went from downtown Brussels to downtown Paris, 200 miles,

1¼ hours; downtown Barcelona to downtown Madrid, 2½ hours.

We will move forward with high-speed rail in this country.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, you know, I think we've forgotten it's a private corporation, not a government entity, that we're attempting to help here.

Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding the time.

We're debating Amtrak. Well, certainly Amtrak's important for a lot of folks in the Northeast, but I will tell you as far as my constituents in western North Carolina, we can't commute to our jobs using Amtrak. This is not a solution for American energy independence that is being offered here on the House floor.

What is outrageous is as gas prices go above $4, all they have is blame rather than action. My Democrat colleagues are simply passing blame rather than trying to act in a constructive way. And there is a way for us to act as a Congress to bring down gas prices. It is not by lawsuits, which is what the Democrat majority wants; it is not by more taxation on those driving cars, those using energy resources, those producing resources.

You know, there is a way that we can act. The American people understand it. This is a question of supply and demand. Seventy percent of the price of fuel comes from the price of crude oil. The American people understand this as gas is over $4 a gallon, as a barrel of oil is over $130 a barrel. And I will tell you, we must act.

In order to lower gas prices, this Congress must act to increase supply. We have to increase refining capacity, and we have to do this in a constructive, reasonable, proper way. One day we will end our dependence on foreign oil. We will end it and we will use our alternative sources of energy. We will use domestic production. We will use refining capacity here in the United States. But let's talk about some important statistics here.

Seven hundred days ago the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, said, Democrats have a commonsense plan to bring down skyrocketing gas prices. What is the plan? Where's the action? We've seen nothing. The Democrat Whip, JIM CLYBURN, said, Democrats have a plan to help curb rising gas prices. What have we seen? Nothing. STENY HOYER, the Democrat leader, said, Democrats believe that we can do more for the American people who are struggling to deal with high gas prices. Now, all of this was said in an election year. What have we seen in the last 2 years from this Democrat Congress? Nothing.

Now, I will tell you it is not perfect. Not all Republicans support opening up ANWR. Not all Republicans support oil shale. Not all Republicans support increasing refinery capacity, but roughly 91 percent of Republicans support those issues while 86 percent of House Democrats oppose those actions.

I think it's time that we come together for a commonsense solution to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Conservation is a sign of personal virtue but is not a means to energy independence. We must act together.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I want to remind everybody that investing in Amtrak is an energy-efficient way to decrease our dependence on foreign oil. One rail line can carry the equivalent of 16 highway lanes, and Amtrak uses 50 percent less energy per passenger than air travel.

I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, if I could inquire on the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 7 minutes. The gentlewoman from California has 15 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. If I could inquire of my colleague if she has additional requests for time.

Ms. MATSUI. I have no additional speakers, and I will close.

I would yield to the gentleman to use his time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentlewoman for saying she has no additional speakers, so I will continue.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, whatever the outcome of this debate on Amtrak today is, it is not going to affect my constituents very much. What does affect them every minute of every day is the price of energy. I would suggest that we should defeat the previous question on the rule so that the gentleman, Mr. SESSIONS, can offer an amendment to this bill that would bring to the floor a bill that has provisions that will do something about energy, that will do something on the issue that affects every American every moment of every day.

That amendment would bring to the floor H.R. 3089, the No More Excuses Energy Act, and at the same time, a discharge petition today is being filed to require the House to vote on that bill.

The philosophy of that bill is that we need to produce more energy of all kinds here at home, and we have run out of time to make excuses on why we can't do that. And you have heard some of those excuses and some of the political blame game already today during the debate. Some people want to blame China and India for using too much oil. Some people want to blame big oil companies. Other people want to blame OPEC for not producing enough. Some people even want to blame suburban moms for using too much energy as they drive their kids to sporting events in their minivans.

□ 1130

They want to say they're using too much oil. But the point is, we've had enough of this blame game. The point is, it's time for this Congress to act and actually do something. And the way to act today is to vote down the previous question so today we can do something about the cost of energy throughout the country.

The No More Excuses Act takes the approach that we need to do more of everything. Yes, it allows drilling in Alaska and off our coasts, but it also encourages companies to take the CO_2 that goes up the smokestacks and put it back in the ground to flush out all of the oil on existing wells so that we can get every drop we can out of the ground.

This bill encourages the building of more refineries. It encourages the building of nuclear power plants. It encourages more wind energy. There is a lot of wind energy activity in my district, but what I hear from all of those involved is, when Congress just extends the tax credit 1 or 2 years at a time, there is no way that we can make the financial decisions we need to make.

So this bill that ought to come to the floor today would extend it by 10 years so that we can have a major investment in wind, as well as all the other forms of energy that we can produce here at home, because every bit of energy we produce here at home is one less barrel of oil we have to buy from overseas. And that makes sense.

What we're trying to do is to force some action that will make things better, not worse. Unfortunately, what the public and what the markets hear from this Congress so far the last 18 months are ideas that make things worse. They want to put a windfall profits tax on ''Big Oil'' so that they are discouraged from producing more oil. They may not know by the way, Madam Speaker, that 90 percent of the wells drilled in the continental United States are drilled by independent companies, not Big Oil. But what people hear from this Congress is we want to take away the incentives that encourage us to drill the Deepwater in the gulf. So other countries are there drilling, but we want to tie our hands and not produce the energy we have; we'd rather buy the oil from Saudi Arabia or Venezuela or Nigeria. That makes no sense.

There is no one perfect answer, but Madam Speaker, my argument is that rather than pointing the fingers of blame, it's time for no more excuses. It's time for action today, and that action can come by voting down the previous question so that the rule can be amended and we can take action today that produces more energy of all kinds here at home. That will matter to my constituents, and that will matter to all Americans.

Ms. MATSUI. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY, said it best: no excuses. It's time for us to get our work done, and the bottom line is is

that the supply side of the equation is the problem. If we had lots of supply, prices wouldn't be what they are. We need to bring to the table American energy for America's independence, but quite frankly, we're not only tired of paying higher prices, we're also tired of building new Dubais across the world. And that rests at the feet of our Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, who has a policy that restricts Americans from drilling for oil and having energy independence. Today is no excuses.

Madam Speaker, since taking control of Congress in 2007, this Democrat Congress has totally neglected its responsibility to do anything constructive, constructive, to address the domestic supply issues that have created the skyrocketing gas, diesel and energy costs that American families are facing today.

So, today, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so this House can address the real solutions to energy costs. That's the supply side. By defeating the previous question, I will move to amend the rule to allow for consideration of H.R. 3089, the No More Excuses Energy Act of 2007, introduced by my friend MAC THORNBERRY of Texas, that he introduced back 1 year ago in July 2007.

This legislation would reduce the price of gasoline by opening new American oil refineries; investing in clean energy sources such as wind, nuclear and captured carbon dioxide; and making available more homegrown energy through environmentally sensitive exploration of the arctic energy slope and America's deep sea reserves.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. I urge all of my colleagues to take this attempt to spend almost $15 billion of taxpayers' money on subsidized trains and turn it into something positive about energy prices for all of America and for American independence so that we can say we are finally working together and doing something positive about the rising price of fuel. By defeating the previous question, we can do that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

The rule before us today is a fair rule that allows us to highlight transportation challenges and our vision for a better tomorrow. It is Congress' responsibility to provide our constituents with alternative modes of transportation, especially as we see increased congestion and ever rising gas prices.

The Democratic majority is fighting to reduce our dependence on foreign oil and bring down gas prices and launch a cleaner, smarter energy future for America that lowers costs and creates hundreds and thousands of green jobs. This is a marked change from the 7 years of the current administration's energy policies of simply drilling for more fossil fuels and providing even greater taxpayer subsidies to big oil companies already earning record profits.

The underlying bill, H.R. 6033, the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008, takes huge steps to modernize Amtrak and give it the tools it needs to operate effectively and efficiently.

By giving this Nation viable passenger rail, we will be able to decrease our dependence on foreign oil and give commuters options to get to work and school. In fact, Amtrak takes 8 million cars off the road.

We have a commitment to maintain and improve the backbone of our Nation's transportation infrastructure system. This bill does just that, and I urge its adoption.

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

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1253 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall, without intervention of any point of order, consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3089) to secure unrestricted reliable energy for American consumption and transmission. All points of order against the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources, the chairman and ranking number of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) an amendment in the nature of a substitute if offered by Representative Rahall of West Virginia, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions

---

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science and Technology:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 10, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I am writing to notify you of my resignation from the Committee on Science and Technology, effective today.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

DARLENE HOOLEY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 9, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, Capitol, H–232, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER, Thank you for the tremendous opportunity to serve on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Due to the pending assignment, please accept my resignation from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee effective Tuesday, June 10.

It was an honor to serve on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee under the tremendous leadership of Chairman Oberstar. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has provided me with a useful forum to help shape our country's investment in our roadways and transportation systems. I look forward to continuing to following the success of the committee and offering my assistance wherever possible.

It is with great enthusiasm and dedication that I look forward to serving on the Energy and Commerce Committee. My strongest desire as a Member of Congress is to improve the lives of the people I represent, and serving on this committee will afford me invaluable opportunities to make a demonstrative and positive difference in their lives.

I appreciate your attention to my resignation, and please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any assistance to you.

Sincerely,

DORIS O. MATSUI,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 10, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, Capitol Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I am writing to notify you of my resignation from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Please consider this resignation effective today.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

MIKE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Financial Services:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 10, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, Capitol Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: At the request of the Speaker and to provide a slot for a newly-elected colleague, I resign my membership on the Financial Services Committee.

Very truly yours,

JIM MARSHALL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

MERIDA INITIATIVE TO COMBAT ILLICIT NARCOTICS AND REDUCE ORGANIZED CRIME AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6028) to authorize law enforcement and security assistance, and assistance to enhance the rule of law and strengthen civilian institutions, for Mexico and the countries of Central America, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6028

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Merida Initiative to Combat Illicit Narcotics and Reduce Organized Crime Authorization Act of 2008''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—ASSISTANCE FOR MEXICO

Sec. 101. Findings.
Sec. 102. Declarations of policy.

Subtitle A—Law Enforcement and Security Assistance

Sec. 111. Purposes of assistance.
Sec. 112. Authorization of assistance.
Sec. 113. Activities supported.
Sec. 114. Limitation on assistance.
Sec. 115. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle B—Assistance to Enhance the Rule of Law and Strengthen Civilian Institutions

Sec. 121. Sense of Congress.
Sec. 122. Authorization of assistance.
Sec. 123. Activities supported.
Sec. 124. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE II—ASSISTANCE FOR COUNTRIES OF CENTRAL AMERICA

Sec. 201. Findings.
Sec. 202. Declarations of policy.

Subtitle A—Law Enforcement and Security Assistance

Sec. 211. Purposes of assistance.
Sec. 212. Authorization of assistance.
Sec. 213. Activities supported.
Sec. 214. Limitation on assistance.
Sec. 215. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle B—Assistance to Enhance the Rule of Law and Strengthen Civilian Institutions

Sec. 221. Authorization of assistance.
Sec. 222. Activities supported.
Sec. 223. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Conditions on provision of assistance.
Sec. 302. Limitations on provision of assistance.
Sec. 303. Limitation on monitoring.
Sec. 304. Exemption from prohibition on assistance for law enforcement forces.
Sec. 305. Relationship to other authority.
Sec. 306. Rule of construction.

TITLE IV—SUPPORT ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Sec. 401. Report on reduction of drug demand in the United States.
Sec. 402. Reduction of southbound flow of illegal weapons.
Sec. 403. Reduction of southbound flow of illegal precursor chemicals and bulk-cash transfers.
Sec. 404. Report.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Implement the Merida Initiative.
Sec. 502. Metrics and oversight mechanisms.
Sec. 503. Report.
Sec. 504. Sense of Congress.
Sec. 505. Sunset.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees''—

(A) means—

(i) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) for purposes of titles IV and V, includes the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

(2) COUNTRIES OF CENTRAL AMERICA.—The term ''countries of Central America'' means

Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama and includes Haiti and the Dominican Republic.

(3) MERIDA INITIATIVE.—The term ''Merida Initiative'' means the program announced by the United States and Mexico on October 22, 2007, to fight illicit narcotics trafficking and criminal organizations throughout the Western Hemisphere.

TITLE I—ASSISTANCE FOR MEXICO

SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The drug crisis facing the United States remains a significant national security threat.

(2) The Government Accountability Office (GAO) estimates that 90 percent of illegal drugs that enter the United States come through the Mexico-Central America corridor.

(3) The same smuggling routes that are used to bring illegal narcotics north are utilized to illegally distribute arms, precursor chemicals, and bulk cash transfers south.

(4) Drug gangs that operate in the United States, Mexico, and Central America have become sophisticated and vertically-integrated operations expert at penetrating the United States-Mexico border.

(5) Narcotics-related activity and expanding cross-border trafficking is dangerously undermining the security environment for our neighbors to the South, as well as in the United States.

(6) Mexico can and has served as a critical ally and partner in stemming the flow of illegal narcotics into the United States. Under the leadership of Mexican President Felipe Calderón, the United States and Mexico have initiated an approach of joint responsibility to confront the threat of illicit narcotics trafficking and organized crime in the Western Hemisphere.

(7) The spread of illicit narcotics through United States borders and the violence that accompanies it cannot be halted without a comprehensive interdiction and security strategy planned and executed jointly with our southern neighbors.

(8) In March 2007, President George W. Bush and Mexican President Calderón held a summit in the Mexican City of Merida and agreed that the United States and Mexico must expand bilateral and regional cooperation to fight violence stemming from narcotrafficking and regional criminal organizations.

(9) On October 22, 2007, the United States and Mexico issued a joint statement announcing the Merida Initiative, a program to fight illicit narcotics trafficking and criminal organizations throughout the Western Hemisphere.

(10) In the joint statement—

(A) Mexico pledged to ''strengthen its operational capabilities to more effectively fight drug-traffickers and organized crime'';

(B) the United States pledged ''to intensify its efforts to address all aspects of drug trafficking (including demand-related portions) and continue to combat trafficking of weapons and bulk currency to Mexico''; and

(C) both nations pledged to ''augment cooperation, coordination, and the exchange of information to fight criminal organizations on both sides of the border''.

(11) A long-term strategy to adequately contain the northbound and southbound flows of illicit narcotics along the United States-Mexico border, as well as protect the vast and free flow of trade, will require the United States to partner with its southern neighbors in their efforts to build the capacity of their own law enforcement agencies and enhance the rule of law, as well as to fortify United States illicit narcotics reduction efforts.

SEC. 102. DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.

Congress makes the following declarations:

(1) The Merida Initiative is a critical part of a growing partnership and strategy of cooperation between the United States and its southern neighbors to confront the illegal flow of narcotics as well as violence and organized crime that it has spawned.

(2) The United States needs to ensure the free flow of trade between the United States and its critical neighbor, Mexico, while ensuring that the United States border is protected from illegal smuggling into the United States.

(3) The United States must intensify efforts to stem the flow of precursor chemicals, bulk cash, and the so-called ''iron-river'' of arms illegally flowing south, as well as demand-related aspects of the illicit narcotics phenomenon.

(4) The United States should provide its expertise to meet immediate security needs along the United States-Mexico border, fight the production and flow of illicit narcotics, and support Mexico in its efforts to do the same.

(5) The United States should support the Government of Mexico's work to expand its own law enforcement to independently conduct successful counternarcotics and organized crime-related operations.

(6) The Merida Initiative reflects the belief that Mexican military involvement is required in the short-term to stabilize the security situation, but that most aspects of this problem fall into the realm of law enforcement.

(7) In implementing the Merida Initiative, the United States should work with its southern neighbors to mitigate the so-called ''balloon effect'' in which successful counternarcotics efforts shift narcotics-related activities to other areas.

(8) The United States should coordinate with the Congress of the Union of Mexico to ensure full partnership on the programs authorized under this Act.

Subtitle A—Law Enforcement and Security Assistance

SEC. 111. PURPOSES OF ASSISTANCE.

The purposes of assistance under this subtitle are to—

(1) enhance the ability of the Government of Mexico, in cooperation with the United States, to control illicit narcotics production, trafficking, drug trafficking organizations, and organized crime;

(2) help build the capacity of law enforcement forces of Mexico to control illicit narcotics production, trafficking, drug trafficking organizations, and organized crime;

(3) aid the support role that the armed forces of Mexico is providing to law enforcement agencies of Mexico as the security situation in Mexico is initially stabilized;

(4) protect and secure the United States-Mexico border, and control illegal activity going south as well as north;

(5) strengthen the bilateral and regional ties of the United States with Mexico and the countries of Central America by assuming shared responsibility and offering concrete assistance in this area of great mutual concern;

(6) strengthen respect for internationally recognized human rights and the rule of law in efforts to stabilize the security environment relating to illicit narcotics production and trafficking and organized crime; and

(7) support the judicial branches of the Government of Mexico and the countries of Central America, as well as support anti-corruption efforts in those countries; and

(8) respond to the direct requests of the Government of Mexico that the United States reduce the demand for illicit narcotics in the United States, stem the flow of illegal arms into Mexico from the United States, stem the flow of illegal bulk-cash transfers into Mexico from the United States, and stem the flow of illegal precursor chemicals into Mexico from the United States.

SEC. 112. AUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE.

To carry out the purposes of section 111, the President is authorized to provide assistance for Mexico to support the activities described in section 113.

SEC. 113. ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Activities that may be supported by assistance under section 112 include the following:

(1) COUNTERNARCOTICS AND COUNTERTRAFFICKING.—To assist in building the capacity of law enforcement and security forces of Mexico to eradicate illicit narcotics trafficking and reduce trafficking-fueled violence, including along the United States-Mexico border, including assistance such as—

(A) radar and aerial surveillance equipment;

(B) land and maritime interdiction equipment and training, including—

(i) transport helicopters and night-operating capabilities;

(ii) surveillance platform planes; and

(iii) maintenance and training relating to maintenance of aircraft; and

(C) training of security and law enforcement units to plan and execute counternarcotics operations.

(2) PORT, AIRPORT, AND RELATED SECURITY.—To assist in monitoring and controlling the United States-Mexico border and the border between Mexico and Central America to combat illicit narcotics trafficking, including assistance such as—

(A) computer infrastructure and equipment;

(B) secure communications networks; and

(C) nonintrusive monitoring technology.

(3) OPERATIONAL TECHNOLOGY.—

(A) ASSISTANCE OBJECTIVES.—To assist in investigation and collection of intelligence against illicit drug trafficking organizations, including—

(i) expansion of intelligence databases; and

(ii) hardware, operating systems, and training for updating the communications networks of security agencies.

(B) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(i) operational technology transferred to the Government of Mexico for intelligence or law enforcement purposes should be used solely for the purposes for which the operational technology was intended; and

(ii) the United States should take all necessary steps to ensure that use of operational technology described in clause (i) is consistent with United States law, including protections of freedom of expression, freedom of movement, and freedom of association.

(4) PUBLIC SECURITY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT.—To assist in the modernization of law enforcement entities and prevent crime, including assistance and activities such as—

(A) law enforcement training and equipment, including—

(i) transport helicopters;

(ii) surveillance aircraft, including Cessna Caravan light utility aircraft;

(iii) nonintrusive inspection equipment; and

(iv) human rights training for law enforcement units;

(B) enhancement of the Government of Mexico's financial intelligence unit;

(C) safety-related equipment for law enforcement officers and prosecutors, including protective vests and helmet sets;

(D) reduction of drug demand in Mexico, including activities such as—

(i) assistance to the National Council Against Addictions (CONADIC) to establish an Internet web-based support network;

(ii) establishment of a national data center to support the CONADIC; and

(iii) training of CONADIC and other agency staff in best practices and outreach and treatment programs, and design of a methodology to implement best practices in conjunction with the National Network for Technological Transfers in Addiction.

(b) PROVISION OF HELICOPTERS.—Funds made available to carry out this subtitle to provide helicopters to the Government of Mexico, shall, to the extent possible, be used to procure or provide helicopters that are of a similar manufacture to those helicopters already in the possession of the Government of Mexico in order to facilitate integration of those assets into Mexico's existing air fleet.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States shall ensure, to the extent possible, that assistance under this subtitle is made available and cross-utilized by the armed forces of Mexico and relevant law enforcement agencies of the Government of Mexico, including the Mexican Office of the Attorney General.

SEC. 114. LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.

(a) LIMITATION.—No assistance may be provided under this subtitle to any unit of the armed forces of Mexico or any unit of the law enforcement agencies of Mexico if the Secretary of State determines that, consistent with section 620J of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2378d), there is credible evidence that such unit has committed gross violations of human rights.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply if the Secretary of State determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of Mexico is taking effective measures to bring the responsible members of the unit of the armed forces or law enforcement agencies, as the case may be, to justice.

SEC. 115. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To carry out this subtitle, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President $350,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $390,000,000 for fiscal year 2009, and $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.

(b) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subsection (a)—

(A) not more than $205,000,000 may be provided as assistance for the armed forces of Mexico for 2008;

(B) not more than $120,000,000 may be provided as assistance for the armed forces of Mexico for 2009; and

(C) not more than $9,000,000 may be provided as assistance for the armed forces of Mexico for 2010.

(2) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subsection (a) for fiscal year 2009 may be provided as assistance for the Mexican Secretariat of Public Security until the President determines that the Mexican National Registry of Police Personnel (Registro Nacional de Personal Policial) is operational at the federal, state, and local levels.

(c) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subsection (a) are—

(1) authorized to remain available until expended; and

(2) in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, including funds available under chapter 8 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291 et seq.).

Subtitle B—Assistance to Enhance the Rule of Law and Strengthen Civilian Institutions

SEC. 121. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that, as a critical part of a joint, comprehensive security, counternarcotics, and organized crime initiative, the United States should support—

(1) programs of the United States Agency for International Development and other United States agencies focused on strengthening civilian institutions and rule of law programs in Mexico at the federal, state, and local levels; and

(2) anti-corruption, transparency, and human rights programs to ensure due process and expand a culture of lawfulness in Mexico.

SEC. 122. AUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE.

The President is authorized to provide assistance for Mexico to support the activities described in section 123.

SEC. 123. ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.

Activities that may be supported by assistance under section 122 include the following:

(1) INSTITUTION BUILDING AND RULE OF LAW.—To assist Mexico's efforts to expand the rule of law and build the capacity, transparency, and trust in government institutions, including assistance such as—

(A) rule of law and systemic improvements in judicial and criminal justice sector institutions, including—

(i) courts management and prosecutorial capacity building;

(ii) prison reform activities, including those relating to anti-gang and anti-organized crime efforts;

(iii) anti-money laundering programs;

(iv) victim and witness protection and restitution; and

(v) promotion of transparent oral trials via training for the judicial sector;

(B) police professionalization, including—

(i) training regarding use of force;

(ii) human rights education and training;

(iii) training regarding evidence preservation and chain of custody; and

(iv) enhanced capacity to vet candidates;

(C) support for the Mexican Office of the Attorney General, including—

(i) judicial processes improvement and coordination;

(ii) enhancement of forensics capabilities;

(iii) data collection and analyses;

(iv) case tracking and management;

(v) financial intelligence functions; and

(vi) maintenance of data systems.

(2) ANTI-CORRUPTION, TRANSPARENCY, AND HUMAN RIGHTS.—To assist law enforcement and court institutions in Mexico to develop mechanisms to ensure due process and proper oversight and to respond to citizen complaints, including assistance such as—

(A) enhancement of polygraph capability in the Mexican Police agency (SSP);

(B) support for greater transparency and accountability in the Mexican legal system, including—

(i) establishment of a center in the Mexican Office of the Attorney General for receipt of citizen complaints;

(ii) establishment of clerk of the court system to track cases and pretrial detentions;

(iii) reorganization of human and financial resources systems; and

(iv) equipping and training of criminal investigators; and

(C) promotion of human rights, including—

(i) support for human rights organizations, bar associations, and law schools; and

(ii) training for police, prosecutors, and corrections officers.

(3) PREVENTION.—To assist in the prevention of individuals from participating in illicit narcotics-related violent activities, such as—

(A) establishment of programs that address domestic violence and increase school attendance rates; and

(B) expansion of intervention programs, including after-school programs and programs for at-risk and criminal involved youth.

(4) DEVELOPMENT.—To assist in the development of areas where lack of jobs breeds illicit narcotics-related violence, including—

(A) expansion of alternative livelihood programs, including job creation programs and rural development programs and the provision of microenterprise development assistance under title VI of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2211 et seq.); and

(B) establishment of gang reeducation and training programs.

SEC. 124. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To carry out this subtitle, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President $120,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $100,000,000 for fiscal year 2009, and $110,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subsection (a) are—

(1) authorized to remain available until expended; and

(2) in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, including funds available under chapter 8 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

TITLE II—ASSISTANCE FOR COUNTRIES OF CENTRAL AMERICA

SEC. 201. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) A May 2007 report by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) argues that countries of Central America are particularly vulnerable to violent crimes fueled by illicit narcotics trafficking and corruption because such countries are geographically located between the world's largest drug producing and drug consuming countries.

(2) According to Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs Thomas Shannon, ''[T]he nations of Central America have committed to collective action to address these common security concerns. Through the Central American Integration System (SICA), the governments have expressed the political resolve to join forces to strengthen regional security; however they lack sufficient tools and capacity to execute such will.''.

(3) Crime and violence in Central America has increased in recent years.

(4) In 2005, the estimated murder rate per 100,000 people was roughly 56 in El Salvador, 41 in Honduras, and 38 in Guatemala.

(5) Youth gang violence has been one of the major factors contributing to increased violence in Central America, with the United States Southern Command estimating that there are 70,000 gang members in Central America.

(6) Many Central American youth gangs are transnational and negatively impact both Central America and the United States.

(7) Youth gang violence cannot be curbed only through enforcement, but must also include a substantial investment in prevention, rehabilitation, and reintegration.

(8) Deportees sent from the United States back to Central America, while not a central cause of crime and violence, can contribute to crime and violence in Central America.

(9) Guatemala has experienced a surge in murders of women in recent years, many of which have been committed by illicit narcotics traffickers and other organized criminals.

(10) Violence between partners, particularly violence by men against their wives or girlfriends, is widespread in Central America, and an international violence against

women survey comparing selected countries in Africa, Latin America, Europe, and Asia found that 60 percent of women in Costa Rica—often considered the least violent country in Central America—reported having experienced domestic violence during their lives.

(11) Weak justice systems in the countries of Central America have led to a high level of impunity in Central America.

(12) The United Nations International Commission against Impunity in Guatemala (CICIG) was recently created to begin to address impunity related to illegally armed groups in Guatemala.

(13) The United States and the Central American Integration System (SICA) signed an agreement in July 2007 to improve intelligence sharing and policing and to institutionalize dialogue on regional security.

SEC. 202. DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.

Congress makes the following declarations:

(1) A long-term United States strategy to curb illicit narcotics trafficking must include Central America, which is the corridor for 90 percent of the cocaine that transits from South America to the United States.

(2) It is in the interest of the United States to support a long-term commitment to assisting the countries of Central America to improve security by combating illicit narcotics trafficking, investing in prevention programs, increasing intelligence sharing, improving regional security coordination, improving border and customs capabilities, professionalizing police, justice, and other government officials, and funding programs to reintegrate deportees from the United States.

(3) The countries of Central America are committed to combating illicit narcotics trafficking and its related violence and crime, including gang violence, and the United States must seize the opportunity to work in partnership with Central America.

Subtitle A—Law Enforcement and Security Assistance

SEC. 211. PURPOSES OF ASSISTANCE.

The purposes of assistance authorized by this subtitle are to—

(1) enhance the ability of governments of countries of Central America to control illicit narcotics production, trafficking, illicit drug trafficking organizations, and organized crime;

(2) help build the capacity of law enforcement agencies of the countries of Central America to control illicit narcotics production, trafficking, illicit drug trafficking organizations, and organized crime;

(3) strengthen the bilateral ties of the United States with the countries of Central America by offering concrete assistance in this area of great mutual concern;

(4) strengthen respect for internationally recognized human rights and the rule of law in efforts to stabilize the security environment relating to illicit narcotics production and trafficking and organized crime; and

(5) support the judicial branch of governments of the countries of Central America, as well as to support anti-corruption efforts in such countries.

SEC. 212. AUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE.

To carry out the purposes of section 211, the President is authorized to provide assistance for the countries of Central America to support the activities described in section 213.

SEC. 213. ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.

Activities that may be supported by assistance under section 212 include the following:

(1) COUNTERNARCOTICS, COUNTERTRAFFICKING, AND RELATED SECURITY.—

(A) ASSISTANCE OBJECTIVES.—To assist in the following:

(i) Investigation and collection of intelligence against illicit narcotics trafficking.

(ii) Combating illegal trafficking in arms.

(iii) Prevention of bulk currency smuggling.

(iv) Collection of information on crime and establishment of a regional database.

(B) ASSISTANCE.—Activities under subparagraph (A) may include—

(i) automated fingerprint identification systems (AFIS);

(ii) vetting sensitive investigative units to collaborate on counternarcotics at the federal, state, and local levels;

(iii) technical assistance to develop strong and effective financial crimes investigation units;

(iv) maritime security support, including refurbishing and procuring patrol boats;

(v) firearms interdiction training; and

(vi) illicit narcotics demand reduction programs.

(2) PUBLIC SECURITY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT.—To assist in building the capacity of the police in countries of Central America, supporting efforts to combat transnational gangs, investing in gang prevention and rehabilitation programs, and programs for the reintegration of deportees, including assistance such as—

(A) funding to continue the United States-Central American Integration System (SICA) Dialogue;

(B) youth gang prevention activities, including targeted education for at-risk youth, vocational training and funding of community centers in areas with high youth gang violence rates and other risk factors;

(C) programs to reintegrate deportees from the United States back into the societies of their home countries to avoid further criminal activity;

(D) transnational anti-gang initiatives;

(E) police professionalization, including—

(i) training regarding use of force;

(ii) human rights education and training;

(iii) training regarding evidence preservation and chain of custody; and

(iv) enhanced capacity to vet candidates;

(F) utilization of the International Law Enforcement Academy (ILEA) in El Salvador consistent with traditional respect for human rights and professional police practices;

(G) police training programs of the Organization of American States (OAS);

(H) police equipment, including communications equipment; and

(I) anti-domestic violence education programs and women's shelters.

SEC. 214. LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.

(a) LIMITATION.—No assistance may be provided under this subtitle to any unit of the armed forces of a country of Central America or any unit of the law enforcement agencies of a country of Central America if the Secretary of State determines that, consistent with section 620J of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2378d), there is credible evidence that such unit has committed gross violations of human rights.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply if the Secretary of State determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the government of the relevant country of Central America is taking effective measures to bring the responsible members of the unit of the armed forces or law enforcement agencies, as the case may be, to justice.

SEC. 215. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To carry out this subtitle, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President $60,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $80,000,000 for fiscal year 2009, and $80,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subsection (a) are—

(1) authorized to remain available until expended; and

(2) in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, including funds under chapters 2 and 8 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2166 and 2291 et seq.).

(c) LIMITATION.—Of the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subsection (a) for any fiscal year, at least $15,000,000 should be made available to carry out section 213(2)(B).

Subtitle B—Assistance to Enhance the Rule of Law and Strengthen Civilian Institutions

SEC. 221. AUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE.

The President is authorized to provide assistance for the countries of Central America to support the activities described in section 222.

SEC. 222. ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.

Activities that may be supported by assistance under section 221 include assistance in building the capacity, transparency, and trust in the justice system of the countries of Central America and reducing high impunity rates in the countries of Central America, including assistance such as—

(1) improved police academies and entry level training on crime investigations;

(2) courts management and prosecutor capacity building;

(3) witness and victim protection programs, including in Guatemala in coordination with the United Nations International Commission Against Impunity in Guatemala (CICIG);

(4) programs to enhance transparency in the procedures to designate and remove personnel in the recipient country's judicial system;

(5) prosecutor and judge protection programs, including in Guatemala and in coordination with the CICIG;

(6) short-term assignment of United States Government personnel to the CICIG to provide technical assistance for criminal investigations, specifically but not limited to investigations involving money laundering so long as this assignment does not negatively impact United States domestic operations;

(7) regional juvenile justice reform;

(8) prison management;

(9) programs to rehabilitate gang members released from prison, including job training; and

(10) community policing, including human rights and use of force training for community policing projects.

SEC. 223. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To carry out this title, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2009, and $95,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subsection (a) are—

(1) authorized to remain available until expended; and

(2) in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, including funds available under chapters 2 and 8 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2166 and 2291 et seq.).

TITLE III—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. CONDITIONS ON PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President may not provide assistance under title I or II to a foreign country for a fiscal year until the end of a 15-day period beginning on the date on which the President transmits to the appropriate congressional committees a determination that the requirements described in

subsection (b) have been met with respect to the government of such foreign country for such fiscal year.

(b) REQUIRED DETERMINATION.—The requirements referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) The provision of assistance will not adversely affect the human rights situation in the foreign country.

(2) Vetting procedures are in place to ensure that members and units of the armed forces and law enforcement agencies of the foreign country that may receive assistance under title I or II have not been involved in human rights violations.

(3) The civilian authority in the foreign country is investigating and prosecuting any member of any government agency or entity receiving assistance under title I or II who has been credibly alleged to have committed human rights violations on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) Equipment and material provided as support is being used only by officials and employees of the government of the foreign country who have been approved by such government to perform counternarcotics activities, including on the basis of the background investigations by such government.

(5) The government of the foreign country has cooperated with the Secretary of State to ensure that—

(A) the equipment and material provided as support will be used only by the officials and employees referred to in paragraph (4);

(B) none of the equipment or material will be transferred (by sale, gift, or otherwise) to any person or entity not authorized by the United States to receive the equipment or material; and

(C) the equipment and material will, to the extent possible, be used for the purposes intended by the United States Government and will be utilized by those agencies for which such assistance is intended.

(6) The government of the foreign country has implemented, in consultation with the Secretary of State, a system that will provide an accounting and inventory of the equipment and material provided as support.

(7) The government of the foreign country will, along with United States personnel, conduct periodic observation and review of the use of the equipment and material provided as support under terms and conditions similar to the terms and conditions imposed with respect to such observation and review under section 505(a)(3) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2314(a)(3)).

(8) To the extent the foreign country has received equipment in the past, it has utilized the equipment properly and in a manner that warrants additional provision of equipment or assistance.

SEC. 302. LIMITATIONS ON PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) activities undertaken under titles I and II of this Act should be performed wherever possible by official employees, personnel, or officers of the federal, state, or local government of the recipient foreign country; and

(2) the United States should limit, to the maximum extent possible, the number of United States civilians and foreign nationals retained as contractors in a recipient country.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Except as provided in subsection (c)—

(1) none of the funds made available to carry out title I may be available for the employment of any United States individual civilian retained as a contractor in Mexico or any foreign national retained as a contractor if that employment would cause the total number of individual civilian contractors employed in Mexico in support of the Merida Initiative who are funded by United States funds to exceed 50;

(2) none of the funds made available to carry out title II may be available for the employment of any United States individual civilian retained as a contractor in a country of Central America or any foreign national retained as a contractor if that employment would cause the total number of individual civilian contractors employed in all countries of Central America in support of the Merida Initiative who are funded by United States funds to exceed 100; and

(3) none of the funds made available under this Act shall be made available for budget support or cash payments.

(c) EXCEPTION.—The limitations contained in subsection (b) shall not apply if the President determines that it is in the national interest of the United States that such limitations shall not apply and transmits to the appropriate congressional committees a notification thereof.

SEC. 303. LIMITATION ON MONITORING.

Beginning on October 1, 2009, no surveillance-related equipment may be transferred under this Act to any entity of Mexico or a country of Central America unless the President determines that the recipient country has cooperated with the United States to ensure that such equipment will be used principally for the purposes for which it is provided.

SEC. 304. EXEMPTION FROM PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT FORCES.

Notwithstanding section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2420; relating to the prohibition on assistance to foreign law enforcement forces), the President may provide assistance under title I or II if, at least 15 days before providing the assistance, the President notifies the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications pursuant to section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act (22 U.S.C. 2394–1), that (1) it is in the national interest to provide such assistance, and (2) the recipient country is making significant progress to eliminating any human rights violations.

SEC. 305. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER AUTHORITY.

(a) ASSISTANCE UNDER TITLE I.—The authority to provide assistance under title I is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance for Mexico.

(b) ASSISTANCE UNDER TITLE II.—The authority to provide assistance under title I is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance for the countries of Central America.

SEC. 306. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in title I or II shall be construed to alter, modify, or otherwise affect the provisions of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) unless otherwise specified in this Act.

TITLE IV—SUPPORT ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 401. REPORT ON REDUCTION OF DRUG DEMAND IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) supply-side drug reduction strategies when executed alone are not an effective way to fight the phenomenon of illegal narcotics;

(2) the Government of Mexico has identified reduction of United States drug demand as among the most important contributions the United States can make to a joint strategy to combat illicit narcotics trafficking; and

(3) the United States pledged in the United States-Mexico October 2007 Joint Statement on the Merida Initiative, to ''intensify its efforts to address all aspects of drug trafficking (including demand related portions)'' here in the United States.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the measures taken to intensify United States efforts to address United States demand-related aspects of the drug-trafficking phenomenon in accordance with the Joint Statement on the Merida Initiative announced by the United States and Mexico on October 22, 2007.

SEC. 402. REDUCTION OF SOUTHBOUND FLOW OF ILLEGAL WEAPONS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) much of the increased violence in Mexico is perpetrated using firearms and ammunition smuggled illegally from the United States into Mexico;

(2) the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) has told Congress of an ''iron river of guns'' with thousands of weapons per week illegally crossing into Mexico from the United States;

(3) more than 90 percent of the guns confiscated yearly in Mexico originate in the United States and approximately 40 percent of the total trafficked weapons are linked to drug trafficking organizations;

(4) along the 2,000 mile border from Brownsville, Texas, to San Diego, California, there are 6,700 licensed gun sellers, but only 100 Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF) special agents to investigate allegations of weapons trafficking and only 35 inspectors to ensure compliance with United States laws;

(5) on January 16, 2008, ATF announced that it will add 25 special agents and 15 inspectors to their Project Gunrunner along the Southwest Border. And, the ATF budget request for fiscal year 2009 includes funding for another 12 inspectors; and

(6) an effective strategy to combat these illegal arms flows is a critical part of a United States contribution to a jointly executed anti-narcotics strategy with Mexico.

(b) PROJECT GUNRUNNER INITIATIVE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall, to the extent amounts are made available to carry out this subsection pursuant to paragraph (4), use such amounts for the Project Gunrunner initiative (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the ''initiative'') of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives to expand the resources provided to identify, investigate, and prosecute individuals involved in the trafficking of firearms across the United States-Mexico border.

(2) ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall—

(A) assign additional agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives to the area of the United States adjacent to the United States-Mexico border to support the expansion of the initiative;

(B) establish not fewer than 1 initiative team in each State along the United States-Mexico border; and

(C) coordinate with the heads of other relevant federal law enforcement agencies and State and local law enforcement agencies to address firearms trafficking in a comprehensive manner.

(3) ADDITIONAL STAFF.—The Attorney General may hire additional persons to be Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives agents for, and may use such other resources as may be necessary to adequately support, the initiative.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this subsection, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General $15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2010.

(c) ENHANCED INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this subsection, the Attorney General, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, is authorized and encouraged, as appropriate, to—

(A) assign agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives to the United States mission in Mexico, specifically in areas adjacent to the United States-Mexico border, to work with Mexican law enforcement agencies in conducting investigations relating to firearms trafficking and other criminal enterprises;

(B) provide the equipment and technological resources necessary to support investigations and to trace firearms recovered in Mexico; and

(C) support the training of vetted Mexican law enforcement officers in serial number restoration techniques and canine explosive detection.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this subsection, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General $9,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2010.

SEC. 403. REDUCTION OF SOUTHBOUND FLOW OF ILLEGAL PRECURSOR CHEMICALS AND BULK-CASH TRANSFERS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a significant quantity of precursor chemicals used in the production of illegal narcotics flows south from the United States to Mexico;

(2) the Government of Mexico has identified reduction of southbound flows from the United States of precursor chemicals and bulk-cash transfers as a critical component of its anti-narcotics strategy; and

(3) an effective strategy to combat these illegal flows is a critical part of a United States contribution to a jointly executed anti-narcotics strategy with Mexico.

SEC. 404. REPORT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the measures taken to combat the southbound flow of illegal precursor chemicals and bulk cash transfers into Mexico.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. COORDINATOR OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES TO IMPLEMENT THE MERIDA INITIATIVE.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—Congress declares that the Merida Initiative is a Department of State-led initiative which combines programs of numerous United States Government departments and agencies and therefore requires a single individual to coordinate and track all Merida-related efforts government-wide to help avoid duplication and facilitate accountability to Congress.

(b) DESIGNATION OF HIGH-LEVEL COORDINATOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall designate, within the Department of State, a Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Implement the Merida Initiative (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''Coordinator'') who shall be responsible for—

(A) designing an overall strategy to advance the purposes of this Act;

(B) ensuring program and policy coordination among agencies of the United States Government in carrying out the policies in Mexico and Central America set forth in this Act;

(C) ensuring that efforts of the United States Government under this Act in Mexico and Central America are in full consonance with the efforts of the Government of Mexico and the governments of Central America in implementing the Merida Initiative;

(D) tracking all United States Government assistance which fulfills the goals of the Merida Initiative or is closely related to the goals of the Merida Initiative, including information required under section 620J of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2378d) with respect to Mexico and the countries of Central America;

(E) coordinating among agencies of the United States Government on all United States assistance to Mexico and the countries of Central America, including assistance from other relevant government agencies, which fulfills the goals of the Merida Initiative to avoid duplication or conflict among programs; and

(F) consulting with the Attorney General with respect to the activities of Federal, State, and local law enforcement authorities in the United States related to the goals of the Merida Initiative, particularly along the United States-Mexico border.

(2) RANK AND STATUS OF THE COORDINATOR.—The Coordinator shall have the rank and status of ambassador.

SEC. 502. METRICS AND OVERSIGHT MECHANISMS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) to successfully support building the capacity of recipient countries' civilian security institutions, enhance the rule of law in recipient countries, and ensure the protection of human rights, the President should establish metrics and oversight mechanisms to track the effectiveness of activities undertaken pursuant to this Act;

(2) long-term solutions to Mexico and Central America's security problems depend on strengthening and holding accountable civilian institutions;

(3) it is difficult to assess the impact of United States assistance towards these goals absent specific oversight and monitoring mechanisms; and

(4) the President, in developing metrics, should consult with Congress as well as the Government of Mexico and the Central American Integration System (SICA).

(b) REQUIREMENT.—The President shall develop metrics to identify, track, and manage the progress of activities authorized pursuant to this Act and use these metrics to determine the allocation of resources for such activities.

(c) INITIAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that specifies metrics of achievement for each activity to be undertaken under this Act.

(2) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report shall be divided into two sections, the first addressing those activities undertaken pursuant to subtitle A of title I and subtitle A of title II, and the second addressing those activities undertaken pursuant to subtitle B of title I and subtitle B of title II. Metrics may include the following:

(A) Indicators on long-term effectiveness of the equipment and training provided to Mexican and Central American security institutions.

(B) Statistics of counter narcotics-related arrests.

(C) Number of interdictions of drug shipments.

(D) Specific progress on police reform.

(E) Counternarcotics-related arrests.

(F) Quantification of reduction of supply of illicit narcotics into the United States.

(G) Cross-utilization, if any, of equipment among the armed forces and law enforcement entities.

(H) Increased school attendance rates.

(I) Attendance in primary prevention programs

(J) The level of cooperation among United States, Mexican, and Central American law enforcement agencies.

SEC. 503. REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report concerning the programs and activities carried out under this Act during the preceding fiscal year. The first report shall be transmitted not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and subsequent reports shall be transmitted not later than October 31 of each year thereafter.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) METRICS.—A general description of the progress in stabilizing the security situation in each recipient country as well as combating trafficking and building its capacity based on the metrics developed under section 502.

(2) COORDINATION.—Efforts of the United States Government to coordinate its activities pursuant to section 501, including—

(A) a description of all counternarcotics and organized crime assistance provided to recipient countries in the previous fiscal year;

(B) an assessment of how such assistance was coordinated; and

(C) recommendations for improving coordination.

(3) TRANSFER OF EQUIPMENT.—A description of the transfer of equipment, including—

(A) a description of the progress of each recipient country toward the transfer of equipment, if any, from its armed forces to law enforcement agencies;

(B) a list of organizations that have used the air assets provided to the government of each recipient country, and, to the extent possible, a detailed description of those agencies that have utilized the air assets, including a breakdown of the percentage of use by each agency; and

(C) a description of training of law enforcement agencies to operate equipment, including air assets.

(4) HUMAN RIGHTS.—Consistent with sections 116(d) and 502B(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d) and 2304(b)) and section 504 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2464), an assessment of the human rights impact of the equipment and training provided under this Act, including—

(A) a list of accusations of serious human rights abuses committed by the armed forces and law enforcement agencies of recipient countries from the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) a description of efforts by the government of recipient countries to investigate and prosecute allegations of abuses of human rights committed by any agency of the recipient countries.

(5) EFFECTIVENESS OF EQUIPMENT.—An assessment on the long-term effectiveness of the equipment and maintenance packages and training provided to each recipient country's security institutions.

(6) MEXICO PUBLIC SECURITY STRATEGY.—A description of Mexico's development of a public security strategy, including—

(A) an update on the effectiveness of the Mexican federal Registry of Police Personnel to vet police recruiting at the National, state, and municipal levels to prevent rehiring from one force to the next after dismissal for corruption and other reasons; and

(B) an assessment of how the Merida Initiative complements and supports the Mexican Government's own public security strategy.

(7) FLOW OF ILLEGAL ARMS.—A description of efforts to reduce the southbound flow of illegal arms.

(8) USE OF CONTRACTORS.—A detailed description of contracts awarded to private companies to carry out provisions of this Act, including—

(A) a description of the number of United States and foreign national civilian contractors awarded contracts;

(B) a list of the total dollar value of the contracts; and

(C) the purposes of the contracts.

(9) CENTRAL AMERICAN REGIONAL SECURITY PLAN.—A description of implementation by the countries of Central America of the Central American Regional Security Plan, including an assessment of how the Merida Initiative complements and supports the Central American Regional Security Plan.

(10) PHASE OUT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—A description of the progress of phasing out law enforcement activities of the armed forces of each recipient country.

(11) DISPLACEMENT AND DIVERSION OF DRUG TRAFFICKING PATTERNS.—A description of any displacement effect and diversion of drug trafficking patterns from Mexico and the countries of Central America to other routes, including through potentially vulnerable Caribbean countries.

(12) IMPACT ON BORDER VIOLENCE AND SECURITY.—A description of the impact that activities authorized under this Act have had on violence against United States and Mexican border personnel and the extent to which these activities have increased the protection and security of the United States-Mexico border.

SEC. 504. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Government requires an effective public diplomacy strategy to explain the purposes of the Merida Initiative; and

(2) to the extent practicable, the Secretary of State, in coordination with other relevant heads of agencies, shall design and implement a public diplomacy campaign regionally regarding the Merida Initiative.

SEC. 505. SUNSET.

The authority of this Act shall expire after September 30, 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the drug crisis facing the United States remains a top national security threat. The GAO states that 90 percent of illegal drugs entering our country transit the Central American-Mexican corridor.

Drug gangs that operate in the United States, Mexico, and Central America are dangerously undermining the security environment for our neighbors to the south, and the spillover effects on our own soil are undeniable.

President Calderon of Mexico made a brave decision early in his presidency to fight illegal narcotics in a way that no Mexican government had done before, and he and his countrymen have paid a high price for it. Drug cartels have been blamed for 6,000 deaths in two-and-a-half years in Mexico alone, 4,000 of them in the year-and-a-half since Mr. Calderon assumed the presidency.

A significant percentage of these deaths are law enforcement personnel, outgunned and outspent from the proceeds of illegal drugs. There seems to be no limit to the brazenness of the drug gangs. A month ago, the chief of Mexico's Federal police was shot dead in his own home.

It is high time for the United States to do more than applaud President Calderon's courage. We must work together to tackle this difficult problem.

President Bush and President Calderon met in the Mexican city of Merida last year to craft a new and innovative proposal to confront this scourge. That proposal is largely reflected in the legislation we have before us today.

The central tenet of this bill is that, while the violence must stop and security must be restored, the ultimate solution to this problem lies in respect for the rule of law and the strength of institutions charged with upholding it.

□ 1145

H.R. 6028 represents the U.S. implementation of a new partnership with Mexico and Central American countries to face the immediate security threat of drug gangs, help these neighbors build the capacity of their law enforcement agencies, and enhance the rule of law in the region.

As many of my colleagues know, the supplemental appropriations bill includes funding for year one of the Merida Initiative, but the legislation before us today authorizes the full 3 years of this plan in an exhaustive and complete manner necessary to undertake this critical partnership with our southern neighbors.

For example, this legislation authorizes $1.6 billion over 3 years in the areas of counter-narcotics, the fight against organized crime, law enforcement modernization, institution building, and rule of law support.

Mexico has requested that the U.S. provide certain high-tech equipment. And in this bill we authorize transport helicopters with night operating capabilities, aerial and radar surveillance equipment, land and maritime interdiction equipment, and secure communication networks.

This legislation supports a variety of programs designed to enhance the transparency and capacity of civilian institutions at the Federal, State and local level. They include assistance in courts management, prison reform, money laundering capabilities, witness protection, and police professionalization. The latter emphasizes human rights and use of force training, as well as forensics and polygraph capabilities.

In the realm of prevention, the bill supports programs to increase school attendance and expansion of intervention programs. It also seeks to promote development in areas where joblessness feeds the narcotics problem, including alternative livelihood and rural development efforts.

It concentrates considerable funding in the fragile Central America region, as well as in Haiti and the Dominican Republic, in programs tailored to that region's specific needs.

The legislation contains significant human rights safeguards as well as end-use monitoring provisions for equipment and training. It provides no cash transfers.

It calls on the President to devise standards up front that will be used to measure the success of the initiative, and to regularly report to Congress on progress made toward meeting these standards.

Significantly, because this was a specific request from our Mexican neighbors, the legislation bolsters by $73.5 million America's efforts to stem the illegal flow of arms going south by significantly expanding ATF's Project Gun Runner.

Finally, the bill establishes a coordinator for the initiative to provide accountability and harmonize its wide-ranging programs.

Perhaps most importantly the legislation recognizes that the spread of illicit drugs through Mexico and Central America and into the United States, as well as the violence that accompanies it, cannot be halted without a comprehensive interdiction and security strategy planned and executed jointly with our southern neighbors. Madam Speaker, with this authorization of the Merida Initiative we demonstrate our Nation's commitment to work closely with our friends and neighbors to the south in a meaningful and long-term fashion to battle illegal narcotics.

I strongly urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise as a proud cosponsor of the Merida Initiative to Combat Illicit Narcotics and Reduce Organized Crime Authorization Act of 2008.

Based on co-responsibility and cooperation, the Merida Initiative creates an invaluable partnership between the United States, Mexico, the rest of

Central America, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic to work together to fight illicit drugs and organized crime. It is a historic opportunity, an essential collaboration between all of our countries to present a united front against the drug cartels and the gangs who callously threaten the safety and future of our communities every day.

The growing operational and financial capabilities of these groups pose a clear and present threat to the lives and well-being of our citizens. By supporting this authorization, we are supporting the goals of the Merida Initiative to confront these dangers. Furthermore, we are supporting the goals of our friends in Mexico, Central America, Haiti and the Dominican Republic to combat these dangers as well.

The Merida Initiative, as considered under this authorization, is a comprehensive program focused on strengthening democratic institutions, on bolstering law enforcement capabilities, on supporting local communities, and on promoting human rights at all levels of the Initiative's implementation.

For years, drug traffickers and organized crime have used a regional strategy to carry out their illicit activities. Now, under the Merida Initiative, we have a chance for our governments to join forces and match this transnational approach. In Mexico, President Calderon has deployed nearly 30,000 soldiers and federal police to the country's most dangerous drug trafficking hotspots.

In Guatemala, the government has announced plans to send hundreds of troops, elite presidential guards and antidrug police to its northern border to stem the growing violence.

In the United States, our law enforcement agents have been met with increasing hostile actions while working to preserve the security of our borders.

The Merida Initiative enables us to combine all of these efforts to capitalize on all of our strength and confront narcotraffickers and organized crime with the same determination that they so vigorously employ to wreak havoc on our communities.

I was pleased to see that both the House and Senate versions of the supplemental included funding to support the Merida Initiative. I am hopeful that the conferees will look at this bill for direction when determining the final face of the Merida Initiative. I believe that it offers an effective guide for ensuring U.S. interest, while respecting our partners' sovereignty.

For too long, narcotraffickers and organized crime have run free, plaguing the prosperity of our region. By supporting the Merida Initiative, we are making the way for democracy and for development to take hold, and addressing the precursor conditions that help breed instability in the region, and that help create fertile territory even for Islamic extremist recruitment.

Madam Speaker, again I rise in full support of this initiative, and I look forwarding to helping to enhance our Nation's security by fighting and overcoming these daily threats.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I greatly appreciate the gentlelady's strong comments on this bill.

I yield 4 minutes to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6028. And I would like to commend Chairman BERMAN for his leadership on this important legislation that authorizes full funding for the Merida Initiative.

In my subcommittee, as Chair, we held three hearings on the Merida Initiative, so we've covered it really quite extensively. And I'm more convinced than ever that this is such an important bill and such an important proposal.

Recent events in Mexico make the Merida Initiative more crucial than ever. Just last month, the chief of the Mexican federal police was brutally murdered at his home. Shortly thereafter, the deputy police chief of Ciudad Juarez, a city smack on the border with the United States, was shot dead.

The narcoviolence in Mexico is not only undermining the safety and security of our friends to the south, but it is fueling the drug trade and violence here in the United States.

As Western Hemisphere Subcommittee chairman, I worked with Chairman BERMAN in developing this legislation and was pleased to contribute two key parts. First, the Central American piece of this legislation authorizes a much greater amount of assistance for the subregion than the Bush administration proposed. The initial $50 million for Central America was really a drop in the bucket when you look at the whole thing and the needs that are necessary, especially considering that 90 percent of the cocaine shipped from the Andes to the U.S. flows right through Central America.

H.R. 6028 sets aside at least $15 million per year for youth gang prevention programs. That was something that I care very much about as well. With approximately 70,000 gang members in Central America, and the transnational connections linking gang members there to the United States, this is a vast improvement over the administration's proposal. I hope we have learned by now that failing to adequately invest in prevention programs will only hurt us in the future.

I was also pleased to work with the chairman on a provision in H.R. 6028 which establishes a Merida coordinator at the State Department. My staff and I have too often been frustrated by the inability to obtain information on Merida activities or to figure out who was responsible for what, and what would fall under Merida. The Merida coordinator will keep track of all U.S. government assistance, which fulfills the goals of the Merida Initiative.

Madam Speaker, the Merida Initiative is moving on two legislative tracks; this authorization bill, and the supplemental appropriations bill. I understand that the Mexican Government has expressed concerns with certain language in the Senate supplemental proposal. It is my hope that the final product will include important human rights provisions while respecting Mexican sovereignty and the spirit of partnership in which the Merida Initiative was designed. Our relationship with our neighbors to the south is very important, and we need to work with them in a collaborative way and in a partnership.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you again for your leadership on this important legislation and your commitment to the governments and people of Central America and Mexico.

I urge my colleagues to support this crucial legislation. And I want to again say that it's important not only to have funds in there and language in there for Mexico, but for Central America, Haiti and the Dominican Republic as well.

It's also important that we look at the whole situation of guns. Guns that are manufactured in the United States are smuggled over the border, and 90 percent of the guns that are collected come from the United States. And they fuel narcotrafficking, they fuel violence, they fuel the drug trade, and we need to do something about that. So I am pleased that my provision, the Southwest Border Violence Reduction Act, was incorporated into this language to look at this problem, to deal with this problem, and understanding that what we do in the United States goes hand in hand with what happens south of our border as well.

So again, Mr. Chairman, I thank you. I thank the ranking member, with whom I've collaborated on so many things through the years.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT). He is an esteemed member of our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I'll be brief. Let me just start by saying that I appreciate both the chairman's and the ranking member's work on this critical issue. Drugs and cartels and the violence and terror that they bring not only undermine public safety but threaten our security as a Nation. We need to work cooperatively with those nations that are on the front lines of this drug war that we've been involved in for such a long time.

However, I want to mention one fact that I think is very important. Last summer, news reports highlighted the unwillingness of the Mexican Government to work with the U.S. to resolve a mile and a half boundary dispute near Columbus, New Mexico. Because

of a mapping error, the fence that we're building was constructed on Mexican land. Although the U.S. government promptly notified the Mexican Government of the error, the Mexican Government demands that the mistake be corrected at a cost of $3 million to the United States; this, despite the fact that the previously existing boundary had never been in dispute prior to notification by the U.S., and the fact that the U.S. has provided more than $270 million in aid to Mexico between 2004 and 2007, including more than $140 million for counter-narcotics and law enforcement.

Today, we are authorizing funding for an additional $1.6 billion over 3 years. Last July, I introduced House Resolution 545, which states that it is the sense of this Congress that if Mexico doesn't work together to resolve this boundary dispute, U.S. assistance to Mexico should be reduced in a corresponding amount; in other words, $3 million. If it is costing the taxpayers of this country $3 million to do this, which was previously an undisputed border area, it seems like it ought to come out of their money and not ours, since we were the ones that brought it to their attention to begin with.

□ 1200

Now, some people up here in Washington may think that $3 million isn't a lot of money. Well I can tell you it is a lot of money to the folks back in my district and districts all over this country, particularly when you figure that we are spending approximately $4 a gallon for gas nowadays. So it is a lot of money and ought to be taken seriously.

If the U.S. and Mexico are truly partners, and we claim to be, and they claim to be, we should be working together in all areas, including the construction of this fence. We ought to be working cooperatively in this matter. And it plays a key role in our international interdiction efforts, not to mention the border security.

So this $3 million, if we are going to have to go back and rebuild this because of this good faith error, I believe that ought to be taken out of the U.S. aid which is going in their direction, and not from the U.S. taxpayer.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute of time if I may.

The gentleman from Ohio raises an issue of controversy between the United States and Mexico. What I urge the Members of this body to do is to focus on the purpose of this initiative. This is an initiative that is in America's deep national interest. The whole issue of illicit narcotics trade, the role of the corridor between Central America and Mexico in contributing and supplying these illicit narcotics, the war going on in Mexico between the drug cartels, and a president and a leadership that is now taking this head on serves our national interests. Our effort to stem illegal immigration is directly connected, and the effectiveness of it will be greatly dependent on our ability to stop these cartels and to smash this trade in illicit narcotics.

Whatever one's concern is about a particular aspect of the U.S.-Mexican relationship, I would suggest from America's interest point of view that this issue, this initiative, is a compelling one and should be supported.

I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection and a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me associate myself with the words of our chairman. This is in the interests of the American people. I thank Chairman BERMAN for introducing this legislation and the ranking member, as well, for the collaboration that our committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, always engages in.

I think it is important to note that this is an initiative that was entered into by the United States and Mexico that announced a multiyear, $1.4 billion plan to use U.S. assistance to combat drug trafficking and other criminal organization activities. This has been labeled the ''Merida Initiative,'' and the administration has requested $500 million.

Some would ask why? Because we are at a crisis. And I come from the State of Texas. There is bloodshed on the border. The violence is enormous. The wars between drug cartels have caused some 1,800 to 1,900 deaths to Mexicans in the first 9 months of 2007. And it is attributable to the cartel-related violence. More than 60 American citizens have been kidnapped in Nuevo Laredo, a Mexican town directly across the border from the city of Laredo, a fine, wonderful city. And the mayors of those cities have come and asked for relief. But unfortunately, it hasn't been listened to in the way that I believe it could be. Recognizing that the violence or the cause is not Laredo or the border towns as much as it is the violence that is now spilling over.

So I hope as we move forward in our initiative it will have a number of elements to it, and certainly one of the elements has to be the war against drugs here in the United States. It is important to note that Mexico is, in fact, the main foreign supply of marijuana and meth, and as well even though there is a small production of heroin, interestingly enough, they are a large producer of the heroin supply here in United States.

And for this reason, there needs to be a number of collaborations. I disagree, for example, with the Secretary of Homeland Security, who says that we can't put the virtual fence at the border because he realizes that we are being conflicted by the questions of a barrier fence, reasonably so, because we are used to the ingress and egress of trade in that area. And so I hope this initiative will have a balance and recognize that we have to look at many options to secure the border.

I want to also make mention of the fact that I am a member of the Homeland Security Committee and will hope, as this legislation moves forward, that we will have a collaboration with the Department of Homeland Security with this effort. You cannot make this work unless DHS is involved.

And I was prepared to offer an amendment that dealt with assessing the role of the relevant United States Government departments and agencies, including the Department of Homeland Security, in supporting the Merida Initiative, providing specific information on what staff, equipment and other resources the relevant United States Government departments and agencies, including the Department of Homeland Security would need to support this initiative, and assessing the impact of the initiative on the border security operations of the relevant United States Government departments and agencies.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the chairman.

Assessing the impact of the Merida Initiative on the border security operations of the relevant United States Government departments and agencies, including the Department of Homeland Security, and identify additional resources, if any, that the relevant United States Government departments and agencies, including the Department of Homeland Security, need to make available to carry out this initiative.

I recall specifically as a member of the Subcommittee on Border Security writing legislation and the ranking member on the Immigration Subcommittee in our past Congresses on providing more resources for our Border Patrol. It was interesting that the administration was always voicing their leadership on the idea of border security, and our Border Patrol agents were suffering. There were not enough. They didn't have the kind of speedboats, night goggles and computers. Now you see it is like night and day because of legislation carried by members of the Democratic Caucus.

And so it is important that as we go forward we find a collaboration of the Department of Homeland Security because human trafficking and drug trafficking are intertwined. The violation of the borders is intertwined with all we are doing here, and we need to have a collaboration with the Department of Homeland Security. I support this initiative, and I know it can be expanded.

I rise today in cautious support of H.R. 6028, the "Merida Initiative to Combat Illicit Narcotics and Reduce Organized Crime Act of 2008." I would like to thank my colleague

Congressman BERMAN for introducing this legislation, as well as for his ongoing leadership as Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. While I do support this bill, I am extremely disappointed in the manner in which it was brought to the floor today. Like many Members, I have outstanding concerns about this legislation that have not yet been addressed, and I believe Members should have been given the opportunity to offer amendments to this important and far-reaching bill. I remain concerned about human rights in the region and I believe that the United States must do far more to address the demand for drugs in the United States, but I also believe that this legislation represents a positive step toward partnering with our southern neighbors to combat a problem that we share.

Mr. Speaker, I had planned to introduce an amendment to this legislation that will require the President to submit a report

(1) assessing the role of the relevant United States Government departments and agencies, including the Department of Homeland Security, in supporting the Merida Initiative;

(2) providing specific information on what staffing, equipment, and other resources the relevant United States Government departments and agencies, including the Department of Homeland Security, have provided for the Merida Initiative;

(3) assessing the impact of the Merida Initiative on the border security operations of the relevant United States Government departments and agencies, including the Department of Homeland Security; and

(4) identifying additional resources, if any, that the relevant United States Government departments and agencies, including the Department of Homeland Security, need to make available to carry out the Merida Initiative.

As a senior Member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I am cognizant of the fact that the Department of Homeland Security will play a major role in the implementation of the Merida Initiative. Among other things, Customs and Border Patrol will be involved in the procurement and training of non-intrusive inspection equipment (scanners, x-ray vans) and rescue and communications equipment, and Immigration and Customs Enforcement will be involved in modernizing Mexico's immigration database and the training of vetted units focused on anti-gang and anti-money laundering.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Merida Initiative will not be complete or successful without the cooperation of the Department of Homeland Security and the dedication of its brave men and women. The report required by my Amendment would have made sure Congress knows what resources DHS is contributing to the Merida Initiative and whether more are needed. It would also have let Congress know how the Merida Initiative is affecting DHS's ability to carry out its other missions, including border security. As we continue to fight criminal syndicates and terrorism organizations around the world, we must ensure that there is accountability for our precious resources and that we are not losing focus of the needs at home. I am extremely disappointed that this legislation has been brought up under suspension, as I believe that my amendment would have improved the legislation.

On October 22, the United States and Mexico, in a joint statement, announced a multi-year, $1.4 billion plan to use U.S. assistance to combat drug trafficking and other criminal organizations. As part of this plan, known as the Mérida Initiative, the Administration has requested $500 million for Mexico and $50 million for Central America in the FY 2008 Supplemental Appropriations. Since March 2007, when Presidents George W. Bush and Felipe Calderon met in Mérida, officials of both governments, without the input of the legislative branch of either country, have been working on an initiative to expand bilateral and regional cooperation, in order to combat organized crime and criminal gangs in the region.

Mexico has, in recent years, experienced an increase in drug violence. Much of the recent violence has been attributed to turf wars between drug cartels, with between 1,800 and 1,900 deaths of Mexicans in the first nine months of 2007 alone being attributed to cartel-related violence. More than 60 American citizens have been kidnapped in Nuevo Laredo, a Mexican town directly across the border from the city of Laredo, in my own state of Texas. Some of this violence is reportedly spilling over the border into the United States.

Spill-over violence and attacks on Americans are not the only reasons Mexico's drug trade is of intimate interest to the United States. Mexico is the main foreign supplier of marijuana and a major supplier of methamphetamine to the United States, and, though it produces only a small share of global heroin production, it produces a sizeable proportion of the heroin distributed in the United States. In addition to production of drugs, Mexico is also a major transit country. According to State Department estimates, 90% of the cocaine entering the United States transits through Mexico.

With the demise of powerful cartels in Colombia, Mexican drug cartels have recently become increasingly significant. According to the National Drug Intelligence Center, Mexican cartels now dominate the illicit U.S. drug market, using "well-established overland transportation networks to transport cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, and heroin—Mexican and increasingly South American—to drug markets throughout the country." Though Colombian groups retain a significant share of smuggling and distribution operations in the United States, the operations of Mexican groups continue to account for an increasingly large percentage of the market.

Recent years have indicated that much more needs to be done to address issues of drug production and trafficking in Mexico. While I certainly agree that the Mérida Initiative represents an important and much needed effort, I am extremely disappointed that neither members of the U.S. nor the Mexican congress were included in the discussion process. In addition, I have significant concerns about the initiative itself, and I believe there are many outstanding issues that remain to be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we can address the problem of drug trafficking by combating the supply side alone. This legislation does require the President to submit a report on efforts to reduce demand in the United States, and I believe that this language is extremely important, acknowledging that this is not just a foreign issue. I would like to see this Congress take a more active role in reducing the prevalence of drug use and addiction in our own communities, in conjunction with working to eliminate the flow of drugs across our borders.

Mr Speaker, it is essential that this Committee stay engaged with this program after it is implemented, particularly monitoring its effects on human rights. U.S. dollars absolutely should not be going to fund abuses; they should be used to build a culture of respect for fundamental human rights. To this end, I am pleased that this legislation states that one of the purposes of this initiative is to "strengthen respect for internationally recognized human rights and the rule of law in efforts to stabilize the security environment relating to the illicit narcotics production and trafficking and organized crime." Further, this legislation restricts funding to any units known to commit gross violations of human rights, provides assistance for human rights training in relevant law enforcement units, and, perhaps most crucially, requires the President to report to Congress on the human rights impact of the equipment and training provided in this bill. Mr. Speaker, this language is important, but alone it is not enough, and I fully expect that this committee will remain engaged in this important issue following the implementation of this program.

Mr. Speaker, despite my outstanding concerns and my disappointment over the manner in which this legislation was brought before us today, I do believe that this legislation will strengthen the bonds of cooperation with our southern neighbors on an important issue in which we all share a stake. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) who is also an esteemed member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. I thank the gentlelady from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, let me say first that I support a military strategy to deal with the drug cartels. Having come from Texas, having worked counterterrorism with the Justice Department at the Mexican border, I know firsthand what a direct threat to the security of this Nation these drug cartels present. They export drugs. They poison our children. They export human trafficking. They bring special interest aliens into this country, some of whom are not caught. And in the post-9/11 world, they present a threat that we can no longer ignore. And they must be dealt with. That is why I have been supportive of this initiative.

However, I believe that we need a strategy on this side of the border, as well. I believe we need a two-pronged approach, if you will, a comprehensive strategy that deals not only with the Mexican side but with the U.S. side. And for too long, our border sheriffs and our Border Patrol agents have been outmanned and outgunned. And if we are going to provide assistance to Mexico, it seems to me we ought to be providing assistance to our men and women on our side fighting this war every day.

I had a unique opportunity to meet with President Calderon. He told me that he is at war with the drug cartels. He is at war with these drug cartels. And we need to fight this war against the drug cartels.

And I believe the best way to do that is provide the military assistance, but also provide the resources necessary on this side of our border, which is why I offered an amendment at the foreign affairs markup of this bill to provide $1.4 billion, an equal amount, if you will, over 3 years for our Federal, State and local law enforcement, including the border sheriffs. And Chairman BERMAN was supportive of this amendment. The chairman sits on the Judiciary Committee. It was my sincere hope that this amendment would have been taken up by the Judiciary Committee when they marked up this bill, as well.

Unfortunately, that didn't happen. And the Judiciary Committee decided not to take up this bill. In addition, instead of having an open rule whereby it could offer this amendment on the floor, we have a closed rule, and this vote is now under suspension. I believe this is a missed opportunity. I believe it is a missed opportunity to have a really comprehensive bill that could have had strong bipartisan support, that had the approach and the strategy that I just outlined, a military strategy on the Mexican side of the border, and a beefed up law enforcement on this side of the border. That is how we are going to achieve true border security in this Nation. So I just wanted to present that objection.

It is my sincere hope we can fix this and add this amendment at some point in the process to give our law enforcement on this side of the border the tools that they need, also, to win this war against the drug cartels.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), an esteemed member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. POE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work that the chairman and the ranking member have done on this initiative. However, I rise in opposition to this legislation before the House. As a former prosecutor and longtime judge in Texas, I am concerned about drugs and violence on the border, but I am also concerned about corruption.

According to the DEA, 500 people were murdered in Nuevo Laredo in 2005. None of those cases was solved. Many of those murdered were police officers. There have been 400 kidnappings in Nuevo Laredo. Forty-one of them were American citizens. None of them have been solved.

I doubt if anyone would be surprised to find out that the drug cartels are to blame for most of the violence on the border. What you might be surprised to learn is that U.S.-trained Mexican forces are behind some of the attacks. The Department of Homeland Security has reported that in the last 10 years, there have been over 250 incursions by suspected Mexican military units into the United States.

In order to gain control of access corridors in the United States, drug cartels are hiring hit men from an elite force in Mexico's military. This group is known as the ''Zetas.'' It has been reported that some of the Zetas are military deserters that may have been trained in the United States at the former School of the Americas in Fort Benning, Georgia. Reports claim that these forces were sent by the Mexican Government to the United States-Mexico border to combat drug trafficking. Instead, some of them deserted and became assassins for the Mexican drug cartels. Officials suspect that there are more than 200 Zetas. Between January and September of last year, nearly 5,000 Mexican soldiers deserted. Many of them went to work for the drug cartels because they pay more money.

The bill before the House today would authorize $1.5 billion in money, training and equipment over the next 5 years to Mexico. Most of that amount, more than $1 billion, would go, as I said, to Mexico. And Mexico in its arrogance objects to any conditions we want to put on this money. The administration can offer us no assurance that our equipment and training won't be used against us and neither can Mexico.

These forces are violent. They kill people and are a danger to the enforcement of our border, especially to our sheriffs. We've tried to work with Mexico in the past to stop drug trafficking. Every new president talks about how they are going to stop the drug trade, but it never has worked. Why should we send $1 billion to Mexico when we have no idea whether the goods we send will end up in the hands of corrupt Mexican officials and be used against us? Rather than sending all this money and equipment to Mexico and the lawless Mexican officials at the border, we ought to be equipping United States border sheriffs who can use this equipment to protect our homeland. We need to keep our money on this side of the border where we need it and where we can keep up with it.

And that's just the way it is.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. We will miss him greatly when he retires.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this important initiative, the Merida Initiative, to combat illicit narcotics and reduce organized crime authorization legislation. I commend Chairman BERMAN, Chairman ENGEL and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN for their work in putting together bipartisan legislation that implements not only a bipartisan agreement but also an international agreement with our neighbor and our neighbors to the south.

Ladies and gentlemen, think of it in these terms, if in the last few months the director of the FBI had been assassinated by narcotraffickers, think about it if the head of the Drug Enforcement Administration had been assassinated by narcotraffickers, think about it if dozens of police chiefs were shot down in the streets and murdered in their homes in front of their families, how would we as Americans react?

□ 1215

Would we ask for help and want every resource we could put in place to go after those who committed those horrible crimes?

Ladies and gentlemen, in Mexico, our friend, our ally, our partner in so many ways, that has been occurring, where the head of their counternarcotics program was assassinated, where police chiefs are being shot down, where the narcotraffickers have been so brazen they have publicly posted signs listing police officers and police chiefs that they intend to target for assassination, and at the same time, saying ''come join us. We will pay you better if you are in law enforcement today. Switch sides. You will be paid more.''

Well, today we have a President in Mexico, President Calderon, who decided to take the fight to the narcotraffickers. He has deployed 30,000 Mexican troops against narcotraffickers throughout Mexico, for the first time, and they have asked for our help. Both our friends in Mexico and our friends in Central America have asked our help with this fight.

That is why this legislation is important, because we have an obligation to help our neighbors; because by stopping the flow of drugs it affects other issues, policy concerns many of us have talked about. Number one is the flow of drugs into our country. And if you care about illegal immigration, if that has been a point you have debated on this floor, you argued we have got to do something about illegal immigration, well, frankly, safe streets and communities in Mexico and Central America are vital to ensuring that families and their children feel safe in their own communities, rather than having to leave for the United States illegally for a safe place to live.

And if you if you care about the arguments that many have made that narcotraffickers are crossing our borders and the Mexicans need to do more, well, they are. Again, 30,000 Mexican troops have been deployed against the narcotraffickers. Unfortunately, in many cases narcotraffickers are equally or better armed than the Mexican military.

That is why this legislation is needed. That is why this legislation needs bipartisan support. I urge bipartisan support.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, FDR made a statement about why he was giving aid to England to fight Nazi Germany, and that statement was, when your neighbor's home is burning, only a fool would not let them borrow your hose to put out the fire.

Well, Mr. Speaker, our border is burning. Mexico is in flames with violence. We are not taking on a war on drugs down at the border; we are taking on the battle against narco-terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken a lot of positions about the fact that the boarders are out of control, but now is the time the American people have to wake up and this Congress has to wake up and realize that the people in Mexico are fighting desperately for their republic. They are being murdered in the streets. Police chiefs on the day they do a press conference stating that they caught a cartel smuggling drugs into San Diego County through a tunnel, the day that they do that press conference, that night that police chief is murdered by the cartel. The head of their law enforcement, who is comparable to our FBI, was murdered in their capital.

You may say, but is Mexico doing enough? I have a lot of disagreements with Mr. Calderon. The justification for ignoring the cartel when they smuggle aliens is one of them. But the same cartel that is smuggling aliens and drugs into the United States are killing law enforcement and judges and politicians in Mexico.

And do not think that this is a problem far away from us. This problem is in our front yard, in our backyard, in our lap right now. Washington can ignore it, but they are already starting to kidnap and kill people in San Diego County in the south. We have an obligation to make sure that we fight this battle on Mexican soil before it becomes a battle in the main streets of the United States.

I ask us to join now. The fact is if there is anything that we can do, we need to defend our American freedom and our security when and where we find the threat, and the threat today is in Mexico. Calderon has been brave enough to export criminals to the United States. He has judges being killed right and left down there. Mexico is willing to work with us on this and desperately asking for our help, and only a fool would not give them the help to fight the battle on Mexican soil before we are fighting it on U.S. soil.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, at a time of record national debt and deficit, at a time when gasoline prices are now well over $4, when oil is over $130 a barrel and Mexico is sitting on one of the largest oil reserves in the world, it is inexcusable, it is intolerable for us to send one dime to the Mexican Government when they can afford to pay for this equipment themselves.

But even more importantly than that, our southern border not secure. We should not send a dime to Mexico until our own American law enforcement officers have the resources they need to secure the border once and for all; not one dime to Mexico until the American border is secure.

I am going to call for a record vote on this bill, because we need to defeat this legislation until our southern border is secure.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of an issue of great importance to both the Nation and my congressional district in south Texas.

As a life-long resident of the southern border region, America's relationship with Mexico is of great importance to me, to my constituents, our chambers of commerce and economic development corporations.

For far too long, our Nation has focused its attention upon far-away lands on the other side of the world while our relationship with our closest of neighbors has languished. While current and past administrations shoulder much of the blame for our history of inattention to Mexico, Congress has been complicit in this failure.

When our Nation has needed to show compassion and understanding for the Mexican people, this Congress has been unable to agree on a comprehensive immigration plan befitting our American heritage. When our Nation should be celebrating our partnership and common interests with a close geographic ally, this Congress has literally built a wall between ourselves and Mexico.

This is no way to treat a friend and neighbor and actually our second largest trading partner. Although not a solution to all of the deficiencies in our relationship with Mexico, the Merida Initiative is a step in the right direction. Border residents are keenly aware of the violence and dangers of the drug trade and the criminal networks that span our continent. While based within Mexico, these criminal cartels are an affliction of the entire continent and must be addressed through national partnerships and cooperation.

We were there in Monterrey yesterday with a large delegation of Members of Congress and the Senate and we heard from and had a great dialogue with the congressmen and senators of that country. They are the ones who are fighting this battle for us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. They are the ones who are at the forefront as Colombia and other countries are bringing their drugs through Mexico, and they are the ones who have to fight it. They are the ones who have given up their lives. They are the ones who are helping us fight the drug cartel.

I ask my colleagues to please join me in supporting this important initiative.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I know we only have 1 minute remaining, so I would like to yield myself that remaining minute to close on our side on the Merida Initiative.

I would like to point to the testimony that was given by an official of the Department of Homeland Security when he testified on the importance for the United States of the Merida Initiative, because this is not a bill for Mexico. This is not a legislative bill for Central America. This is not for Haiti. This is not for the Dominican Republic. This is for the United States citizens. This is to protect our homeland from these vicious gangs and these drug dealers.

As this gentleman said, rather than simply giving money to foreign governments, the Merida Initiative has been tailored to provide our foreign partners with the specific tools they each need to fight transnational organized crime and work cooperatively with us in the United States. This is a bill that will help our communities, our country, our national security and our children.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), a member of the committee.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. This is my first term on the Foreign Affairs Committee. But I am not here necessarily as a committee member. I am here as a Member of Congress from Texas concerning the relationship Texas has had with Mexico for generations, if not centuries, and the relationship that we need to continue.

There is literally a battle going on in Mexico, our closest neighbor, and there has been an effort to try and support them in their battle with narcotics and narco-terrorism, and that is what this bill is about.

Whatever Mexico has been doing in their country is actually protecting those of us in Texas and California and all over the United States, because if they slow that situation down or win that battle, it makes our citizens and our people a lot safer.

We should help our local police even more. We should do a lot of things. But that is a whole separate piece of legislation. What we are talking about here is stepping up to the plate and helping a neighbor who is our closest neighbor and one who is in the middle of a war and losing police chiefs, law enforcement officers, the military. Whatever they do in their own country to take

care of thisi problem will make us safer in our own.

There are some concerns about human rights, and I want to address that, but I would hope we would address it with members of Congress from Mexico. When I met with those members from both the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies in Mexico, they were concerned about some of the human rights violations in our country. We have to share that information and work with each other. Again, we are not moving, Mexico is not moving, and we need to make sure we work as a partnership with Mexico in their efforts to control their own country.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an exchange of letters between the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and myself.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, June 6, 2008.

Hon. HOWARD L. BERMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BERMAN: This is to advise you that, as a result of your working with us to make appropriate revisions to provisions in H.R. 6028, the Merida Initiative to Combat Illicit Narcotics and Reduce Organized Crime Authorization Act of 2008, that fall within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, we are able to agreed to discharging our committee from further consideration of the bill in order that it may proceed without delay to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with the understanding that by forgoing further consideration of H.R. 6028 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this similar legislation. We also reserve the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this important legislation, and request your support if such a request is made.

I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to this request, and for the cooperative relationship between our two committees.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS, JR.,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, June 6, 2008.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 6028, the Merida Initiative to Combat Illicit Narcotics and Reduce Organized Crime Authorization Act of 2008.

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. I acknowledge that the Committee will not seek a sequential referral of the bill and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee over subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation.

Further, as to any House-Senate conference on the bill, I understand that your committee reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees for consideration of portions of the bill that are within the Committee's jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during the consideration of House debate on H.R. 6028, and I look forward to working with you on this important legislation. If you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact me or have your staff contact my staff.

Cordially,

HOWARD L. BERMAN,
Chairman.

I urge very strongly, don't make the best the enemy of the better. This is a very important proposal for the American people, for our interests. Yes, more police here, more Border Patrol, better technology, better employer verification. But understand what is going on in Mexico. This is a compelling initiative for our interests.

I urge an ''aye'' vote.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6028, the Merida Initiative to Combat Illicit Narcotics and Reduce Organized Crime Authorization Act of 2008. H.R. 6028 creates a foundation for future cooperation in assisting our neighbors to the south in combating the rise of organized crime.

This legislation is a good starting point but much more work will need to be done, including significant transnational and interagency cooperation, in order to ensure the success of the Merida Initiative. I was disappointed that the House Homeland Security Committee was not included in the development of this bill, despite the fact that the Department of Homeland Security will play a large role in the Initiative by coordinating its agencies that are already assisting Mexico and other foreign governments to address smuggling, trafficking and violence on our borders.

Last week the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border, Maritime, and Global Counterterrorism, which I have the privilege of chairing, had a hearing entitled ''The Merida Initiative: Examining U.S. Efforts to Combat Transnational Criminal Organizations.'' This hearing highlighted the importance of the Merida Initiative in stemming the growing transnational crime in the United States and on our borders. For example, in my home district in Orange County, CA, gang violence is on the rise as a result of the huge presence of the largest transnational gang in the United States, Mara Salvatrucha, in Los Angeles County. It is reported that there are over 900 members of Mara Salvatrucha in Los Angeles County, and many of these gang members are in the United States illegally. The rise of this type of gang in the United States can be linked to a practice by many of the drug cartels of ''contracting out'' drug, ammunition, and weapon smuggling activities to these gang members. The Homeland Security hearing emphasized that many agencies, including the Department of Homeland Security will need to work together closely to stop these growing transnational crime networks.

H.R. 6028 must ensure interagency cooperation within the United States in order to succeed abroad with the foreign governments we seek to assist. As I stated earlier, much more needs to be done in order to help stem the violence along the U.S. and Mexican border, but this bill helps build the necessary foundation. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to help ensure further cooperation between the key departments involved in its implementation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly in opposition to this bill.

I applaud the Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, my friend and colleague Congressman BERMAN, for asserting the role of the Congress and making sure that new initiatives such as the Merida Initiative are authorized. It is the right thing to do, and I look forward to working with him over the coming weeks on a number of foreign policy matters pending before the Committee.

There is much to support in H.R. 6028, and there are also several troubling matters.

Regarding the provisions of the bill that deal with Central America—a region of Latin America that is very close to my heart—I believe H.R. 6028 takes several important steps forward, seriously investing in community-based solutions to youth and gang problems. H.R. 6028 provides strong support to non-security programs that address the endemic conditions giving rise to violence related to drugs, arms and human trafficking. It provides support for the U.N. International Commission Against Impunity in Guatemala (CICIG), especially in the areas of witness and victim protection, an initiative that merits the very strongest support by the United States and the international community. The bill also seeks to promote transparency and an end to impunity throughout Central America by strengthening police and judicial systems so that they may more effectively and successfully carry out investigations and prosecutions of those responsible for human rights violations and other criminal acts.

This is all very good news, Mr. Speaker.

I am very concerned that this authorizing bill fails, however, to reflect the thoughtful and critically important human rights conditions contained in the Senate and House versions of the FY 2008 supplemental appropriations on military and security-related aid to Mexico. I understand that those proposed conditions are controversial in Mexico, in large measure because of the history of the very problematic drug certification process that existed in the past. I do not believe that the human rights conditions included in the supplemental appropriations bill bear any resemblance to the flawed drug certification process, and the House and Senate Appropriations Committees took great care not to mirror that flawed certification process.

By failing to include the conditions on aid provided for the Merida Initiative that are included in the Senate and House supplemental appropriations bills, passage of this authorizing measure could be viewed as an effort to weaken or eliminate those provisions from the final conference report on the supplemental that will soon be sent to the President for his signature. It is my sincere (hope that this is not the intention of bringing H.R. 6028 to the House floor at such a delicate moment. There was no reason to rush this bill before the House, since we know it has no counterpart on the Senate side. So its consideration today invites concern that its passage is indeed an attempt to influence conference negotiations on the supplemental and to send a message that human rights conditions are not welcome, and certainly not the stronger, more specific

conditionality included in the Senate version of the FY08 supplemental appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that America wants to be a good partner with Mexico on fighting drugs and ending corruption and human rights violations within Mexico's judicial system and its military and police. Over the past several weeks we have all seen the effects of the bloody rampage carried out by the drug cartels, especially those targeted at assassinating key officers and members of the Mexican National Police. I hope in other legislation that may come before the House this year that we will pay special attention to investing in drug education, prevention and treatment programs, as well as our own law enforcement agencies, so that U.S. demand for illegal drugs will also be forcefully and substantially addressed.

But we cannot simply write blank checks and fail to ensure that our aid is not subject to strong conditions on human rights, transparency, justice reform and promoting and protecting the rights of civil society. These concerns are very much at the forefront of the strong Senate conditions in the FY08 appropriations bill, and are also reflected in the slightly less stringent House conditions. They should have been included in H.R. 6028, the authorizing legislation, which is where human rights conditionality appropriately belongs.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are my concerns and my hopes regarding H.R. 6028, and I will be following closely the consequences of authorizing and appropriating these funds.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 6028.

With our economy facing serious, mounting challenges, and Americans facing unprecedented energy prices, I cannot support sending money to Mexico and Central America to take up the fight on drug trafficking.

As Mexico currently profits from the sale of oil on the world market as gas prices continue to skyrocket, I seriously question why we would send their government any aid to fight this battle. Think about it: gas is so much less expensive in Mexico that border area citizens from this country are going there to fill up.

Our own borders remain porous, illegal immigration strains our economy, and Americans are vulnerable to terrorists slipping into our country: fighting Mexico's war on drugs, and essentially securing Mexico's southern border, should not be at the top of our list of priorities right now.

While sending aid to fight criminal behavior and drug trafficking abroad is laudable in theory, given the current economic hardships Americans face, I simply cannot support this bill.

Mr. BERMAN. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6028, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1230

MARKING THE 225TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TREATY OF PARIS OF 1783

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1063) marking the 225th anniversary of the Treaty of Paris of 1783, which ended the Revolutionary War with the Kingdom of Great Britain and recognized the independence of the United States of America, and acknowledging the shared values and close friendship between the peoples and governments of the United States and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1063

Whereas the United States will celebrate this year the 225th anniversary of its relationship with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland since the September 3, 1783 signing of the Treaty of Paris, which formally ended the American Revolutionary War between the Kingdom of Great Britain and the United States of America;

Whereas both the United Kingdom and the United States are free and democratic nations with a common commitment to human rights and the rule of law;

Whereas the United Kingdom is a major ally of the United States and 2008 marks the 50th anniversary of the US-UK Mutual Defense Agreement that was signed in Washington, DC, on July 3, 1958, and renewed in Washington, DC, on June 14, 2004;

Whereas both the United Kingdom and the United States are founding members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), having been party to the North Atlantic Treaty signed in Washington, DC, on April 4, 1949;

Whereas the United Kingdom is a major partner in the worldwide fight against terrorism, supporting the United States in many key armed struggles;

Whereas the United Kingdom is the second largest contributor to the multinational force in Iraq;

Whereas the United Kingdom plays a significant role in the military effort to bring lasting stability to Afghanistan and is the second largest contributor to NATO's International Security Assistance Force;

Whereas the United Kingdom and the United States share a steadfast alliance and a long tradition of opposing extremism, which included fighting the forces of nazism and communism in the 20th century;

Whereas the United Kingdom is the sixth largest trading partner of the United States, and the United States is the largest trading partner of the United Kingdom;

Whereas the United States and the United Kingdom share the world's largest foreign direct investment partnership, with American investment sustaining over a million jobs in the United Kingdom and British investment sustaining over a million jobs in the United States;

Whereas approximately 675,000 British citizens reside in the United States, and 155,000 Americans reside in the United Kingdom, with both communities contributing to the fabric of life in their host countries;

Whereas approximately 8,400 British students are currently studying at universities in the United States, and 32,000 American students are studying at universities in the United Kingdom; and

Whereas the relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom is one of unity and strength, and has been proven to be of mutual benefit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) marks the 225th anniversary of relations between the United States and the Kingdom of Great Britain;

(2) recognizes that the Kingdom of Great Britain's recognition of the United States was an important event in the history of the Nation;

(3) reaffirms the value of the deep friendship that has developed between our two Countries since the signing of the Treaty of Paris; and

(4) looks forward to a continued and strengthened relationship between the British and American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I am pleased to support this resolution that marks 225 years since the Treaty of Paris concluded the Revolutionary War with Great Britain and that acknowledges the close friendship enjoyed by our two countries ever since.

I commend our distinguished colleague, Representative WU of Oregon, and Vice-Chair of the British-American Parliamentary Group, who introduced this measure. It is important that the House marks this anniversary and celebrates such a vital bipartisan partnership, bilateral partnership also.

The Treaty of Paris was signed on September 3, 1783, formally ending the Revolutionary War between the 13 original colonies and the Kingdom of Great Britain. The settlement of the war and the recognition of our young Nation by Great Britain was a moment of great significance in the infancy of our Nation.

Two hundred twenty-five years later, the United Kingdom remains one of our closest allies by virtue of our shared history and values. Both the United States and the UK have proud histories of representative democracy and respect for the rule of law.

They have also encouraged and helped many people around the world secure the freedoms and rights their

own citizens enjoy. During World War I, the United States and the United Kingdom fought together as a part of the allied forces against autocratic imperialism.

During World War II, again, against the Axis, our countries stood together against the scourge of Nazism and fascism. Our brave troops helped to liberate European countries from Nazi occupation, and innocent civilians from the horrors of concentration camps. We talked about the greatest generation, our World War II veterans, that we today still admire and respect.

Throughout the 20th century, the United Kingdom has stood side-by-side with the United States on critical issues concerning liberty and human rights. Most recently the United Kingdom has strongly supported the United States' effort in South Asia and the Middle East. British soldiers are the second largest contributors to NATO's International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan and the multinational force in Iraq.

The United States and the United Kingdom share long histories of industrialization, being among the first nations to develop technologically. Both nations have a culture of intervention and curiosity, as evidenced by the innumerable number of scientific discoveries and inventions. This work has enhanced the frequent collaboration between American and British researchers. We have a tremendous bilateral system going.

Indeed, such links are often developed at an early stage as young people take advantage of educational opportunities in each others' countries. There are currently 8,400 British students attending American universities and 32,000 American youth staying in the UK. These young people know all too well the extensive cultural links between our countries as British and American arts, music, literature, cinema, are enjoyed on both sides of the Atlantic.

In recognition of the close bilateral relations shared by the United States and the United Kingdom, I strongly support this resolution and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, while the positive relationship enjoyed by the United States and Great Britain is certainly historic, enduring and merits recognition, and it merits nurturing, we should also be focusing our time and debating policies to address the rising energy costs that are facing our Nation.

Nevertheless, we have this resolution before us marking the 225th anniversary of the Treaty of Paris of 1783 between the United States and the United Kingdom. The great British Prime Minister Winston Churchill was the first to refer to the alliance between the United States and the United Kingdom as a special relationship. In a speech he delivered in 1946, he was right to use that term.

The American British relationship is, indeed, special, with its foundation lying in the common values of freedom, democracy and human rights. Our mutual commitments to those principles have led the United States and Great Britain to stand side by side on the beaches of Normandy, at the Berlin wall, in the mountains of Afghanistan, and in those the parts of Iraq where the challenges today are greatest.

The murderous terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in America, and on July 7, 2005, in Britain, have bound America and Britain even closer together in our determination to defeat extremism.

During his recent visit to the United States, British Prime Minister Gordon Brown reaffirmed our strong relationship saying, ''I continue to stand shoulder to shoulder [with the US] in the fight where freedom and justice are at risk.''

By adopting the resolution before us, we will again recognize the history of our special relationship with Britain, a relationship that ironically began with the revolution of one against the other, but that came into its full strength because of the values and the ideals that our two people have continued to share.

Now, 225 years after the treaty of peace, in which Britain recognized the independence of the United States of America, that alliance between our two countries takes its guidance from the speech in 1946 in which Mr. Churchill noted our special relationship, and here is what he said then:

If there is to be a fraternal association . . . with all the extra strength and security which both our countries can derive from it, let us make sure that that great fact is known to the world, and that it plays its part in steadying and stabilizing the foundations of peace. There is the path of wisdom.

I encourage my colleagues to join supporting this resolution which follows Mr. Churchill's advice and lets the world know that the United States and the United Kingdom, indeed, have a strong and continuing relationship. I am not sure what Winston Churchill would say about today's high energy costs, but I bet that he would have a detailed plan to help us bring our costs down.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the author of this resolution, Mr. DAVID WU of Oregon, chairman of the Subcommittee on Science and Technology.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his many kindnesses.

Thomas Jefferson once said that ''no two countries upon Earth have so many points of common interest and friendship'' as the United States and the United Kingdom. Indeed, our two nations share values, traditions and a common commitment to democracy, human rights and the rule of law.

I introduced House Resolution 1063 to mark the 225th anniversary of our diplomatic relationship with the United Kingdom, which began with the signing of the Treaty of Paris of 1783. This treaty formalized the peace between the United States and Great Britain following our Revolutionary War.

In September of 1782, Benjamin Franklin, along with fellow peace commissioners John Adams and John Jay, began formal negotiations for an end to hostilities between Great Britain and the de facto independent United States of America.

After 2 months of negotiation, Britain and France and the United States reached a preliminary peace agreement. The following September, the parties met in Paris and signed what would become known as the Treaty of Paris of 1783. Since that time, Britain and the United States have come to be friends, allies and economic partners, a relationship that advances, enriches and inspires both sides of the Atlantic.

As with all old sayings, it is the exception which proves the rule. For the old saying that great powers have only interests, not friends, the relationship between the United States of America and the United Kingdom is the exception which proves the rule.

Recently I joined several of my colleagues in Congress and with members of the British Parliament for extensive discussions. It was a productive and thought-provoking exchange of ideas. I believe we can learn much from the experience of our British counterparts. One example would be dealing with the challenge of global climate change.

I also believe our own knowledge and expertise can be of continued value to our friends in the United Kingdom. One example of that would be their expressed interest in the Death with Dignity Law which we passed in the State of Oregon.

After two centuries, we can still learn from each other, prosper together, and jointly promote a better world.

So it is fitting that we should mark with special approbation the 225th anniversary of the treaty that began our relations with the United Kingdom as independent States. For over two centuries, our two nations have stood together in peace and war, in prosperity and hardship. Together we have faced two world wars, the Great Depression, the Cold War, terrorism, and triumphs and tragedies too numerous to recount.

Please join me in marking the genesis of our diplomatic relationship with the United Kingdom by supporting House Resolution 1063. I thank the Speaker of the House for the House consideration of this resolution today, and I urge swift passage of H.R. 1063.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, in order to close, I would like to yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like to note that this 225th anniversary

of the signing of the Treaty of Paris, the declaration in that treaty of the intention of both the U.S. and the United Kingdom to forget all past misunderstandings and differences and to secure perpetual peace and harmony, over 200 years later these goals remain a cornerstone to our strong relationship.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution and reaffirm our close ties to our dear ally, Great Britain.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me, once again, say what a great occasion it is marking the 225th anniversary of the Treaty of Paris of 1783.

As has been indicated, we are close allies. Many of our organizations, as a matter of fact, the YMCA, which was founded in Great Britain in the late 1840s to take people who were coming into London because of the Industrial Revolution in London and England found a place where they could have a wholesome relationship. Twenty-five years later, that organization was brought to the United States of America. Still we have relations between them, just another example of close ties between the United States and the United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1063.

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. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1253; adopting House Resolution 1253, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 6028.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

□ 1245

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6003, PASSENGER RAIL INVESTMENT AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1253, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 185, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

YEAS—227

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

NAYS—185

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Cubin
Cummings
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Ferguson
Fossella
Gillibrand
Green, Al
Hall (NY)
Holt
Hulshof
Lamborn
McCrery
Meek (FL)
Miller, George
Ortiz
Pickering
Rush
Tancredo
Wilson (SC)

□ 1310

Mrs. DRAKE and Messrs. FRANKS of Arizona, KINGSTON and DOOLITTLE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 187, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

YEAS—227

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

NAYS—187

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

NOT VOTING—19

Cubin
Cummings
Dingell
Ferguson
Fossella
Gillibrand
Green, Al
Hall (NY)
Holt
Hulshof
Marchant
McCrery
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Miller, George
Ortiz
Rush
Tancredo
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1322

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 391 and 392, I did not receive a page. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" and "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably delayed and missed the vote on Ordering the Previous Question (rollcall 391) and H. Res. 1253—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 6003—Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (rollcall 392). Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 391 and rollcall 392.

MERIDA INITIATIVE TO COMBAT ILLICIT NARCOTICS AND REDUCE ORGANIZED CRIME AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6028, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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. 6028, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 311, nays 106, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

YEAS—311

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Childers
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey

Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Scalise
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—106

Aderholt
Akin
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonner
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Carney
Carson
Carter
Chabot
Clarke
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Culberson
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ellison
Ellsworth
Everett
Feeney
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Heller
Hensarling
Hoekstra
Hunter
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Kucinich
Lamborn
Latta
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moore (WI)
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Paul
Payne
Petri
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Stark
Stearns
Sullivan
Thornberry
Walberg
Wamp
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wittman (VA)
Woolsey
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—16

Costello
Cubin
Cummings
Dingell
Ferguson
Fossella
Gillibrand
Holt
Hulshof
McCrery
Meek (FL)
Ortiz
Rush
Speier
Tancredo
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1331

Messrs. WITTMAN of Virginia, ADERHOLT, and FORBES changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING CERTAIN MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1256

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—Mr. Childers.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—Ms. Matsui.

(3) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—Ms. Speier, Mr. Cazayoux, Mr. Childers.

(4) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. Carson.

(5) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Mr. Cazayoux.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 332) recognizing the 60th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 332

Whereas the United Nations Charter sought to establish an international forum to ''save succeeding generations from the scourge of war . . ., reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small . . .'';

Whereas, through manifold works of generosity, the people of the United States exemplify a noble conviction that the deepest yearnings of the human heart for respect and dignity transcend political, ethnic, and religious differences;

Whereas the people of the United States continue to inspire their leaders to prioritize endeavors which bring hope and healing to those in need throughout the world;

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on December 10, 1948, as a ''common standard of achievement for all peoples and nations . . .'';

Whereas the preamble of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states, ''. . . recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice, and peace in the world . . .'';

Whereas the Universal Declaration of Human Rights sets forth a common understanding of universal rights and freedoms and the notion that these cannot be created and are neither conferred by countries nor by governments, but rather are inalienable rights and freedoms with which all human persons are endowed by their very nature;

Whereas, Eleanor Roosevelt, who led the United States delegation to the first Commission on Human Rights, was responsible for drafting the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in recognition of her unparalleled humanitarian conviction, was elected as Chairwoman of the Commission; Eleanor Roosevelt expressed her vision of a declaration of true universality with enduring principles that would be perpetually recognized by all nations when she stated, as she submitted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights for consideration by the United Nations General Assembly, ''We stand today at the threshold of a great event both in the life of the United Nations and in the life of mankind. This declaration may well become the international Magna Carta for all men everywhere.''; and

Whereas United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon noted on Human Rights Day 2007, that ''[i]t is our duty to ensure that these rights are a living reality—that they are known, understood and enjoyed by everyone, everywhere'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes on its 60th anniversary year the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a singular achievement of the community of nations;

(2) recognizes the contribution in the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution to the development of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the role of the United States in preserving the legacy of these foundational human rights precepts through its participation in the United Nations;

(3) urges all United Nations Member States to renew their commitment to uphold and promote the transcendent principles of human dignity enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, especially on behalf of the world's most vulnerable persons and those who have no power to advocate on their own behalf; and

(4) joins with colleagues inspired by the spirit of goodwill in parliaments throughout the world in seeking to guide the United Nations and its agencies to serve as effective instruments of genuine and lasting justice and peace among nations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I want to congratulate our colleague Mr. FORTENBERRY for putting forth this very important resolution. He's a very valued member of our subcommittee, and he has been a strong supporter of issues of goodwill.

This resolution celebrates the 60th anniversary of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the first international agreement on the rights of humankind. The universal declaration proclaims the inherent dignity and equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family. It is this universal quality of the declaration that is its strength.

The core freedoms and guarantees are entitlement of all people, not just those from certain groups or cultures. As such, no government or Nation has the power to confer these rights. They are inalienable freedoms with which all people are endowed by their very nature.

The notion of inalienable rights was not invented in 1948. Socrates wrote about ethic laws that were higher than laws of kings over 2,500 years ago.

Even a proclamation of such rights is not new. The Magna Carta, the U.S. Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution, the Bill of Rights and the French Declaration of the Rights of Men all articulated specific inalienable rights.

The power of the declaration is that it represents the first comprehensive agreement among Nations as to the specific rights and freedoms belonging to all human beings. It has become a cornerstone of customary international law, binding all governments to its principles.

In the 60 years that I have followed the adoption of the universal Declaration, expansion of the circle of human dignity has come in fits and starts. Authoritarian governments still attempt to limit freedoms proclaimed by the declaration, including political and economic pluralism, a free press, freedom of association, freedom of religion, free and fair elections, and the rule of law. Nevertheless, the declaration allows humble citizens, be they monks in Burma, political dissenters in Cuba, journalists in Russia, lawyers in Pakistan or dispossessed in Zimbabwe, a standard by which to measure and challenge any government. As such, we see roots of freedom and democracy growing in even the most repressed societies.

Our duty is to support the efforts of human rights defenders to expand the circle of human freedoms so that the declaration will, in Eleanor Roosevelt's vision, become the Magna Carta for all men everywhere. As she says, it's better to light a candle than to curse the darkness.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 332, recognizing the 60th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

As we reflect on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the gross violators such as Iran and Saudi Arabia, we cannot help but think about how these repressive governments manipulate international oil flows to keep us at their mercy.

We must reduce our reliance on these unstable foreign energy sources, and the way to do that, Mr. Speaker, is by finding alternatives to oil dependence. The U.S. should lead the way; yet we're stuck in the past as our global competitors are indeed pursuing 21st century technologies. We must commit ourselves to a comprehensive energy reform policy that will improve energy efficiency and encourage investment in ground-breaking research and advance alternative and renewable energy technologies.

Much like the situation we're facing on human rights at the United Nations, we shouldn't wait 60 years to address the increasing problem of our foreign dependence on oil.

Mr. Speaker, 60 years ago and without a dissenting voice in the United Nations General Assembly, we recognized the fundamental human rights to life, to liberty, to freedom of religion, to freedom of expression, to self-government through free elections, to freedom from slavery and torture and so many other basic rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was the product of remarkable international consensus, and it captured the distilled conscience of the world in one of the United Nations' finest moments.

It was not an international law or covenant, and it did not claim to be creating the rights that it included. Rather, its purpose was to serve as a common standard of achievement for all peoples that is premised on faith in fundamental human rights and the dignity and worth of the human person.

We are fortunate and, indeed, truly blessed to live in a country whose constitutional heritage has served to secure those aspirations for all of America's people. But for so many people in the world, the ideals of the universal Declaration are nothing more than an unkept promise.

In Burma, in Cuba, North Korea and Zimbabwe, and many other Nations, people suffer at the hands of self-seeking tyrants and brutal dictatorships. Millions of others endure the scourges of human trafficking, of religious persecution, and other offenses against human dignity.

For those reasons, the universal declaration remains a valuable touchstone, and the United States remains committed to promoting the values that it espouses.

For this anniversary, however, it is also a sad opportunity to reflect on how far the United Nations and its human rights bodies have fallen from the lofty aspirations of the original declaration.

The United Nations Human Rights Council, formed to replace the discredited United Nations Human Rights Commission, has devolved into an offensive farce even worse than its predecessor.

The Council embraces some of the world's most notorious human rights abusers as its members and has ignored genuine human rights advocacy in favor of a relentless, single-minded attack on the democratic, freedom-loving, multi-party State of Israel. In its session in March, the Council passed more resolutions against Israel than against Burma, North Korea, and Sudan combined, and it failed to comment at all on abuses by Iran, Cuba or Uzbekistan.

The Council recently elected Jean Ziegler, a man who has compared Israel to Nazis, and approved a notorious Israel basher as the new Special Rapporteur on Israel and the Palestinian territories, Mr. Speaker. The Council approved this mandate in the very same session that it discontinued its observation of the Congo where rape is used as a weapon against women and children.

In December 1948, Mr. Speaker, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1 year and 2 weeks after it adopted a resolution creating the Jewish State that became Israel. It is both tragic and offensive that extremists have been allowed to hijack the U.N. human rights apparatus and turn the United Nations' noblest intentions into a weapon against a democratic country.

It is my hope that the United Nations can somehow recover its moral foundation and credibly place the ideals of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights back at the center of its operations.

□ 1345

Human dignity and American values demand no less.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas, chairwoman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Transportation, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished chairperson of the Africa Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs and the full committee chair, Mr. BERMAN, and the ranking member of the full committee, Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and the ranking member of the subcommittee that Mr. PAYNE chairs.

This is an important reiteration of this Congress' commitment to the premises of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And I might read, in part, the language of this declaration that says, ''The recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.''

I believe that there is no better time than the time that we are engaged in today, the era of the world status, to reemphasize the importance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The United Nations General Assembly proclaimed it on December 10, 1948, and the language stated that it was declared as a ''common standard of achievement for all peoples and nations.'' Sadly, in the 21st century, when we would hope to be celebrating the foundation of freedom, justice and peace to the world, the world is conflicted. It is conflicted in Iraq, where the different, distinctive ethnic groups of Shiites, Sunnis and Kurds are engaged in violations, respectively, of each of them by the other. And so even in a place of disruption in Iraq, in a war that I oppose, we have concerns that are ignoring the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We must call for the protection of human rights in Iraq. We must call for the protection of human rights in Iran.

Today, I had the chance to speak to a young woman in Iran long distance, international conversation to Miriam, a young woman of 22, who had a wonderful vision in front of us for freedom, and the ability to be the best interior designer the world would know. To do that, she must have freedom, justice and peace in the world. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights must apply to Iran.

And as we look to the tragedy in Burma, now some weeks old, to understand that the junta continues to oppress those who suffer from the terrible and horrific tragedy that occurred, that people sit along roadsides trying to find, if you will, the resources that will come to them through the international aid organizations, and their oppressive regime is denying them that right.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Can you imagine that the human rights and dignity of those who are already brutalized through a horrific tragedy of catastrophic proportions are now denied their human dignity because this oppressive regime in Burma refuses to allow the international aid organizations to go forward?

I hope by our reemphasizing this declaration, that we will stand in abhorrence, in outrage over such undignified treatment. And then I would ask, as we move forward, that we can no longer tolerate the genocide in Sudan, and the completely reckless response of the Sudanese Government in Khartoum to the dignity and human rights of those in Darfur.

We have a litany of those. Those Tibetans who continue to fight every day in Tibet simply to be acknowledged, simply to allow the Dalai Lama to return over religion reasons. And to think that he has to be denied the right to come back over religion reasons, Mr. Speaker. They allow him to come on political reasons, on government affirmation, on saluting the government, but just to be able to engage in his religious, if you will, explanation, he is denied his human rights, the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world. We could give a roll call along the way of the travesties of justice.

Might I compliment and announce the change-around in Liberia with President Johnson, who recognized a nation that had literally burned the principles of human dignity and human rights; now, with her stellar leadership, she is restoring the dignity to the Liberian people.

It can be done. It can be done in Sudan. It can be done in Bangladesh. It can be done in Burma. It can be done in North Vietnam. It can be done in places where oppression exists. But I rise today to recount the tragedies of denial of human rights, but also to applaud those who have overcome. And I believe it is our responsibility to not only applaud them, but to encourage them.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation, and let us do it by words and deeds.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), the author of this resolution.

MR. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute today to a pre-eminent achievement of 20th century statesmanship, an example of U.S. leadership in the quest for securing fundamental dignity for all human persons.

I would also like to thank Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN and her staff, as well as Chairman BERMAN and Mr. PAYNE, my subcommittee chairman, as well for their work in bringing this important resolution before the House.

Mr. Speaker, it was on December 10, 1948 that the memory of a brutal world war, which took over tens of millions of lives, scarred millions of survivors of an unimaginable holocaust, and unleashed the full fury of atomic power on the guilty as well as the innocent, remained vividly etched in the world's collective consciousness that led to this important moment.

In view of this unprecedented devastation, and in the hope of preventing future conflict, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed a Universal Declaration of Human Rights as ''a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations.'' And it also recognized that ''the inherent dignity and equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.''

As the memory of World War II fades and recedes into history, it becomes ever clearer to me that our rapidly changing world appears to be losing sight of the guiding principles that have accompanied the promotion of human dignity, peace and prosperity since the earliest progression of civilization. I also believe we are living in a day when the myriad of distractions of modern life in the United States leave precious little time for philosophical reflection upon the foundations which have guided this Nation through many turbulent times.

To draw attention to these important principles and the pivotal role of the United States in bringing the Universal Declaration to fruition, I was pleased, along with Mr. DELAHUNT, to introduce this resolution to recognize the 60th anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights. It is my hope that this effort will serve as a vivid reminder of the profound contributions of the United States throughout our short history as a champion of human rights around the world, of the work that is left to be done, and inspire thoughtful reflection on the transcended principles of human dignity.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is extremely important. We have to work to have the United Nations. And we certainly celebrate this 60th anniversary.

I urge support for this resolution. I'd like to thank Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and, of course, Mr. FORTENBERRY for this very timely resolution.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 332, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF SANITATION

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 318) supporting the goals and ideals of the International Year of Sanitation, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 318

Whereas, in 2000, the United States, along with other world leaders, at the 55th United Nations General Assembly, committed to achieving the Millennium Development Goals which provide a framework for countries and international organizations to combat such global social ills as poverty, hunger, and disease;

Whereas one target of the Millennium Development Goals is to halve by 2015 the proportion of people without access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation, the only target to be codified into United States law in the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121);

Whereas the lack of access to safe water and sanitation is one of the most pressing environmental public health issues in the world;

Whereas over 1,000,000,000 people live without potable water and an estimated 2,600,000,000 people do not have access to basic sanitation facilities, which includes 980,000,000 children;

Whereas every 20 seconds a child dies as a direct result of a lack of access to basic sanitation facilities;

Whereas only 36 percent of sub-Saharan Africa and 37 percent of South Asia have access to safe drinking water and sanitation, the lowest rates in the world;

Whereas at any one time almost half of the developing world's people are suffering from diseases associated with lack of water, sanitation, and hygiene;

Whereas improved sanitation decreases the incidences of debilitating and deadly maladies such as cholera, intestinal worms, diarrhea, pneumonia, dysentery, and skin infections;

Whereas sanitation is the foundation of health, dignity, and development;

Whereas increased sanitation is fundamental for reaching all of the Millennium Development Goals;

Whereas access to basic sanitation helps economic and social development in countries where poor sanitation is a major cause of lost work and school days because of illness;

Whereas sanitation in schools enables children, particularly girls reaching puberty, to remain in the educational system;

Whereas according to the World Health Organization, every dollar spent on proper sanitation by governments generates an average of $7 in economic benefit;

Whereas improved disposal of human waste protects the quality of water sources used for drinking, preparation of food, agriculture, and bathing;

Whereas, in 2006, the United Nations, at the 61st Session of the General Assembly, declared 2008 as the International Year of Sanitation to recognize the progress made in achieving the global sanitation target detailed in the Millennium Development Goals, as well as to call upon all Member States, United Nations agencies, regional and international organizations, civil society organizations, and other relevant stakeholders to renew their commitment to attaining that target;

Whereas the official launching of the International Year of Sanitation at the United Nations was on November 21, 2007; and

Whereas the thrust of the International Year of Sanitation has three parts, including—

(1) raising awareness of the importance of sanitation and its impact on reaching other Millennium Development Goals;

(2) encouraging governments and their partners to promote and implement policies and actions for meeting the sanitation target; and

(3) mobilizing communities, particularly women's groups, towards changing sanitation and hygiene practices through sanitation health education campaigns: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the International Year of Sanitation;

(2) recognizes the importance of sanitation on public health, poverty reduction, economic and social development, and the environment; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe the International Year of Sanitation with appropriate recognition, ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate the importance of sanitation and hygiene in achieving the Millennium Development Goals, and to support developing countries in their efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goal target on basic sanitation among populations at greatest need.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

First of all, I'd like to thank my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee, Ranking Member CHRIS SMITH and Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE as well as Representative CHRIS SHAYS for being lead sponsors on H.Con.Res 318, which supports the United Nations Declaration of 2008 as the International Year of Sanitation. Their bipartisan support has helped to bring this resolution to the floor for a vote. I also would like to thank Senator RICHARD DURBIN, who introduced the Senate companion to this concurrent resolution.

In September 2000, the United Nations adopted the eight Millennium Development Goals to challenge the global community to reduce poverty and increase the health and well-being of all peoples. Two years later, in September of 2002, at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, the United States and the rest of the international community reaffirmed these goals and added access to basic sanitation as a centerpiece of the poverty eradication commitments. The target to halve the proportion of people without access to the basic sanitation by 2015 was defined in the Johannesburg Plan of Action.

In September of 2005, President Bush addressed the United Nations General Assembly, at which time, as I was the U.S. delegate from the House to the United Nations, I was very pleased that President Bush recommitted the United States to achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

Last year, the United Nations declared 2008 as the International Year of Sanitation in order to recognize the great strides that have been made towards increasing access to sanitation for people around the world. However, it is also a time to galvanize member nations, U.N. agencies, regional and international organizations, and other relevant stakeholders to renew their commitment.

Access to basic sanitation is something so simple, yet so fundamental to everyday life. Well, simple, at least, for the majority of people who live in the developed world. An estimated 2.6 billion people live in an environment where they do not have access to proper toilet facilities and human waste cannot be properly disposed. And approximately 1.1 billion people have no access to any type of improved drinking sources of water. As a direct consequence, over 1.6 million people die every year from easily preventable diseases attributable to lack of access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation. Ninety percent of those are children under five, mostly in developing countries.

This lack of access to basic sanitation affects everything from how food is grown and prepared to the ability of girls and young women to attend school. Sanitation is an obvious issue of health, but also one of dignity, physical safety and development.

Halving the proportion of people without access to basic sanitation is a target of the seventh Millennium Development Goal, which is to ensure environmental sustainability. In fact, it is vital to the success of other Millennium Development Goal targets in order for them to reach their goal.

Access to proper sanitation is essential to reducing childhood and maternal mortality. It can help reduce the symptoms associated with HIV and AIDS. It can also improve the living conditions of 100 million-plus people living in slums.

□ 1400

The dividends that increased access to basic sanitation pay are multifold. Depending on the region of the world, economic benefits have been estimated to range from $3 to $34 for each dollar invested in access to basic sanitation and safe water. According to the United Nations, meeting this MDG target will yield nearly $200 billion in annual benefits. If we meet this goal, people and governments will save more than $500 million in direct health treatment costs and get back more than 3 billion working days that are now lost to sanitation-related illnesses. Reducing the incidences to sanitation-related diseases will add nearly 200 million days of school attendance.

As we in Congress work to increase access to lifesaving medication and strengthening health care infrastructures, we must remember that the success of such initiatives is, in part, dependent upon individuals having access to basic sanitation. Let us use this time to also refocus our efforts on strengthening one of the basic pillars upon which global health must stand, proper sanitation.

I strongly support this resolution and ask that my colleagues back H. Con. Res. 318, which supports the ideals and goals of the International Year of Sanitation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 318, authored by my good friend from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Lack of access to clean drinking water and sanitation are indeed some of the most pressing environmental public health issues in the world. Today, an estimated 2.6 billion people, including almost 1 billion children, live without access to basic sanitation facilities. Every 20 seconds, a child dies as a direct result.

In fact, it is estimated that nearly half the developing world suffers from preventable diseases associated with the lack of access to clean water, sanitation and hygiene. Without sufficient access to these services, countries, communities and families become susceptible to and are often defenseless against life-threatening diseases and infections which perpetuate this horrible cycle of poverty.

As this resolution notes, sanitation improves health. It saves lives. It protects the environment. It improves economies. And it contributes to human dignity and social development. It is imperative that the United States and the international community work together to achieve the goals of the Millennium Development Account and significantly reduce the number of people suffering from a lack of sanitation and clean water.

Another pressing issue is one that underscores the potentially grave future that we may face if we don't immediately address rising energy costs and find alternative sources of energy to carry out our daily tasks, some critical tasks such as the energy required to filter our water supply. This resolution also reminds us, however, that necessity is the mother of invention, and that human beings have the potential to achieve any task necessary to improve living conditions.

How does it remind us of this? In Africa, for example, where there are areas that lack consistent and dependable sources of oil to produce electricity, they must develop and rely on alternative methods, sometimes primitive ones, such as fire for boiling water to avoid disease. Again, in the most remote region of the world, we are thinking of alternative sources and alternative methods. We here must also think and seek alternative clean energy. Will we wait until circumstances are so dire that American will be forced to boil their water in their backyards to conserve the little energy available because we failed to develop alternative sources today?

Just as we seek to foster ingenuity in the developing world to provide greater access to clean drinking water and basic sanitation in resource-poor settings, we must foster such ingenuity in our own energy sector.

I thank Chairman PAYNE for introducing this timely resolution which highlights the important issues of clean water, sanitation and hygiene. And I urge my colleagues to fully support House Concurrent Resolution 318.

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

Mr. PAYNE. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas, Representative SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman and the ranking member of the subcommittee and the chairman and the ranking member of the full committee. I would like to thank Chairman PAYNE in particular for introducing this important resolution. And I am very proud to cosponsor it because it is clearly a life-and-death matter. When you talk about sanitation and the removal of waste and the removal of sewage, you are talking about the lives of children. And as the cochair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, let me acknowledge that the most vulnerable to unsanitary conditions are children. In the disease that spreads, they are, in fact, the victims.

Global sanitation coverage has increased from 49 to 59 percent between 1990 and 2004. And that is, in essence, allowing over 1 billion people throughout the world to gain improved sanitation in the past 14 years. Pregnant women, nursing mothers and, of course, young children are, in fact, the bigger victims.

I am particularly troubled that 90 percent of these deaths that I have mentioned of those who died because of lack of access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation are children under 5, mostly in developing countries. As I mentioned, children are particularly hard hit by poor sanitation, paying a high price through missed schooling, disease, malnutrition and even death. An estimated 1.5 million children die each year due to poor sanitation, hygiene and unsafe water. UNICEF reports that girls are particularly vulnerable, missing out on schooling once they hit puberty, due to the lack of clean and safe latrines.

As the world's only remaining superpower, I think it is important to avert this humanitarian crisis. Chairman PAYNE, I believe that this is an important, constructive way of avoiding this massive death. Simply put, the Millennium Development Goal on basic sanitation would avert 470,000 deaths. And it would continue to do so. According to economic analysis, depending on the region of the world, economic benefits have been estimated to range from $3 to $34 for each dollar invested in it.

Let me just indicate that this is common sense. It is, again, human dignity. And as I close, let me also add my support for H. Con. Res. 337 honoring the Seeds of Peace. It is a program that I am very much aware of, having participated with the young people who have come from Israel and Palestine who have sat down together as teenagers and said we want peace. It was founded by John Wallach. Seeds of Peace initially brought 46 Israeli and Arab youths together. It has spread now to Greece, Turkey, Cyprus, the Balkans, India, Pakistan and Afghanistan. These summer camps are enormously important. Again, the Congressional Children's Caucus believes that children are not only our tomorrows, they are our yesterdays and todays.

And I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his leadership in these areas. And with that I ask my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 318 and as well the following bill H. Con. Res. 337. And again, I thank Mr. PAYNE for his leadership.

I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 318, "supporting the goals and ideals of the International Year of Sanitation." I would like to thank my colleague Congressman PAYNE for introducing this important resolution, which I am proud to cosponsor, as well as the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman BERMAN, for his leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, In 2007, the United Nations declared 2008 to be the International Year of Sanitation, to raise awareness of the importance of sanitation and its impact on reaching other Millennium Development Goals and to recognize progress made in achieving the global sanitation target detailed in the Millennium Development Goals. In addition, the International Year of Sanitation is intended to call upon all Member States, United Nations agencies, regional and international organizations, civil society organizations, and other relevant stakeholders to renew their commitment to attaining the target.

As my colleagues are aware, in September 2000, the United Nations adopted the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) that challenged the global community to reduce poverty and increase the health and well-being of all peoples. Two years later, in September 2002, at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, the United States and the rest of the international community reaffirmed these goals and added access to basic sanitation as a centerpiece of the poverty eradication commitments. The target to halve the proportion of people without access to basic sanitation by 2015 was defined in the Johannesburg Plan of Action.

We have begun to make important progress. Over one billion people, throughout the world, have gained access to improved sanitation in the past 14 years. Global sanitation coverage has increased from 49 percent to 59 percent between 1990 and 2004. These gains represent substantial improvements in the quality of life and basic health for countless people.

Mr. Speaker, despite the establishment of these goals, billions of people still lack access to safe drinking water and sanitation, and we are not on target to meet the Millennium Development Goal to reduce by half the proportion of people without access to basic sanitation by 2015. Today, over 2.4 billion people—half the developing world—lack access to basic sanitation and 1.1 billion people have no access to any type of improved drinking source of water. As a direct consequence, over 1.6 million people die every year from easily preventable diseases attributable to lack

of access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation.

As Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I am particularly troubled that 90 percent of these deaths are children under 5, mostly in developing countries. Children are particularly hard hit by poor sanitation, paying a high price through missed schooling, disease, malnutrition, and even death. An estimated 1.5 million children under five die each year due to poor sanitation, hygiene, and unsafe water.

In addition to claiming too many young lives, poor sanitation reduces children's ability to grow and develop, stunting the economic and social development of the entire nation. UNICEF reports that girls are particularly vulnerable, missing out on schooling once they hit puberty due to the lack of clean and safe latrines.

As the world's only remaining superpower, the United States has a moral obligation to take the lead in averting humanitarian catastrophe. Increased access to sanitation would have an enormous impact on the lives of people throughout the world. Simply put, meeting the Millennium Development Goal on basic sanitation would avert 470,000 deaths. In addition, achieving the target would bring enormous economic gains. Meeting the Millennium Development Goal would result in an extra 320 million productive working days every year, and would bring considerable benefits to investment. According to economic analysis, depending on the region of the world, economic benefits have been estimated to range from $3 to $34 for each dollar invested in access to basic sanitation and safe water.

Mr. Speaker, even as our attention is consumed by rising food and fuel prices, it is vital that we do not lose focus of the equally vital goal of basic sanitation. The resolution that we are considering today recognizes the importance of sanitation on public health, poverty reduction, economic and social development, and the environment and encourages all Americans to observe the International Year of Sanitation with appropriate recognition, ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate the importance of sanitation, hygiene, and access to safe drinking water in achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits of meeting the Millennium Development Goal on basic sanitation would be dramatic and global. We have the opportunity to drastically improve the international community's ability to reduce global poverty, and to improve the health of people worldwide. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health. I hope that he addresses not just this resolution, but the one before us on human rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend, the ranking member, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and didn't get here in time to speak on the resolution lauding the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is among the most durable, enduring, inspiring and historic set of fundamental principles ever enunciated by anyone ever in history. It ranks right up there with the Magna Carta. It ranks right up there with the U.S. Bill of Rights, which obviously enumerated a number of our fundamental freedoms that we love and enjoy as Americans.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 60 years after its adoption, continues to serve as a backdrop to judge government policies and behaviors toward its citizens. And that is especially important as to how a government treats the weak, its most vulnerable and those who might otherwise be disenfranchised.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is a promissory note. It's a paper promise that must be backed by deeds. It has only, however, been realized in part over the last 60 years. It is a work in progress. The Declaration inspires people to realize that they, as human beings, endowed by God, by our Creator, with certain inalienable rights, ought to fight for those rights. And this gives them a very useful tool in that endeavor, a means to that end.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights has emphasized a number of important and hallowed rights, including religious freedom, the right to life, freedom from torture, equal protection, due process, labor nights and freedom of assembly. Under it, no one should ever be left behind. And that means that regardless of race, ethnicity, age, disability, or condition of dependency, no one should be left behind.

We know in many countries of the world, sadly that is not the case. In places like the People's Republic of China, human rights are systematically and pervasively violated by Beijing, whether it be religious freedom or the outrages we recently saw in Tibet, where the government crackdown crushed dissent with an iron fist. China persecutes the Uighurs in the autonomous region and families, especally women as part of their draconian one-child-per-couple policy which has made brothers and sisters illegal throughout China. That's right. Brothers and sisters are illegal in the People's Republic of China. A couple is required to get government permission to have a child. And forced abortion and huge fines are imposed on women and men who do not submit to the plan. In Burma and North Korea, human rights are also violated with grave impunity. And the U.N. Human Rights Council and other bodies of the U.N. need to do more to implement the intent of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Sadly, they have largely failed.

We have seen a very disturbing rise in anti-Semitism throughout Europe, certainly in the Middle East, and even in the United States and Canada. That too has to be combated. We see a rise in modern-day slavery, human trafficking—sex trafficking or labor trafficking. That needs to be combated and eradicated and victims assisted. Everyone should be free of that kind of terrible and despicable mistreatment. The Sudan, Zimbabwe, the genocide occurring in the Darfur region of Sudan is also a grave violation of human rights, completely antithetical to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Like the last, this is a century of victims.

And let me say before the West gets too smug about how well we are doing, we, too, have our problems. We see them every day. We have fallen short of the standard. I respectfully submit to my colleagues that we have failed to treat the defenseless unborn child with compassion and justice. We know now more than we have ever known before about the magnificent world of an unborn child. Ultrasound, 4–D ultrasound, the ability to do intrauterine blood transfusions and microsurgery have shattered the myth that an unborn child is somehow not human or alive. Of course they are. We know that these babies are society's littlest patients, in need of care and love, increasingly surviving at earlier, earlier times if born prematurely.

Abortion needs to be looked at, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, as a serious violation of human rights. Abortion is violence against children. The dismemberment or chemical poisoning of a baby is antithetical to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. All abuse is contrary to the Declaration and that holds true no matter how old you are, and that includes unborn children. We also know abortion hurts women psychologically and physically. And that evidence grows by the day.

So I would hope that we would look at human rights as being for everyone, at all times, regardless of age, condition of dependency, regardless of race, no matter where you live. The universal declaration is for you. We need to speak out more boldly with better, more focused appeals employing all the tools at our disposal, linking sanctions and withholding of certain aid if a country doesn't live up to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Again, the Declaration is a backdrop. And I hope that we do even better than we have in the past. The past has been checkered. Certainly we have moved the ball down the court. Much more needs to be done however to respect everyone's fundamental human rights.

I thank my colleagues.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, the member of the Budget Committee and one of the leading environmentalists in the House, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

□ 1415

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, as I appreciate his leadership on this, and look forward to watching this legislation pass today.

It was my pleasure to be in Johannesburg in 2002 when sanitation was added to the Millennium Challenge Development Goal to create a comprehensive framework for the needs of the world's poorest. But I am saddened

that we are here today, still repeating those horrible statistics about over 1 billion who lack access to safe drinking water, more than 2 billion who lack access to sanitation.

I would only take exception to my good friend from Florida's comments a moment ago, because I have been told that a child dies needlessly every 15 seconds. But whether it is 20 seconds or 15 seconds, it is absolutely scandalous that in this day and age, when we know what to do, when for less than the price of a take-out pizza per year per family, the United States alone could be transformational on that. One reflects on what difference it would make, not just those children that wouldn't die needlessly. It would translate into over one-quarter billion additional days in school. It would save over $7 billion in unnecessary medical costs. It would allow one-third of a trillion working days for young people from age 15 to 39 worldwide. And, make no mistake about it, it makes a difference for those of us in the United States.

First of all, pollution any place in the world finds its way into the water supply and makes a difference for us. Make no mistake, that at a time when virtually no one in the world is more than 24 hours away from anybody else watching disease break forth unnecessarily, it is not just a tragedy in some remote village or some southern hemisphere megacity. It can make a difference for the health of Americans here and abroad. And when the CIA has identified urban instability and decay as one of the seven greatest causes of threats to our security, this compounds our problem with global unrest and terrorism.

I am pleased that we have been able to work together with Mr. PAYNE. In my prior tenure on the Foreign Affairs Committee, we passed the Water for the Poor Act in 2005 and acknowledged the late Mr. Lantos and former colleagues Leach, Hyde and Senator Frist. But we are not even fully implementing that legislation 3 years later. I commend the gentleman for his oversight hearing to help the Department of State to understand what is going to be necessary to fully implement this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we are halfway through the International Year of Sanitation. It is time for us to reflect on what we are going to do about this problem. This isn't some remote goal that is beyond our capacity. Girl Scout troops, churches, synagogues and Rotary Clubs know what to do and in fact they are acting at a grassroots level to do something about it. We in Congress need to do our job supporting Mr. PAYNE with the accountability of the State Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. One of the most important things we can do is to work to transfer unnecessary military assistance. The United States is lavishing huge sums of money for military aid on countries like Egypt and Pakistan, where it is dubious in terms of the outcome of security for us or anybody else, but they have populations that are desperately in need of clean water and sanitation. We need to reorder our priorities to be able to achieve this goal.

Back in 2002 when we added sanitation, 2015 seemed like a long way away. Well, we are halfway there, in terms of time, but we are not halfway there in terms of accomplishment. I hope that this resolution will be a little nudge to us all to make sure that we do our part. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and his leadership.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I urge support of this resolution. As the previous speaker indicated, we passed legislation called Water For the Poor, and in our oversight hearing I was looking for places like Burkina Faso in Niger that had no water, but found that the money was allocated to Iraq and Afghanistan. ''Water for the Poor'' was what it was called, not ''Water for the War.''

So we need to be sure that when we pass legislation, that it goes to the intended recipients and not for other purposes. If other purposes must be done, put them in another budget. There is plenty of money in other budgets and no one ever opposes them. So put it over there, and leave our Water for the Poor for the countries that are actually and really poor.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 318, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

HONORING SEEDS OF PEACE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 337) honoring Seeds of Peace for its 15th anniversary as an organization promoting understanding, reconciliation, acceptance, coexistence, and peace in the Middle East, South Asia, and other regions of conflict.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 337

Whereas Seeds of Peace, founded by the late John Wallach, is a program that brings together young people and educators from regions of conflict to study and learn about coexistence and conflict resolution;

Whereas these young people study and learn primarily at an international conflict resolution summer camp operated by Seeds of Peace in Otisfield, Maine, and also through its regional programs such as the facilitation training course in the Middle East, the homestay programs in South Asia, and international regional conferences;

Whereas the first international conflict resolution camp welcomed Israeli, Palestinian, Jordanian, and Egyptian youths in the summer of 1993, and has since expanded to involve youths from other regions of conflict, including from Greece, Turkey and divided Cyprus, the Balkans, India, Pakistan, and Afghanistan;

Whereas Seeds of Peace utilizes the summer camp to initiate dialogue between the youths of the United States and the youths from various conflict regions to dispel hatred and create religious and cultural understanding;

Whereas Seeds of Peace regional programs have trained hundreds of educators to teach peaceful conflict resolutions techniques in their classrooms, positively influencing thousands of students;

Whereas Seeds of Peace works to dispel fear, mistrust, and prejudice, which among others are root causes of violence and conflict, and to build a new generation of leaders who are committed to achieving peace;

Whereas Seeds of Peace reveals the human face of those whom youth may have been taught to hate, by engaging campers in both guided coexistence sessions and ordinary summer camp activities such as living together in cabins, sharing meals, canoeing, swimming, playing sports, and creative exploration through the arts and computers;

Whereas long-term peace between Arabs and Israelis, Indians and Pakistanis, and Afghans and Pakistanis can only be achieved with the emergence of a new generation of leaders who will choose dialogue, friendship, and openness over violence and hatred;

Whereas Seeds of Peace provides year-round opportunities via regional programming and innovative technology to enable former participants to build on the relationships forged at camp, so that the learning processes begun at camp may continue subsequently in the participants' home countries;

Whereas youth graduates of the camp, known as Seeds, currently number over 4,000, with an additional 567 adult delegation leaders also having completed Seeds of Peace training;

Whereas this graduate network receives continued support from Seeds of Peace in promoting professional cooperation;

Whereas Seeds of Peace is strongly supported by participating governments and many world leaders; and

Whereas continued partial Federal funding for Seeds of Peace demonstrates its recognized importance in promoting peaceful resolution of conflicts as a primary goal of United States policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) reaffirms that youth should be involved in long-term, visionary solutions to violent conflicts;

(2) honors the accomplishments of Seeds of Peace in its 15 years of promoting understanding, reconciliation, acceptance, coexistence, and peace among youth from the Middle East and other regions of conflict around the world; and

(3) views Seeds of Peace as a highly creative and successful effort to achieve reconciliation among peoples from areas of conflict, which inspires great hope that nations in conflict ultimately can learn to live together in peace, cooperation, and security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 337, a resolution honoring Seeds of Peace for its 15th anniversary as an organization promoting tolerance and peaceful coexistence in the Middle East and around the world.

While the peace process has had its ups and downs over the last 15 years, Seeds of Peace has blossomed into a widely recognized organization that has facilitated interaction among thousands of young people and young leaders and educators from all around the world.

Seeds of Peace lays a foundation for sustainable peace by promoting dialogue among young leaders before their fears, mistrust and inherited prejudices have permanently shaped their vision of their enemy. We get them in time to prevent that from happening.

After a summer program in Maine, which also includes many American participants, these young seeds, as they are known, and their teachers, continue with regional and international programming that furthers the dialogue among and across nationalities and supports the development of future leaders. Seeds of Peace also fulfills an important recommendation of the 9/11 Commission, reaching out to young people, particularly in Arab and other Muslim countries, and offering them hope and a positive vision of the future.

A decade and a half ago, Seeds of Peace, founded by the late John Wallach, envisioned a handful of Israeli, Palestinian, Egyptian and Jordanian teenagers coming together in the woods of Maine and breaking down barriers of mistrust. Since its inaugural camp session 15 years ago, the mission of Seeds of Peace has grown to include not just those from the Middle East, but young people from throughout South Asia and Afghanistan. Governments negotiate agreements, but Seeds of Peace has remained as the only people that can define a quality of peace.

Every new seed, you may recall that is what they are called when they complete the course, whether he or she is in Kabul or Tel Aviv, Ramallah or Islamabad, represents one more person who has the potential and the required skills to see through mistrust and prejudice and thereby to contribute to making and building peace. That is why we seek to honor the terrific organization Seeds of Peace. That is why I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 337, which honors Seeds of Peace on its 15th anniversary. We in Congress and all people of goodwill worldwide want to see peace, stability and security prevail in the Middle East, and indeed in all regions of conflict. However, that goal remains illusive when leaders act in ways that distort, perpetuate and aggravate otherwise resolvable disputes between nations and peoples.

Such leaders make peace impossible by programming their citizens into viewing other nations and other people as wicked, inhumane and worthy of hatred and death. The most obvious example of this phenomenon is the unceasing dissemination by Arab countries of anti-Israel and anti-Semitic propaganda. Children in the Arab world and Iran are taught using textbooks and official media to hate Israel, to hate the Jews and to forfeit their own lives in order to kill as many Israelis and Jews as possible.

Fortunately, Seeds of Peace has spent 15 years bringing together youth from the Middle East and other conflict-torn regions and encouraging them to engage their peers as fellow human beings worthy of respect and tolerance. Programs like Seeds of Peace cultivate the young leaders who can oppose violent extremism and hateful propaganda, who can promote a culture of life and seek peaceful, rational and mutually beneficial solutions to seemingly intractable conflicts.

Mr. Speaker, given that Seeds of Peace is devoted to promoting peaceful resolution of the world's most dangerous conflicts, it is important to note that the allocation of vital and scarce resources contributes to conflicts around the globe. In the Middle East, oil and natural gas resources enable many authoritarian governments to resist reform and to finance destabilizing actions, including weapons programs and sponsorship of Islamic jihadists. Therefore, it is especially important for our national security and for the cause of peace worldwide for the United States to stop our dependence on foreign sources of energy.

I thank my good friend and colleague from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for introducing this Seeds of Peace anniversary resolution. I urge the House to adopt it.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), chairperson of the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

□ 1430

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me thank the Chair and the subcommittee chairs of these committees.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Representative ALLEN in bringing forth this House Concurrent Resolution 337 honoring the Seeds of Peace for its 15th anniversary as an organization.

The importance of peace in the world today is often overlooked due to the severity of constant conflict. As a mother and a lawmaker, the reality of war concerns me for the future of our Nation and the world.

Seeds of Peace is dedicated to empowering young leaders from regions of conflict with the leadership skills required to advance reconciliation and coexistence. I am proud to say that I worked with them here in Washington and in Dallas, and I have partnered with Congressman BARNEY FRANK at times to host them.

Due to its proven impact and success in the Middle East, Seeds of Peace has earned international recognition as an effective model for resolving conflict worldwide, and these are young people who have not been kept away from communication or a part of irritation of Israel.

I firmly support Seeds of Peace because I believe peace ultimately depends upon breaking down barriers and mistrust among people from these regions of conflict. Governments negotiate agreements, but only people can define the quality of peace. Innovative people-to-people programs like Seeds of Peace successfully accomplish this goal on a rather modest budget.

I am proud to support the passage of this resolution and urge my colleagues to support it. I thank Mr. PAYNE for allowing me to make these statements.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 337, "Honoring the Seeds of Peace for its 15th Anniversary as an Organization." I would like to thank my colleague Congressman

ALLEN for introducing this important resolution, which I am proud to cosponsor, as well as the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman BERMAN, for his leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, fifteen years ago, in 1993, Seeds of Peace hosted its first international conflict resolution camp. In that first year, amidst regional conflict and fighting a history of hatred, the organization brought together Israeli, Palestinian, Jordanian, and Egyptian youth. Founded by journalist John Wallach, Seeds of Peace initially brought together 46 Israeli and Arab youth. Since that time, Seeds of Peace has offered summer camps for youths from conflict regions around the world and from the United States, involving young people from the initial countries as well as from Greece, Turkey, Cyprus, the Balkans, India, Pakistan, and Afghanistan. These summer camps have made enormous strides toward fostering cultural and religious understanding.

Seeds of Peace empowers a new generation of leaders with the tools they need to overcome prejudice and to communicate and negotiate effectively. The summer camps help these youth to develop empathy, respect, and confidence, while giving their ''enemies'' a human face. The young people who attend these summer camps are the same people who will grow up to build a future of peace and stability. There are now nearly 4,000 young Seeds of Peace leaders who are working to make a positive difference in some of our world's most troubled regions.

As Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I strongly believe in investing in our children. By doing so, we are investing in our future. Long-term peace between warring parties, including Arabs and Israelis, Indians and Pakistanis, and Afghans and Pakistanis, is dependent on the emergence of a new generation of leaders able and willing to engage in constructive dialogue.

By bringing young people from different backgrounds together in a recreational environment, Seeds of Peace lays a foundation for sustainable peace by facilitating interaction among young leaders before their fears, mistrust, and inherited prejudices have permanently shaped their vision of their ''enemy.'' After spending a summer at camp in Maine, participants and teachers continue to interact through regional and international programming, furthering the dialogue among and across nationalities. Seeds of Peace supports the development of future leaders.

In addition to these summer camps for children from conflict regions, Seeds of Peace now operates a domestic program called ''Maine Seeds,'' addressing ethnic and racial tensions between diverse communities in Maine. Also, in 2004, Seeds of Peace launched its ''Beyond Borders'' initiative, bringing teens from additional Middle East countries, such as Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait, to participate in a cultural exchange program between American and Arab youth.

Mr. Speaker, while the Arab/Israeli peace process has moved forward haltingly since 1993, Seeds of Peace has grown into a major organization that continues to foster interaction among thousands of young leaders and educators from around the world. It continues to build upon the basic premise the prejudices dispelled during youth will be prejudices dispelled for life.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution, honoring Seeds of Peace for its fifteen years of promoting reconciliation, coexistence, and peace among youth of the Middle East and other conflict areas.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 337.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE SACRIFICES AND CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Con. Res. 336) honoring the sacrifices and contributions made by disabled American veterans.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 336

Whereas the people of the United States have a sincere appreciation and respect for members of the Armed Forces who suffered disabling wounds while serving in the United States military;

Whereas there are approximately 2,800,000 veterans receiving benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for disabilities incurred while defending our Nation;

Whereas the current wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have resulted in 30,000 disabled American veterans as a direct result of combat operations, and even more so from conditions simulating war, instrumentalities of war, and hazardous duty in combat-related training;

Whereas families throughout every State in America have been affected by loved ones returning disabled from their service to their Nation;

Whereas the American public supports the brave men and women who have defended the freedom of all in America;

Whereas America owes its very integrity to her sons and daughters in uniform, who risk the most for the least, and who epitomize the extraordinary meaning of service, sacrifice, and, most importantly, freedom; and

Whereas Americans should remember and honor our men and women in uniform who incurred disabilities while defending our Nation with a Disabled American Veterans Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes the great sacrifices made by disabled veterans and their families;

(2) calls on the people of the United States to honor all disabled American veterans and the freedom for which they sacrificed;

(3) encourages local, State, and national organizations and governmental institutions to participate in the effort to honor the sacrifices of America's disabled veterans; and

(4) supports the goals and ideals of Disabled American Veterans Week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With House Concurrent Resolution 336, we honor the sacrifices and contributions made of our disabled veterans. The current wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have added well over 30,000 of our sons and daughters to the roles of veterans disabled in defense of our Nation, with the number continuing to grow.

Collectively, there are approximately 2.8 million veterans receiving compensation for disability incurred in the line of duty. This resolution calls for the establishment of a single week dedicated annually to each and every one of our Nation's disabled veterans.

What better time would there be for groups large and small, national and local, private and public, to come together and remember in their own way the sacrifices of the Nation's heroes? Those great Americans gave the most for the least. They have earned our lasting remembrance and much more.

It is far too easy for many to forget the true costs of war, to forget the deaths of our servicemen and to ignore the wounds of those who return. It is too easy for too many of us to think that the cost of war ends when the last soldier returns.

Our disabled veterans continue to serve our country in so many ways, bearing their wounds as a reminder to all that freedom and liberty are not free. The men and women who return wounded and disabled from combat, and service to our Nation, remind us of the terrible price we pay, not only in costs measured in dollars, but the costs measured in lives lost and changed.

It is therefore right and proper that we remember the service and sacrifice of our disabled veterans and pay tribute and honor to them during this week of Disabled American Veterans Week.

When called, they answered. When needed, they served. All Americans owe them a debt of gratitude and a heartfelt remembrance for their sacrifice and service. I am reminded of the words of the first President of the United States, George Washington, whose words are worth repeating at this time. ''The willingness with which our people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportioned as to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their country.''

It is part of my service and duties to visit the veterans' hospitals and clinics

in the areas I travel to. I recently visited the medical center in Puerto Rico, dedicated a new clinic in Orange City, Florida, and, before that, the Medical Center in New Orleans.

We have been funding the VA and veterans health care at record levels, giving the VA the largest increase in funding in the history of the United States. It is our duty to oversee the VA to make sure that they are spending the money properly in the best interests of our brave men and women who defend the rights and freedom of our great Nation.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 336, a measure to honor the sacrifices and contributions made by America's disabled veterans. Throughout our Nation's history, the men and women of our Armed Forces have gone bravely into battle, risking their lives and livelihoods, sacrificing their safety to defend our freedom.

When their duty is done, many return home to life as it was.

Sadly, for veterans seriously injured in the line of duty, leaving the battlefield does not mark the end of conflict. These permanently disabled soldiers often carry home life-changing disabilities, harsh reminders of the price of freedom.

By supporting H. Con. Res. 336, we will recognize the great sacrifices made by disabled veterans and their families. We will call upon the people of the United States to honor disabled American veterans and the freedoms for which they sacrificed. We will encourage local, State and national organizations and governmental institutions to participate in the effort to honor the sacrifices of America's disabled veterans, and we will support the goals and ideals of Disabled American Veterans Week.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution establishing Disabled American Veterans Week.

I introduced this resolution to express my gratitude and to allow the entire Nation to express our gratitude to those brave men and women who have given so much in the name of freedom.

I would especially like to thank Congressmen BILIRAKIS, BOOZMAN, LYNCH and the over 100 other original cosponsors who joined me in support of this resolution.

Over 2.8 million men and women who fought for our country have sustained injuries that have forever changed their lives. It is my hope that by establishing Disabled American Veterans Week we will increase awareness of the struggles that America's heroes face every day and encourage more support for our brave wounded warriors.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the great sacrifices made by disabled American veterans and their families. These heroes epitomize the meaning of service and sacrifice, and this is the very least we can do to honor our Nation's disabled veterans.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of H. Con. Res. 336, a commonsense resolution that expresses support for one of the greatest segments of the American population, the disabled American veteran.

Back home in Florida, I represent nearly 110,000 veterans, the second highest number of any Member of Congress. As you might guess, many of these brave men and women are disabled, either injured in battle or in the course of their service in the United States military.

Disabled veterans are cared for by military professionals at the VA. They also band together in veterans organizations like the Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, or Blinded Veterans Association.

However, there was no Federal recognition in place for Americans specifically to remember the deeds and heroism of disabled veterans.

The concurrent resolution before us today calls for the establishment of a Disabled American Veterans Week and shows all disabled veterans that Congress does not forget their bravery and actions in service to our great Nation.

You know, every weekend I returned home to Florida to meet with my constituents and hear their needs and concerns and what I can do to serve the men and women who live in the Fifth Congressional District.

I often hear words of thanks for voting in support of drilling in ANWR and in the Outer Continental Shelf, or get asked what Congress is going to do to stop the outrageous increase in the cost of gasoline that we have seen since our colleagues across the aisle took over the House and Senate.

However, the most poignant and heart-wrenching stories I hear are oftentimes from veterans. As you might expect, I attend dozens of veterans events throughout the eight counties in my district. It is, indeed, at these events that I hear stories of courageous deeds, heroic actions and lives forever changed by the ravages of war.

Disabled veterans have given so much to this Nation with their blood, sweat and tears, lying on the battlefields from Germany, to Korea, to Vietnam, to Iraq and Afghanistan.

This resolution calling for a Disabled American Veterans Week shows the thousands of men and women who served with honor and distinction that Congress will see that their memories and deeds are never forgotten.

I thank my colleague, Mr. ALTMIRE, for introducing this resolution. I would hope that all Members of this body can support such a worthy passage for disabled veterans.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Firstly, I would like to thank Representative BROWN for graciously yielding me time for speaking on this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 336 a resolution which honors the sacrifice and contributions made by America's disabled veterans. The brave men and women currently serving in our Armed Forces, and the veterans who have put on the uniform before them, deserve our utmost appreciation for their continued commitment to the protection of this Nation.

Regrettably, millions of these veterans have been wounded and disabled while defending the rights and freedoms that uniquely define our country. According to the latest statistics provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, there are approximately 2.9 million disabled veterans now receiving services from the VA. Of the 2.9 million disabled veterans, a total of 30,000 have served in either Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan.

The great sacrifice that these men and women have made on behalf of the American people cannot go unnoticed. American veterans have earned our undying gratitude and our continued support. During last year's appropriation process, we began to head in the right direction, in my opinion, when Congress allocated $87.59 billion to the Department of Veterans Affairs, an $8 billion increase from the previous year.

□ 1445

Of this total, $37.2 billion was provided the Veterans Health Administration, with $3.6 billion allocated to post-traumatic stress disorder funding, and $189.25 million for traumatic brain injury funding, and $500 million for medical and prosthetic research. Our commitment to America's disabled veterans is exemplified by honoring these men and women in the present and continuing to invest in their future.

I thank Mr. ALTMIRE for introducing this thoughtful resolution and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 336.

Mr. SCALISE. I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a Nation we are blessed with many things. We have a Constitution that sets the standard for freedom around the world.

We have a land that provides us with bountiful food and superb scenery. But most importantly, America is blessed to have sons and daughters willing to put themselves in harm's way to protect the 99 percent of Americans who do not serve.

Unfortunately, that feeling of patriotism and sacrifice way too often results in disability that affects the veteran for the rest of their life. Often, the disability is small. But sometimes the injury, whether physical or mental, has a significant impact on the veteran's quality of life and their ability to support their families. In such situations, the disability has affected more than just the veteran. As a part of our debt to these men and women, taxpayers compensate them for their injuries and provide a range of benefits unmatched in any other country. But we can and should do something more symbolic of disabled veterans' service to the Nation, and that is to designate a week that will remind Americans that disabled veterans are with them every day.

By giving disabled American veterans the recognition of a week named in their honor, we demonstrate to the American people the importance of the sacrifices made by disabled veterans and their families. This is a way to honor our disabled veterans, and I certainly urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. BUYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the ranking member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have an obligation to help ensure that veterans and their families have access to the benefits and services they so richly deserve. More importantly, I have been an advocate for military members and veterans almost my entire life. I have been in uniform for 28 years while I served the last 16 years in Congress. It is a great part of who I am.

We have before us this House resolution to create a disabled veterans week. Now we should pause for a moment and say why is Congress bringing this bill to the floor at this time? You see, I view this bill on the floor at this time as an inoculation. It is an inoculation because the Democrats who control this Congress want to bring a bill to the floor where it will cut a monthly pension to wartime elderly disabled and indigent veterans in the amount of a billion dollars. So before the Democrats take a billion dollars away from disabled veterans, they want to stand and say I put my arms around disabled veterans, and we are going to create a week for America to celebrate them.

I am going to blow the whistle on you. I believe that it is a matter of principle that the Nation should not be taking money from one group of deserving veterans to fund benefits for others. However, you should also know that last month the Senate approved a bill that would cut $912 million in pension benefits for wartime elderly indigent severely disabled or housebound American veterans. A portion of the funding saved by this unprecedented cut in veterans' benefits would be used to fund oversized pensions for noncitizen, non-resident World War II Filipino veterans and for other veterans' programs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the country is probably shocked hearing me say something like this. But, Mr. Speaker, we are here on the floor to ask for a designation that the country support the ideals for which men and women fought for and are now disabled, while in the same stroke this very Congress wants to cut veterans' benefits from those very same people when they are asking the country to celebrate their ideals.

The bill that was in the Senate is Senate 1315. There was a bill here in the House, H.R. 760. That bill was voted out of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on a party-line vote. That hardly ever happens. A party-line vote hardly ever happens in the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

They voted to eliminate a special monthly pension for severely disabled veterans over 65 who are receiving pensions for wartime services. The special monthly pension provides an additional payment of up to $2,200 per year to the most severely disabled veterans. In 2006, the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims overturned the Department of Veterans Affairs decision that denied the special monthly pension to an 86-year-old legally blind World War II veteran, Robert A. Hartness, who was also receiving a VA pension granted to low-income, disabled veterans.

The court reversed the VA's denial of benefits to Mr. Hartness and required them to begin paying this special monthly pension. The court held that the United States law requires an award of a special monthly pension to a veteran eligible for VA nonservice-connected disability pension if, in addition to being at least 65 years old, the veteran has a disability rating of at least 60 percent or is permanently housebound.

The Senate bill, S. 1315, would override the court decision legislatively, and it is also what H.R. 760 sought to do. According to the VA, more than 20,200 veterans could be affected by this unprecedented cut in veterans' benefits.

This cut in veterans' benefits that goes to the disabled is opposed by the American Legion, AMVETS, the National Association of Uniformed Services, and other veterans' service organizations. The following excerpt is from an April 25, 2008, letter to all Members of Congress from the American Legion: ''The American Legion believes the sacrifice of these heroes warrants relief. Balancing the books on the backs of the very patriots that protected and defended this Nation is unconscionable. Don't make a grave mistake in the name of fairness, equality, or even fiscal responsibility. Do what is right.''

I wholeheartedly agree. Congress has an obligation to protect those veterans who are the most vulnerable. They have no voice; and, indeed, many of them are so severely disabled they are housebound and require aid and attendants. I personally find appalling the notion of taking benefits from these disabled veterans to create a new benefit for other veterans, especially those of a foreign nation.

There are better ways to fund new entitlements than to cut benefits from aging veterans who need us most, violating the principle of honor that defined their service and our obligation to both them and the Nation they served.

I believe that our veterans are our country's most precious asset. I also believe that those are the ideals for which you seek to recognize in the bill that is before us. I would remind every Member who votes in support of this bill, please recognize that when you come to the floor and there is presented to you a Senate amended bill that would repeal the special monthly pension for the Nation's most vulnerable veterans, those of whom are wartime elderly, indigent, disabled and homebound, that you remember the vote you cast this day. Because if you embrace to defend these disabled veterans who sacrificed for the ideals and the heritage of this country, do not cut their veterans' benefits.

It was done in committee. It was done in the Senate. We have to defend the most vulnerable and those who do not have a voice.

I support what is in front of us, but I do not support the rationale of inoculation before you bring a bill to this floor that will cut a billion dollars from these wartime elderly, disabled indigent veterans.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, for thousands of our Nation's soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines, the sacrifices of war far outlast the war itself. There are more than 2 million veterans with service-connected injuries or illnesses, including thousands who have returned from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Thanks to advances in medical science, the vast majority of American servicemembers wounded in combat survive traumatic events that would have proven deadly in previous wars.

Previous generations of veterans have come home wounded from battlefields in Europe, the Korean peninsula, and the jungles of Vietnam. They have returned to America with permanent damage to limb or spirit.

Today's veterans of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom are suffering tragic injuries from

IED attacks and other hazards that are filling our military hospitals with victims who have lost limbs, with severe burns, and with head injuries.

We owe a debt of gratitude to all of these veterans whose physical or psychological well-being was permanently damaged in service to their country.

In my own district, disabled veterans have also had to endure the closing of the Southeast Louisiana VA Hospital due to damage from Hurricane Katrina. As a result, approximately 212,000 veterans in a 23-parish area in southeast Louisiana have to travel up to 4 hours to go to other VA hospitals just to receive basic care. And as we all know, gas prices are now topping $4 a gallon, which further adds to the cost our disabled veterans are facing when they travel to and from VA facilities for their health care.

I want to express as well how gravely concerned I am at the high cost of fuel and how it is affecting their ability to stretch their limited pension and compensation dollars. I call on the Democratic leadership in Congress to step forward and join us to help these disabled veterans by addressing this problem and enacting a strong national energy policy that increases supply to lower gas prices.

I want to thank my colleagues in the House for passing the VA Medical Facility Authorization and Lease Act authorizing $625 million for Southeast Louisiana VA Hospital that was closed down due to damage caused by Hurricane Katrina. And I want to specifically recognize the leadership of Chairman BOB FILNER and Ranking Member STEVE BUYER in passing this critical legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our disabled veterans for their sacrifice and contributions to the cause of freedom. The intent of this bill is to express America's eternal gratitude to these courageous heroes, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it. America's disabled veterans have honored us with their service and selfless duty. We should honor them by passing this resolution.

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

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I want to be clear, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Concurrent Resolution 336 honors the sacrifices of the disabled veterans, and I urge all Members to support it.

I am very proud of the fact that we have just passed the largest VA budget in the history of the United States of America. Now a lot of times people talk the talk, but we as Members of this body need to walk the walk for the veterans. And when I said that I have visited the facilities in Puerto Rico and St. Thomas, I have also visited the facilities in Louisiana, and I made sure that we put the money into the budget so we could rebuild that facility for veterans in that area.

I urge my colleagues to unanimously support H. Con. Res. 336.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 332, which recognizes the 60th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. On December 10, 1948, the United Nations General Assembly came together to pass the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which serves as a set of standards for all people and all nations of the world to strive toward.

Drawing upon principles from both the U.S. Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes the fundamental human rights bestowed to each person on this Earth regardless of race, religion, or ethnicity. Ronald Reagan once described the U.S. Constitution as "a kind of covenant. It is a covenant we've made not only with ourselves but with all of mankind." The Universal Declaration of Human Rights shines light in the darkest corners of the world and reminds those in the most desperate of situations that every person is entitled to respect and dignity.

It has been my distinct privilege to serve as co-chair of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus for the past 7 years. The Caucus was founded in 1983 by the late Congressman Tom Lantos and former Congressman John Porter for Members of Congress to work to defend the rights of individuals worldwide as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

With the passage of this important resolution, I reaffirm my commitment to serve as a voice for the voiceless and continue to ensure that human rights remains a priority in the U.S. Congress.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 336.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 336.

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. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1500

NATIONAL D-DAY REMEMBRANCE DAY

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1235) expressing support for the designation of National D-Day Remembrance Day, and recognizing the spirit, courage, and sacrifice of the men and women who fought and won World War II.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1235

Whereas June 6, 2008, marks the 64th anniversary of D-Day, the day of the beginning of the Allied assault against the Axis forces at Normandy, France, during World War II;

Whereas the D-Day assault, codenamed Operation Overlord, was the most extensive amphibious invasion ever to occur, and involved 5,000 ships, over 11,000 sorties of Allied aircraft, and 150,000 American, British, and Canadian troops on the first day of the operation;

Whereas the D-Day assault was among the most important events of World War II, as the success of the Allied landings in Normandy provided the foothold for the liberation of France and the eventual Allied advancement into Germany, leading ultimately to the Allied victory in Europe;

Whereas the brave men and women of our armed services who participated in the D-Day assault forever changed the course of history by starting the liberation of occupied Europe from Nazi Germany;

Whereas 5 separate beaches were assaulted, with American forces under the command of Lieutenant General Omar Bradley attacking Omaha and Utah beaches, and British and Canadian forces under the command of General Miles Dempsey attacking Gold, Juno, and Sword beaches;

Whereas according to General Dwight D. Eisenhower, American troops would "accept nothing less than full victory";

Whereas American troops displayed tremendous heroism, dedication, and strength in storming the beaches of Normandy against a heavily fortified enemy;

Whereas American troops suffered significant losses during the assault, including over 6,500 casualties;

Whereas June 6, 1944, is one of the most significant dates in the history of the United States;

Whereas the National D-Day Museum was dedicated on June 6, 2000, in New Orleans, Louisiana;

Whereas Congress designated the museum as "America's National World War II Museum" in 2003;

Whereas the museum has welcomed 1,800,000 visitors since its opening, and currently sees an average of 17,000 visitors a month;

Whereas the National World War II Museum is the only museum in the United States that exists for the exclusive purpose of interpreting the American experience during World War II on both the homefront and battlefront and, in doing so, covers all the branches of the Armed Forces and the Merchant Marines;

Whereas the museum interprets the American experience during World War II, celebrates the American spirit, recognizes the teamwork, optimism, courage, and sacrifice of the men and women who won World War II, and promotes the exploration and expression of these values by future generations; and

Whereas it would be appropriate to designate June 6, 2008, as National D-Day Remembrance Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives supports the designation of National D-

Day Remembrance Day, recognizes and honors the veterans who served on D-Day, and thanks them for their spirit, courage, and sacrifice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last week, on June 6, we celebrated the anniversary of one of our greatest military accomplishments and an historic event that changed the face of our Nation and the world.

On June 6, 1944, the largest seaboard invasion in history began the 2-month Battle of Normandy. The D-day invasion began during the night, and continued with air and naval attacks and an amphibious attack in the early morning hours.

The D-day operation of June 6, 1944 brought together the land, air and sea forces of the Allied armies in what become known as the largest invading force in human history. Operation Overlord landed five naval assault divisions to the beaches of Normandy, code-named Utah, Omaha, Gold, Juno and Sword.

The invasion force included 7,000 ships and landing craft manned by 195,000 Navy personnel from eight Allied countries. Almost 133,000 troops from England, Canada and the United States landed on D-day. Casualties during the landing was over 10,000.

New Orleans is the home of a wonderful museum, the National World War II Museum. This museum opened its doors on June 6, 2000, and paid tribute not only to the D-day but all of the efforts in World War II. One of the reasons it is located in New Orleans is it was the home of Andrew Jackson Higgins.

The historian, Steven Ambrose, reported that General Eisenhower once told them that Higgins was the man who won the war for us. Eisenhower explained to him that if Higgins had not designated and built the LCVPs, we never could have landed over the open beach. The whole strategy of the war would have been different.

According to the National World War II Museum, the Higgins work force was the first in New Orleans to be racially integrated. This work force shattered production records, turning out more than 200,000 boats, including 12,500 LCVPs, or Landing Craft, Vehicle, Personnel, by the end of the war.

General Eisenhower's D-day message read: You are about to embark upon the greatest crusade, toward which we have strived these many months. The eyes of the world are upon you, and hopes and praise of liberty-loving people everywhere march with you.

The world still recalls D-day, and the efforts of the United States and our Allies to end fascism in Europe and across the globe. It is fitting that we recall these accomplishments, and this day, and the service and sacrifice that hastened the end of World War II.

The world still looks to us for leadership for leadership and to be a beacon to illustrate the path ahead. Let us always strive to provide this light, this leadership and this wisdom to do what is right.

Last August I had the honor and privilege to visit the Normandy American Cemetery and Memorial in France. While there I laid a wreath of flowers in honor of the soldiers that fought and died at Normandy and visited the graves of Floridians who gave their life fighting the Nazis.

Tori Robinson, an American gospel singer based in Paris, also a constituent of mine, sung at the ceremony. Her version of God bless America brought people from all over the memorial. There this honor was shared by all visitors in this holy place.

I want to take a special note to honor Chairman OBEY and Chairman MURTHA for their hard work in getting funds for this new Normandy Visitors Center appropriated. My visit to this center followed theirs, which was just dedicated on June 6, 2007, the 63rd anniversary of D-day.

This visitors center truly paid tribute to the soldiers who stormed those beaches and gave visitors a true sense of what these men and their loved ones was going through during the war that led up to the D-day invasion.

I encourage all Americans to visit this hallowed site. Most of the visitors are from Europe and come to honor the sacrifice of the young Americans made for their freedom.

Many brave men and women died on this day, 64 years ago, to restore the freedom we enjoy today. Here rests in honored glory a comrade in arms only God knows, reads just one of the 9,387 grave markers at the American cemetery in Normandy, France. We honor them by remembering and this resolution calls us to remember.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1235, a measure expressing support for the designation of National D-Day Remembrance Day, and recognizing the spirit, courage and sacrifice of the men and women who fought and won World War II. D-day is one of the most significant days in our Nation's history, and we should never forget the bravery and determination displayed on the beaches of Northern France.

This resolution also recognizes the National World War II Museum in New Orleans. The museum was dedicated in 2000 as the National D-Day Museum, and later in 2003, Congress designated the museum as America's National World War II Museum. The museum has welcomed 1.8 million visitors since its opening, and currently sees an average of 17,000 visitors a month.

The National World War II Museum is the only museum in the United States that exists for the exclusive purpose of interpreting the American experience during World War II. It celebrates the American spirit, recognizes the teamwork, optimism, courage and sacrifices of the men and women who won World War II, and promotes the exploration and expression of these values by future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, no one can visit the American cemetery at Normandy without gaining a profound appreciation for the courage and the sense of self-sacrifice demonstrated by every one of our soldiers who fought to take that beach and begin the liberation of Europe.

For years, families who went to that cemetery to think about their loved ones, think about their loss and, at the same time, think about their pride, had a totally inadequate place in which to sit and think or perhaps retreat from the rest of the people around them for a few precious moments. And I am so pleased that I was able to work with Congressman MURTHA, with Congressman WALSH, with Congressman HOBSON, in order to provide the funding for the new visitors center which is now at that location. It is a spectacularly beautiful, and yet subtle tribute to each and every American who fought there.

For years, that visitors center did not tell an adequate story of the sense of self-sacrifice that was exhibited in those days. Now it finally does, and I think it will serve as an inspiration, not just to every American who visits that site, but also to every person from any part of the world who values freedom and values sacrifice.

I know of no monument that is more eloquent in paying tribute to both than that monument, and I think it's fitting that we pass a resolution, again, praising the courage and the dedication of the Americans who fought to make the entire world free.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, Mr. BOOZMAN from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. SCALISE for bringing this forward. It's important for us periodically to pause and think about the tremendous sacrifice, especially while the men and women that made all of this possible are still with us, that we can pause and just think of the sacrifice that they did on this day.

I also want to welcome Mr. SCALISE to the Veterans' Affairs Committee again, that he has volunteered to become a part of that committee and to work in a very bipartisan way so that we can do our best for veterans.

On June 6, 1944, the United States participated in the largest seaboard invasion in history. Countless men and

women served their country that day, and I stand before you to ask for your support for the designation of National D-Day Remembrance Day.

Preparations for D-day began long before June 6, 1944. In fact, discussions about an allied invasion began in 1942. The Germans expected an invasion along the north coast of France and built up forces along the narrowest portion of the channel. However, the Allies planned to land just south of the German build-up. In order to execute a successful campaign, our men and women, along with Allied forces in other countries, not only had to plan an attack, but also to contend with many of the same issues we ourselves are faced with today.

War planners projected 5,000 tons of gasoline would be needed daily for the first 20 days after the initial invasion. 3,489 tons of soap would be needed in the first four months after the invasion. Approximately 300 planes would drop bombs along the coast of Normandy. Six parachute regiments, including 13,000 men, needed to be transported. 5,000 vessels would transport men and 30,000 vehicles across the English channel.

It's clear that the efforts that led to D-day and the many days afterward were that of dedicated men and women who sacrificed their jobs, their families and in many cases their own lives to ensure that the United States of America and the Allied forces would be successful.

Words cannot express our gratitude for their courage and spirit. However, by designating a National D-Day Remembrance Day, we can continue to remember the sacrifice unwavering commitment to our country, and determination of the men and women who fought and won World War II. I urge my colleagues to remember and honor these men and women by supporting this resolution.

I also want to comment on Mr. OBEY, what he said in regard to the actual monument. And I've had the opportunity to be there. My daughter, while she was vacationing in Europe, in her early twenties, she and her friends enjoyed it so much that they actually were just going and planning on spending an afternoon, wound up spending the night, and were so impressed with the way that everything's portrayed that, again they did a good job.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAZAYOUX).

Mr. CAZAYOUX. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1235, by my fellow delegation member, Congressman SCALISE. This resolution thoughtfully commemorates the sacrifices of our armed services on that fateful day, 64 years ago on the beach of Normandy.

I was reminded of that sacrifice when I visited veterans over Memorial Day at a ceremony at the USS *Kidd* in Baton Rouge. I also attended an event for the Louisiana Honor Air Program, which helps our World War II veterans, many themselves D-day survivors, visit the World War II memorial for the first time.

The D-day assault was the most extensive amphibious invasion in history. Its success was a shining example of the strength and professionalism of our armed services.

As our thoughts and prayers go out to our young men and women who fight for us in Iraq and Afghanistan, we pay tribute to their predecessors by supporting this resolution to designate a National D-Day Remembrance Day.

Louisiana played a huge part in the Allies' success at D-day. Indeed the amphibious Higgins boat itself was developed in Louisiana and based on boats built to navigate our swamps and marshes. For this reason, New Orleans is home to the National D-Day Museum and is designated by Congress as America's National World War II museum.

I support the resolution, and strongly encourage this House to designate June 6, 2008, as National D-Day Remembrance Day.

□ 1515

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, about 6 months ago I got an unexpected call in my office from a fellow named Carlo DiVirgilio from Upstate New York. I had never met the man, and when I got on the phone, he said, I just learned that you were in Congress. I just wanted to ask you a question. Was your father Dr. Lungren? And I said, Yes, he was. And he said, I served with him in Normandy 60 years ago.

And he recounted to me some of the battles they went through: the Battle of Senlo, the Battle of Mortain. And he talked about the fear that young men had at that time as they got up to the front lines how they feared death. One of the great things he said to me was, When we were around your father, we felt safe. We felt that we were not going to die.

These were young men who were sent into battle not knowing whether they were going to win but knowing that they had to fight. Had the outcome been different, history would have changed. We would not have liberated Europe. D-day is such an important date that we need to commemorate it as this resolution does.

It is a date that gives us pause because we understand that when Dwight D. Eisenhower made the decision to go, it was not certain that it would succeed. As a matter of fact, those who come here to our Nation's Capitol and go into the Rotunda, they see a statue of Dwight Eisenhower, President of the United States. But he is not there depicted as President of the United States. Rather, he is depicted as the Supreme Allied Commander, the first leader of combined forces in the history of warfare. And he's standing there with a gesture that commemorates a photograph that was taken at the time that he went to go see the paratroopers he was sending off to war.

You have to understand. He realized that maybe as many as six or eight out of every ten that he looked at were going to die, and they were going to die because he was sending them into battle. But he had the courage as a leader to look them in the face, to talk to them before they went off to war and to give them the best that he could.

And then, remarkably, after he had addressed them, he got back into his military automobile and turned to his aide and gave him a piece of paper. And on that piece of paper, General Eisenhower had written out a statement; and he said, If this fails, I want this statement to be read. And what was the statement? It gave all support and all honor to the men who served under him, and he took all blame and responsibility for its failure. What a remarkable example of leadership at that time.

Today, when we hear the first response from many people, I don't care whether they're in professional sports or whether they're in politics or whether they're in business, when something goes wrong, almost the first instinct is to point the finger at somebody else to say, It wasn't my job. It wasn't my responsibility.

But Dwight Eisenhower was not that kind of person. He is the definition of a leader. He is one who made the tough decision to go on June 6, 64 years ago, not being guaranteed a success but knowing that the risk was worth it. There was nothing else he could do. And then saying, If this fails, it is all on me.

Ladies and gentlemen, as we remember today that great day, the great sacrifice of all, including my father, let us remember the example of a great leader, Dwight Eisenhower, who told us what it is to lead: Not for vain glory, but rather for great purpose.

Thank you very much.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, June 6, 2008, marked the 64th anniversary of D-day, one of the most significant days in our Nation's history. June 6, 1944, marked the beginning of the Allied assault against the Axis forces in Normandy, France, and the beginning of the end of World War II; and it started the liberation of occupied Europe from Nazi Germany.

The D-day invasion was the largest amphibious assault the world had ever seen with more than 5,000 ships and over 150,000 American, British, and Canadian troops involved on that single day.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member who is honored to represent the people of

Southeast Louisiana, I am proud of the role that my State played on D-day. In New Orleans, Andrew Jackson Higgins designed the LCVPs, or the Higgins boats, that were used extensively in World War II for amphibious landings. Higgins and the 30,000 Louisiana workers of Higgins Industries built and tested the Higgins boats in Southeast Louisiana during the war.

The Higgins boat was crucial to the success of D-day. According to General Eisenhower, the Allies would not have been able to land on an open beach without the Higgins boat. General Eisenhower claimed that Higgins was the man who won the war for us.

Louisiana is also home to many of the brave men and women who fought and won in World War II. J.J. Witmeyer, who lives in the New Orleans suburb of Hanrahan, participated in the D-day invasion. Mr. Witmeyer served as an infantry soldier and landed on Utah Beach. Mr. Witmeyer describes his experience of landing at Normandy on Higgins boats like this: ''When the ramp went down, you were going through the gates of hell . . . you didn't know how deep the water was, where the beach was and they were firing at you.''

Mr. Witmeyer escaped injury that day but was later wounded twice. He won a battlefield commission as a captain, served as an acting military governor in Dortmund, Germany, and as a commandant of two camps for displaced war victims in Czechoslovakia.

It is because of the courage and sacrifice of soldiers like J.J. Witmeyer and the ingenuity and dedication of individuals like Andrew Higgins that we were successful on June 6, 1944, and went on to win the war.

The brave men and women of our Nation's Greatest Generation displayed tremendous heroism, dedication, and strength and forever changed the course of history. General Dwight D. Eisenhower said we would ''accept nothing less than full victory,'' and our troops did just that.

Our success did not come without significant losses, however. American forces suffered over 3,300 soldiers killed in action and an additional 3,000 soldiers suffered injury.

Mr. Speaker, the courage and sacrifice displayed by the Allied forces on June 6, 1944, should never be forgotten, and we should always remember D-day and honor the men and women who fought and persevered for the price of freedom. D-day will forever be an important part of U.S. history, and the day deserves to be recognized. The Members of the Armed Forces who participated in the invasion are true American heroes. That is why I introduced House Resolution 1235 calling on Congress to support the designation of a national D-day Remembrance Day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to recognize and honor the veterans who served on D-day and join me in thanking them for their spirit, courage, and sacrifice. I also urge my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the National World War II Museum in New Orleans for sharing their stories with future generations. For so many years, the Greatest Generation was reluctant to share their stories, and fortunately for all of us, as time went on, more and more have been willing to open up and give that testimony; and we are so honored to have much of that testimony collected at the National World War II Museum for future generations to share.

By passing House Resolution 1235, we honor D-day. More importantly, we honor the men and women of the Greatest Generation who made June 6, 1944, one of the most important days in our Nation's history, a day that all men can be proud of, a day that all Americans should never forget.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on House Resolution 1235.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1235, a resolution to designate National D-Day Remembrance Day and recognize the spirit, courage, and sacrifice of the men and women who fought and won World War II. One of modern history's defining events, D-day was the climactic engagement of the Second World War. On June 6, 1944, an Allied Expeditionary Force representing twelve nations launched more than 5,000 boats and ships, 11,000 aircraft, 28,000 aerial sorties, and landed 150,000 ground troops. Among those troops were more than 30 soldiers from Bedford, Virginia, a small, rural community which experienced the highest per capita loss rate of any community in the United States on D-day. For this reason, Bedford is the home to the National D-Day Memorial, which was dedicated by President Bush on June 6, 2001. The National D-Day Memorial exists in tribute to the valor, fidelity, and sacrifice of the Allied Forces on D-day. The Memorial preserves the lessons and legacy of that fateful day and reminds all who enter it of the heavy price that heartland communities have paid, and still pay, for freedom.

I urge all members to support H. Res. 1235 and honor the great sacrifice of our veterans who served on D-day and in all the other conflicts that preserved American freedom throughout our history.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to unanimously support House Resolution 1235.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1235.

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. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROCEDURE FOR CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE IF OFFERED TODAY

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) offers a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House at any time on the legislative day of June 10, 2008—

(1) the previous question shall be considered as ordered thereon without intervening motion except one motion to refer; and

(2) the Speaker may postpone further proceedings on such a vote on a motion to refer as though under clause 8(a)(1)(A) of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

TO AWARD POSTHUMOUSLY A CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 254) to award posthumously a Congressional gold medal to Constantino Brumidi.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 254

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) On July 26, 1805, Constantino Brumidi was born in Rome, Italy of an Italian mother and a Greek father who inspired him with a love of liberty.

(2) While Constantino Brumidi's Greek ancestry stirred his passion for liberty and citizenship, his Italian heritage provided the art styles of the Renaissance and the Baroque which influenced the artwork of the United States Capitol.

(3) Constantino Brumidi became a citizen of the United States as soon as he was able, embracing its history, values, and ideals.

(4) Beginning in 1855, Constantino Brumidi designed and decorated 1 House and 5 Senate committee rooms in the Capitol, as well as the Senate Reception Room, the Office of the Vice President, and, most notably, the President's Room, which represents Brumidi's supreme effort ''to make beautiful the Capitol'' of the United States.

(5) In 1865, Constantino Brumidi completed in just 11 months his masterpiece, ''The Apotheosis of Washington'', in the eye of the Capitol dome.

(6) In 1871, Constantino Brumidi created the first tribute to an African American in the Capitol when he placed the figure of Crispus Attucks at the center of his fresco of the Boston Massacre.

(7) In 1878, Constantino Brumidi, at the age of 72 and in poor health, began work on the Rotunda frieze, which chronicles the history of America.

(8) On February 19, 1880, Constantino Brumidi died at the age of 74, four and a half months after slipping and nearly falling from a scaffold while working on the Rotunda frieze.

(9) Constantino Brumidi, proud of his artistic accomplishments and devoted to his adopted country, said, ''My one ambition and my daily prayer is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country on earth in which there is liberty.''.

(10) Constantino Brumidi's life and work exemplify the lives of millions of immigrants who came to pursue the American dream.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the posthumous presentation, on behalf of Congress, of a gold medal of appropriate design to Constantino Brumidi, in recognition of his contributions to the Nation.

(2) DISPLAY OF MEDAL IN CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER.—The Architect of the Capitol shall arrange for the gold medal presented under this subsection to be displayed in the Capitol Visitor Center, as part of an exhibit honoring Constantino Brumidi.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the ''Secretary'') shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 2 under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—The medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 5. AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS; PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund, such amounts as may be necessary to pay for the costs of the medals struck pursuant to this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals authorized under section 3 shall be deposited into the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 254 which would posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal to Constantino Brumidi and would authorize the striking of duplicate medals for sale to the public.

Mr. Speaker, for those of us who work here in the Capitol, we are very fortunate to be surrounded by Constantino Brumidi's genius every day. Brumidi's awesome, inspiring murals and frescos are remarkable as they are ubiquitous. Constantino Brumidi's works can be found in three Senate Appropriations Committee rooms, the House Appropriations Committee room, the Senate Democratic Policy Committee room, the Brumidi corridors, the Senate reception area, the Office of the Vice President and, of course, the Rotunda. Like his masterful works throughout the Capitol, Constantino Brumidi's story is uniquely American.

Brumidi was born in Rome in 1805 to an Italian mother and a Greek father. His artistic ability was cultivated at an early age. In his early years, he was commissioned to paint frescos and murals in various Roman palaces. And then in 1849, as did so many of our ancestors, Brumidi, who was already an established artist in Italy and who spent 3 years working for Pope Gregory XVI in the Vatican, migrated to the United States and began a new life in New York City. There he proudly became a naturalized American citizen in 1852.

It was on a return trip from Mexico that Constantino Brumidi first saw the U.S. Capitol. It was a fortuitous twist of fate: at a time when Congress and President Franklin Pierce were preparing to expand the Capitol, a world-class Italian American artist, who just happened to be passing through Washington, inspired by both the freedoms and liberties represented by the seat of Congress and the vast open spaces in the Capitol that seemed to invite frescos and murals, offered his services to Quartermaster General Montgomery C. Meigs. Wisely, Meigs commissioned Brumidi to become the artist of the Capitol.

Brumidi's first work was in the Agricultural Committee room. This masterpiece received such favorable attention that he was given a raise and tasked with painting other larger works culminating with the works in the Capitol Rotunda.

□ 1530

There is no work in the Capitol more impressive or more renowned than ''The Apotheosis of Washington.'' Brumidi completed the fresco in 11 months at the end of the Civil War, soon after the new dome was completed. This absolutely stunning work soars 180 feet above the Rotunda floor. To compensate for the distance from the floor to the ceiling, Brumidi, who spent years mastering depth and scale, painted 15-foot tall figures so that the work could be appreciated from the Rotunda floor.

Another Brumidi masterpiece, ''The Frieze of American History,'' appears just underneath the dome and spans the entire 360 degrees of the Capitol Rotunda. The frieze, which initially looks to be carved or sculpted, as all who view it believe it to be three dimensional, was, in actuality, meticulously painted with the use of scaffolding. While Brumidi first sketched a design of the frieze in 1859, Congress did not authorize work to begin on this piece until 18 years later, in 1877.

The work masterfully displays America's history, beginning with the landing of Christopher Columbus and continuing to the discovery of gold in California. While many visitors to the Capitol have seen Brumidi's genius in the frieze over the years, they may not realize that he nearly lost his life while painting it. While working on a figure of William Penn, 76-year-old Brumidi fell from the scaffolding, but saved himself by clinging to the rung of a ladder for 15 long minutes before he was rescued. While he subsequently ascended the scaffolding once more to continue his work, he died a few months later in 1880. It took two additional artists and 73 years to finish the masterpiece that Constantino Brumidi first began.

Mr. Speaker, Constantino Brumidi's service to the Capitol, and our country, span the administration of six, six Presidents: Franklin Pierce, James Buchanan, Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Johnson, Ulysses S. Grant, Rutherford B. Hayes. On and on, Brumidi worked. All of us here in the Capitol that have the privilege of working in this living museum, as well as the millions of visitors that tour our building each year, who admire and relish Brumidi's works, but precious few know the story of the artist of the Capitol.

In addition to awarding Constantino Brumidi with the Congressional Gold Medal, S. 254 directs the Architect of the Capitol to display the gold medal as an exhibition in the new visitor's center dedicated to Brumidi's life and work. I believe such an exhibit is long past due and would be to the benefit of future generations of Americans who come to see the Capitol and admire the brilliant works of Constantino Brumidi, reminding us yet again that we are a Nation built by immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, Constantino Brumidi was a great son of Italy and a great American. His achievements are a

great source of pride for Italian Americans, and S. 254 would bestow Brumidi, and the Italian American community, with the recognition the artist's great contributions so rightly deserve.

Special thanks are due to Representative BILL PASCRELL from New Jersey, the main sponsor of this bill that we have before us in the House today.

And I'd like to acknowledge the hard work and dedication of somebody who visits us here in the gallery today, Mr. Speaker, Joseph Grano, who's the president of the Constantino Brumidi Society, for his long and tireless efforts on this behalf.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for those who love fine art, creativity, American history, and who appreciate the contributions of Italian American immigrants and all immigrants for the culture and history of our country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 254, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal honoring the great artistic work of Constantino Brumidi on this great Capitol building. The bill was introduced by Senator ENZI and has 99 cosponsors in the Senate, and in the House, a companion bill was introduced by our colleague, Mr. PASCRELL, which has 307 cosponsors.

As we've heard much of Mr. Brumidi's history, he created artworks in the House of Representatives Chamber, many committee rooms, the President's Room, the Senate Chamber, and throughout the corridors of the Capitol. His most famous work within these halls is ''The Apotheosis of George Washington,'' which appears on the Capitol dome in the Rotunda. Mr. Brumidi painted these hallowed halls, and in so doing, he depicted the narrative that is the vivid history of these United States.

Born in Italy in 1805, Constantino Brumidi studied at the Italian Academy of the Arts. In 1852, at the age of 47, he emigrated to America and devoted the rest of his years completing frescoes, sculptures, and paintings in the Capitol Building.

The story of Constantino Brumidi is important not only because he was the artist who gave life to these walls, but because his story is the American story. He was an immigrant to this country, and he used the skill that he had to contribute what he could. In the process, he, like millions of others, built this country into what it is today. Immigrants built this Nation's building, constructed its factories, fed its people, and when called upon, defended its sovereignty. Men and women from this great Nation's inception contributed whatever they could to make this Nation better.

Constantino Brumidi contributed his talents as an artist. And now, because of his efforts, we and all who walk through the Capitol may see not only his talent but this country's history and be filled with the same sense of awe and hope that filled those who walked these halls before us. That, ladies and gentlemen, is a wonderful gift.

On February 19, 1880, at the age of 74, Constantino Brumidi died four-and-a-half months after falling from a scaffolding while working on the Rotunda frieze that chronicles the history of America. He spent his entire time in this country contributing and attempting to fulfill his life's goal. He said, ''My one ambition and my daily prayer is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country on Earth in which there is liberty.''

As we stand here today and walk these halls, it is clear to all that Constantino Brumidi accomplished his goal.

This bill awards Constantino Brumidi the Congressional Gold Medal for his contribution. The medal will be displayed in the Capitol Visitor's Center as part of a display honoring his work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the bill's immediate passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the sponsor of the bill, Bill Pascrell of New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to stand in strong support of S. 254, or H.R. 1609 in the House, to award this posthumous Congressional Gold Medal to Constantino Brumidi which would be displayed in the Capitol Visitor's Center. This American immigrant was the creator of some of the most beautiful works of art in the United States Capitol Building.

As the sponsor of the House version of this bill and as cochair of the Congressional Italian American delegation, this is an issue very close to me, Mr. Speaker.

Now, these things don't happen in a vacuum. I want to express my sincere gratitude to Senator ENZI and Senator CLINTON, to Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY, to Congressman JOHN MICA, to Congressman ZACK SPACE and GUS BILIRAKIS, and my very close friend GARY ACKERMAN, JOHN SARBANES, MICHAEL BURGESS, and RICK RENZI for their tireless work in garnering support for this worthy initiative.

If it were not for the diligent advocacy efforts of the Constantino Brumidi Society, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, and the National Italian American Foundation, we would not be standing here today. It's as simple as that.

Born in Rome of Italian and Greek heritage in 1805, Constantino Brumidi trained in drawing, painting and sculpture at Rome's prestigious Accademia di San Luca.

In 1840, this rigorous artistic training was put on display when Brumidi and several other artists were commissioned to restore the richly decorated frescos in the Vatican Palace.

He immigrated to the United States in 1852, with nothing in his pocket, and when he died, he had nothing in his pocket. His only objective was to come here and become an American citizen, and he did that in 5 years. He gave it all, as you walk through this beautiful edifice of freedom that everyone knows all over the world.

In 25 years, from 1854 to 1879, he decorated the Capitol with murals and frescos. His frescos in this Capitol were probably the first true frescos to be painted in the United States of America.

Brumidi believed that the classical architecture of the Capitol Building required real fresco, like the palaces of Augustus and Nero, and the baths of Titus and Livia at Rome, and the admired relics of the painting at Herculaneium and Pompei.

His art drew heavily on his training and experience in Rome, incorporating the history and symbols of the United States into his classical repertoire. His most significant influences included ancient Greek and Roman wall paintings and Raphael's classical decoration in the Vatican.

Although he's often called the Michelangelo of the Capitol, this immigrant who came here and gave everything to this country, Brumidi perhaps should be called the Raphael of the Capitol, since it was Raphael who was his greatest inspiration.

Brumidi's creations in the Capitol Building include his masterpiece, the allegorical fresco, ''The Apotheosis of Washington,'' in the 4,664-square foot canopy over the eye of the dome, 180 feet above the floor of the Rotunda. He also painted the extensive frescos in the Brumidi corridors throughout this Capitol.

His last years were spent painting the historic scenes in the Rotunda frieze, even carrying out his own historic research for his work.

Outside of his work in this Capitol, he also was well-connected in the Catholic church. His commissions included altar pieces and murals in important cathedrals in Mexico City, New York City, Washington, Baltimore, and Philadelphia.

The consummate American, Brumidi is reported to have remarked: ''My one ambition and my daily prayer is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country on Earth which there is liberty.''

Sadly, at the time of his death in 1880, as I said, he was penniless. Following his death, his work was roundly criticized by the artistic establishment of his day. However, the 1970s, not that far long ago, brought a renewed appreciation for Victorian architecture and decoration and the growth of the historic preservation, and work was done to restore Brumidi's art to its former glory. Today's scholars are able to fully comprehend the full extent of his talent.

Even though he is long gone, it is imperative that we fully recognize the transcendental beauty, the intricate grace he brought to the building that we stand in and that we work in every day.

There is widespread bipartisan support for this initiative. You heard how many cosponsors in the Senate, as my

good friend from West Virginia pointed out how many, 307, right here in the House of Representatives. What great testimony.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support this legislation and to remember the background of this individual, his Italian and his Greek heritage, and think of all the immigrants when we think of Brumidi and his contributions.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he would consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great pride in support of Senate bill 254 to posthumously award Constantino Brumidi the Congressional Gold Medal. We have just heard from the previous speakers the life and times of this inspired artist with whom I'm very proud to share the same Greek heritage.

Many walk through the halls of Congress, but do not know much about the man who dedicated most of his professional life to beautifying it.

Constantino Brumidi, a Greek and Italian immigrant, came to America in search of freedom and opportunity. What he accomplished rivals most any immigrant success story. Constantino Brumidi's life and work exemplify the lives of millions of immigrants who came to pursue the American dream.

□ 1545

Soon after becoming an American citizen, Brumidi was commissioned to decorate the structure which houses the greatest democratic institution in world history. This feat is a testament both to Brumidi's resolve, and our great Nation's willingness to embrace those who want to share in the American dream.

I would also love this award to be accompanied with a statue that would adorn the Capitol Visitors Center. That's why I have introduced H.R. 1313. A statue of Brumidi, along with a Congressional Gold Medal, will serve as a shining example of American ideals and inspire people everywhere who wish to embrace freedom.

While it has taken over 130 years, it is never too late for the installment of this Gold Medal in recognition of the contributions of Constantino Brumidi to the Nation. Congratulations, and I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I thank my good friend and colleague from the great State of New York for his hard work on this and so many endeavors. And I rise today, as the cochair and cofounder on the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, in strong support of S. 254, to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Constantino Brumidi.

I'm so pleased to join 307 of my colleagues here in this legislative body. We were led so well by our colleague and good friend, Representative PASCRELL. And we acknowledge the hard work of Congressman PASCRELL and also the Hellenic Caucus and the Italian-American Caucus in getting the necessary cosponsors.

Brumidi was the son of a Greek father and an Italian mother. He fled Rome and immigrated to the United States in 1852. From 1868 to 1879, he was a resident in my congressional district of New York City. And while he was there, he painted 43 murals at St. Stephen's Church, which is in my district, and scholars come from around the world to study his work there, and here in the Capitol.

He is most famous, however, for his artistic achievement here in our great Capitol. ''The Apotheosis of George Washington'' on the dome in the Rotunda is one of the highlights of his brilliant work. He was called the Michelangelo of the Capitol.

He worked flat on his back on wooden scaffolding through the intense summer temperatures, and he created masterpieces throughout our Capitol. His artwork can be found in the Chamber, the House of Representatives Chamber, several committee rooms, the President's Room, the Senate Reception Room, and truly throughout the corridors of our Capitol. I am thrilled that we are recognizing such an outstanding artist and an important contributor to the history of art and the history of our Nation.

The Capitol building is special because of its beautiful architecture and priceless artistic treasures. Without Brumidi's influence, tours of the Capitol simply would not be certainly as beautiful or interesting to Americans. He is truly deserving of the honor we are bestowing upon him. Like many immigrants, he has brought many treasures to our country.

I thank all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their important work in bringing this legislation to the floor.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 254.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF MANUFACTURED HOUSING IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1010) recognizing the importance of manufactured housing in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1010

Whereas manufactured housing plays a vital role in meeting the housing needs of the people of the United States and is an important source of quality, affordable housing, including both homeownership and rental housing;

Whereas the manufactured housing industry in the United States has approximately $6,000,000,000 annually in sales and employs approximately 70,000 people in factories and retail centers alone;

Whereas 18,000,000 people in the United States, representing all segments of the population, including emerging demographics, live in manufactured homes;

Whereas because it is an important source of affordable housing, manufactured housing is a critical part of the solution to the ongoing crisis in the housing market in this Nation;

Whereas the factory production process provides manufactured housing with technological advantages, value, and customization options for consumers seeking quality housing and sustainable homeownership;

Whereas manufactured homes are built to a national standard under the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974, which governs construction, engineering, quality, safety, and systems performance;

Whereas that Act supports innovation, consumer safety, efficiency, and quality while preserving the affordability and customization of manufactured housing;

Whereas creating affordable homeownership opportunities helps build communities and requires the cooperation of the private and public sectors, including the Federal Government and State and local governments;

Whereas the laws of the United States, such as the Manufactured Housing Improvement Act of 2000, encourage manufactured housing homeownership and should continue to do so in the future;

Whereas June is designated as National Homeownership Month; and

Whereas the third week of June is recognized as Manufactured Housing Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the importance of manufactured housing in providing decent, sustainable, and affordable housing;

(2) recognizes the importance of manufactured housing in contributing to homeownership in the United States;

(3) recognizes the importance of homeownership, including homeownership of manufactured homes, in building strong communities and families; and

(4) recognizes and fully supports the goals and ideals of Manufactured Housing Week and National Homeownership Month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Today, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 1010, a resolution honoring the importance of manufactured housing to our country.

As we celebrate homeownership during the month of June, we also honor the third week of this month as Manufactured Housing Month, recognizing that manufactured homes offer hardworking American families the option to purchase quality homes at an affordable price.

This $8 billion a year industry provides jobs for people not only in the Second District of Indiana, but throughout our country. More than 18 million people live in over 10.5 million homes. I have seen firsthand in my district how these homes have continued a tradition of quality and safe construction over the years. They present a high-quality, affordable housing option for all families.

Mr. Speaker, manufactured housing has come a long way over the years, and often people cannot tell the difference between a modular home and a site-built home. Manufactured homes have a factory production process which provides technological advantages, value, and customization options for consumers seeking quality housing and sustainable homeownership.

Additionally, manufactured homes are built to a national standard under the HUD Code, which governs the construction, the engineering, the quality, safety, and systems performance. The HUD Code supports innovation, consumer safety, efficiency, and quality while preserving manufactured housing's affordability and its customization.

We have all witnessed the ongoing turmoil in the housing market, and I believe it is essential that we look to affordable manufactured housing as a viable solution to this problem.

Creating affordable homeownership is one of the fundamental building blocks of our society, and it plays a fundamental role in achieving the American Dream. It helps to provide families with economic security and build strong communities.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution today and pass House Resolution 1010.

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1010, which recognizes the importance of manufactured housing in the United States.

Manufactured housing plays an important role in meeting this country's housing needs and is an important source of quality, affordable housing, including both homeownership and rental housing. In recent years, manufactured housing placements accounted for more than one-quarter of all new housing starts.

Despite the country's overall drop in home prices, the need for quality, affordable housing has never been greater. Because it is an important source of affordable housing, manufactured housing should be viewed as a critical part of the solution to the ongoing troubles in our housing market.

Today's manufactured homes can deliver quality dwellings and at prices ranging from 10 to 35 percent less per square foot than conventional site-built homes. These savings allow more and more Americans to own their own home or access affordable rental housing units.

The manufactured housing industry has evolved in the last decade to deliver a better quality, more affordable product. The affordability of manufactured housing is mainly attributable to the efficiency of the factory process. The controlled environment and assembly-line techniques remove many of the problems of the site-built sector, such as poor weather, theft, vandalism, and damage to building products and materials stored onsite. Also, factory employees are trained, scheduled, and managed by one employer as opposed to the system of contracted labor on a site-built sector.

As a Congress, we must do all we can do encourage affordable rental and homeownership opportunities for all Americans. Today's manufactured housing industry helps build communities and supports innovation, consumer safety, efficiency, and quality while preserving the affordability and customization of its housing units.

The legislation before us recognizes and fully supports the goals and ideals of Manufactured Housing Week, and I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

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

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may need to the cochair of the Manufactured Housing Caucus, Mr. ETHERIDGE of North Carolina.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank my friend, Congressman DONNELLY, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H. Res. 1010, recognizing the importance of manufactured housing in the United States.

Unfortunately, far too many homeowners are facing difficulties during this current National Homeownership Month. Housing prices are dropping, home sales are stagnating, and thousands of families are facing the prospect of foreclosure.

Manufactured housing can provide a sustainable and affordable housing alternative. Instead of being trapped in exotic mortgages with high interest rates, many Americans can choose cost-effective manufactured housing. This sector of the housing market has also experienced an evolution in the types and quality of homes that they build, offering a wide array of designs that can fit the needs of more families.

In addition, Congress has passed legislation that provides tax credits for the builders of these homes to meet energy efficiency standards. These Energy Star labeled homes are more energy efficient and can provide savings in the face of rising energy costs.

Manufactured housing can be a critical component in achieving two of HUD's most important priorities, providing increased affordable housing, and reducing dependencies on subsidized housing.

In addition, as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I also recognize the importance that manufactured housing can play in the wake of a natural disaster. Manufactured housing can provide a quick, safe, and efficient way to house these victims and provide families with shelters as they put their lives back together.

Owning a home is a large part of the American Dream. I support this resolution as well as the goals and ideals of Manufactured Housing Week. I urge my colleagues to vote for the passage of H.R. 1010.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. I thank the gentlelady.

I rise in support of H. Res. 1010. As a cosponsor of my neighbor and colleague Mr. DONNELLY's resolution, I appreciate his leadership.

I very much appreciate Chairman FRANK's backing this and Congressman CAPITO, and others, because this is an important resolution to recognize the importance of manufactured housing, particularly in the third week of June as the Manufactured Housing Week.

As you've already heard, manufactured housing is a largely underappreciated segment of our Nation's housing industry, even though it uniquely provides both high-quality and affordable housing for millions of Americans.

Companies in my district are numerous across northern—and particularly north central—Indiana—the center of the recreational vehicles industry, as well as manufactured housing. Fairmont in Nappanee, Four Seasons in Middlebury, Patriot in Elkhart, as well as Liberty in Goshen. Forest River has the Hart Homes. We have Coachman. Fleetwood has a huge facility just south of Fort Wayne in Decatur, Schulte Homes. And I could go on with a list. Up to 4,000 jobs in the Third Congressional District in Indiana are related to manufactured housing directly.

Most Americans do not understand how far this housing industry has developed, and the industry suffers from many unfair stereotypes. No longer is manufactured housing the domain of so-called trailer parks on the outskirts of town. In fact, many Americans, even in the typical leafy subdivisions, share a fence with a manufactured home and they don't even know it. For example,

this one from Liberty Homes shows the island kitchen. You see them with vaulted ceilings, four- and five-bedroom homes only for 20, 30, $40,000 less than a site-built home.

□ 1600

For example, a beautiful two-story deluxe 2,000-square-foot multisectional home in my district can sell for just over $100,000, as I said, 10 to 35 percent less than a site-built home. They also gain in energy efficiency. The quality of manufactured homes was shown by the fact that on the gulf coast, among those that best withstood the high winds of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita were manufactured homes. Indeed, in some neighborhoods, manufactured homes were the only ones left standing after the storms blew through.

Given manufactured housing's dual strength in both superior price and quality, we need to recognize and salute this industry. It is a frustrating time in housing as we look at the those who took advantage in the financing end of people's ability to repay or overvalued the homes. But we need to make sure that low- and middle-income people who are striving for better housing can still have access to affordable housing, and manufactured housing is a critical part of that.

We have also seen much alarm in nonscientific facts relating to formaldehyde. Formaldehyde is in the wood. It is not in any particular kind of housing. It's on this House floor. It's in these seats. It's in the Speaker's podium. The question is the size and scale of the unit because formaldehyde is a repellant and an adhesive. And we need to have scientific facts. The fact is that all homes contain wood. It has nothing to do with any particular category. And many thousands of people can have their jobs endangered because of nonscientific political bashing of particular categories. Manufactured housing, in fact, has the same characteristics in this regard as traditional site-built housing.

We also need to make sure that as we look at down payment requirements, and how we deal with very difficult subjects as we go into the housing market, that we understand that manufactured homes, in fact, have the same appreciation as site-built homes. It is just often because they are more affordable, the individuals may not have the same income mix. And we need to figure out a way to make sure that people have access to good quality housing, and that is the American Dream.

I thank the thousands of workers in my district, Mr. DONNELLY's district and across this entire Nation who are providing affordable housing so people can live the American Dream.

Mr. DONNELLY. I want to thank my good friend, Mr. SOUDER, from the district right next to me. We work together on so many issues. I also thank Mrs. CAPITO.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY).

Mr. FEENEY. I thank the gentlelady. I thank my good friend, Mr. DONNELLY, and Chairman FRANK.

Manufactured housing, as has been said, plays a vital role in meeting the needs of families to get affordable, attractive and safe housing throughout our country. There are some 18 million Americans that live in manufactured housing in America. And as the gentleman from Indiana just said, the quality and the attractions just get better every day. It is an important source of quality affordable housing, and it helps new entry-level buyers as well as retirees trying to downsize on both ends of the housing spectrum, whether getting in for the first time or they're living perhaps in the last home that they will own.

It is a responsible means of homeownership that can play a major role in the solution to America's affordable housing problem. The average price of today's manufactured housing hovers somewhere around $48,000, and in a challenging mortgage market where fewer and fewer people have access to credit, this is one way to solve the problem that many homeowners have.

There are lots of homeowners today throughout America that are losing their homes in foreclosure. And yet because of the affordable nature of manufactured housing, they have not seen a dramatic rise in most places as we have in some communities in the rate of foreclosure throughout the country. Manufactured housing is an important component of the solution for affordability and access to the American Dream for every American.

June is designated as the National Home Ownership Month. One of the great choices Americans have is for quality manufactured housing. Again, I thank the sponsor of the bill.

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

Mrs. CAPITO. I yield back the balance of my time and urge passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAPUANO). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1010.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD WILLIAM BROOKE III CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 682) to award a congressional gold medal to Edward William Brooke III in recognition of his unprecedented and enduring service to our Nation.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 682

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 ''Edward William Brooke III Congressional Gold Medal Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) Edward William Brooke III was the first African American elected by popular vote to the United States Senate and served with distinction for 2 terms from January 3, 1967, to January 3, 1979.

(2) In 1960, Senator Brooke began his public career when Governor John Volpe appointed him chairman of the Boston Finance Commission, where the young lawyer established an outstanding record of confronting and eliminating graft and corruption and proposed groundbreaking legislation for consumer protection and against housing discrimination and air pollution.

(3) At a time when few African Americans held State or Federal office, Senator Brooke became an exceptional pioneer, beginning in 1962, when he made national and State history by being elected Attorney General of Massachusetts, the first African American in the Nation to serve as a State Attorney General, the second highest office in the State, and the only Republican to win statewide in the election that year, at a time when there were fewer than 1,000 African American officials in our nation.

(4) He won office as a Republican in a state that was strongly Democratic.

(5) As Massachusetts Attorney General, Senator Brooke became known for his fearless and honest execution of the laws of his State and for his vigorous prosecution of organized crime.

(6) The pioneering accomplishments of Edward William Brooke III in public service were achieved although he was raised in Washington, DC at a time when the Nation's capital was a city where schools, public accommodations, and other institutions were segregated, and when the District of Columbia did not have its own self-governing institutions or elected officials.

(7) Senator Brooke graduated from Paul Laurence Dunbar High School and went on to graduate from Howard University in 1941.

(8) Senator Brooke's enduring advocacy for self-government and congressional voting rights for the citizens of Washington, DC has roots in his life and personal experience as a native Washingtonian.

(9) Senator Brooke served for 5 years in the United States Army in the segregated 366th Infantry Regiment during World War II in the European theater of operations, attaining the rank of captain and receiving a Bronze Star Medal for ''heroic or meritorious achievement or service'' and the Distinguished Service Award.

(10) After the war, Senator Brooke attended Boston University School of Law, where he served as editor of the school's Law Review, graduating with an LL.B. in 1948 and an LL.M. in 1949, and made Massachusetts his home.

(11) During his career in Congress, Senator Brooke was a leader on some of the most critical issues of his time, including the war in Vietnam, the struggle for civil rights, the shameful system of apartheid in South Africa, the Cold War, and United States' relations with the People's Republic of China.

(12) President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed Senator Brooke to the President's Commission on Civil Disorders in 1967, where his work on discrimination in housing would serve as the basis for the 1968 Civil Rights Act.

(13) Senator Brooke continued to champion open housing when he left the Senate and became the head of the National Low-Income Housing Coalition.

(14) Senator Brooke has been recognized with many high honors, among them the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2004, an honor that recognizes ''an especially meritorious contribution to the security or national interests of the United States, world peace, cultural or other significant public or private endeavors''; the Grand Cross of the Order of Merit from the Government of Italy; a State courthouse dedicated in his honor by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, making him the first African American to have a State courthouse named in his honor; the NAACP Spingarn Medal; and the Charles Evans Hughes award from the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

(15) Senator Brooke's biography, Bridging The Divide: My Life, was published in 2006, and he is the author of The Challenge of Change: Crisis in Our Two-Party System, published in 1966.

(16) Senator Brooke became a racial pioneer, but race was never at the center of his political campaigns.

(17) He demonstrated to all that with commitment, determination, and strength of character, even the barriers once thought insurmountable can be overcome.

(18) He has devoted his life to the service of others, and made enormous contributions to our society today.

(19) The life and accomplishments of Senator Brooke is inspiring proof, as he says, that ''people can be elected on the basis of their qualifications and not their race''.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the presentation, on behalf of the Congress, of a gold medal of appropriate design to Edward William Brooke III in recognition of his unprecedented and enduring service to our Nation.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 4. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 3 under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 5. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—The medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 6. AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS; PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund, such amounts as may be necessary to pay for the costs of the medals struck pursuant to this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals authorized under section 4 shall be deposited into the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule the, gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) each will control 20 minutes

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this bill was sponsored in the Senate by our very cherished colleague, Senator KENNEDY, who served with former Senator Brooke for many years. It has been carried in the House with great vigor and care by our colleague from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and I yield her such time as she may consume.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the dean of the Massachusetts delegation, not only for his assistance but for his generosity in yielding to me first on this bill that I sponsored along with him and the entire Massachusetts delegation.

I have to begin by thanking the many, many Republicans and Democrats who are part of the two-thirds that are necessary to award the Congressional Gold Medal. As you are aware, it is a pretty arduous process. In this case, it was not because of the underlying substance of the bill, but because when Members sign on to a bill they obviously have to know something about it. And you have to go from Member to Member.

I am pleased to say that many, indeed most, remembered Senator Brooke, who is alive, and I would say alive and well, if you could talk with him. He has had some illness. I will speak of it in a moment. Of course, it was necessary to remind others of Senator Edward Brooke who became the first African American elected to the United States Senate in 1967 presciently ahead of his time. He was the first popularly elected Black Senator.

I thank Members because I never encountered a Member who didn't see Senator Brooke as a historic figure worthy of the highest award the Congress can give, the Congressional Gold Medal.

Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, of whom the gentleman from Massachusetts spoke, quickly gathered his two-thirds. Our thoughts and prayers are with him. The thoughts and prayers of the American people have been with him since his illness was discovered. He quickly gathered his two-thirds and passed this bill in the Senate. His colleagues understood Senator Brooke's accomplishments in that ''club,'' after all. He was able to get not only his colleagues to sign on quickly but to get the bipartisan leadership. The majority leader, Mr. REID, the assistant leader, Mr. DURBIN were cosponsors. The minority leader, Mr. MCCONNELL, was a cosponsor. Senators TED STEVENS, JOHN WARNER and JOHN KERRY were cosponsors. That gives you the flavor of the degree of respect former Senator Brooke enjoys.

Now, I must say for the RECORD that Senator Brooke is a man who is known for his modesty. He never expected the Congressional Gold Medal. When I approached him to tell him I thought he deserved it, he warned me away from this effort. But he should have expected it. President Bush, 4 years ago, awarded Senator Brooke the Nation's highest medal, the Presidential Medal of Freedom Award. But after all, Senator Brooke was a Member of the United States Congress.

We noted last week the first African American was nominated for the presidency by a major party. The country deserves the self-congratulations it took for the distance it has come and that Senator Obama's nomination signaled.

We must remember, however, that Senator Brooke was elected to the Senate from the State of Massachusetts as a Republican. In 1967 our country was just starting down the road we are traveling and towards the landmark we saw last week. After all, the 1964 Civil Rights Act had just been passed. The 1965 Voting Rights Act had just been passed. We are talking 1967, when Senator Brooks was first elected.

1967 was the beginning of the urban disturbances known as ''the riots,'' which swept the country even before Martin Luther King's assassination, and even before Senator Robert Kennedy's assassination. There was an openly hostile climate to issues affecting race. And racial attitudes were often retrograde.

Mr. Speaker, I began this effort and began to think about Senator Brooke during the struggle for the D.C. Voting Rights Act because the analogies to our struggle and to his seem to me inescapable. Senator Brooke is a native Washingtonian. He spent his entire life in this city. He never left the city until he went to the Armed Forces of the United States of America. The Senator grew up in this city when there was no example of democracy, much less a public official to emulate. There was no vote for President when he grew up in the District of Columbia. There was no self-government at all. The city was run by three commissioners from the Congress of the United States. It had been kept a segregated city by the Congress of the United States. So the medal for Senator has a double symbolic quality for those of us who live in the District of Columbia.

What is most amazing about Senator Brooke is he seemed undaunted by any of the so-called barriers he encountered. The city was as segregated as any southern city in the United States. He went to public schools that will be familiar to D.C. residents—Shaw Junior High School and Dunbar High School were still segregated when I was graduating. He went to Howard University for his college education and then stayed right here to go to Howard Law

School. How could Senator Brooke have thought of himself as a Senator?

He probably, at the time he was at Dunbar and at Howard, did not think about the fact that he would be the first African American attorney general in the United States and the first African American popularly elected to the Senate. He could hardly have thought as a Republican who attained these offices in a heavily Democratic State then and now—that that would be his fate. But he had no fate. He obviously had only his own sense of aspiration of who he was.

During his time in the Senate from 1967 to 1979, Senator Brooke was a strong advocate for the rights of D.C. residents who had nobody, had got home rule only during his time, strong advocate for home rule, got a delegate during his term, pressed hard for that. And he has been a major advocate for the pending D.C. Voting Rights Act, which again I thank this House for passing in 2007. He made calls to Senators urging passage. And during his book tour last year he spoke of the importance of passage of the D.C. Voting Rights Act. His book tour concerned the publication of his autobiography, ''Bridging The Divide: My Life.''

□ 1615

Senator Brooke has breast cancer. Speaking of obstacles, he has regarded his recovery from this disease as an important obligation to educate men about the disease. He obviously has had some of the illnesses associated with being 88 years old, but I must say his robust mind leads me to believe that he will attend the ceremony in the Capitol Rotunda if we award him this medal. It is an amazing accomplishment that with all these strikes against him, he didn't even seem to notice.

So 208 years since the framers of our Constitution expected Congress to grant DC voting rights once it became the capital under its jurisdiction, in this very year when we expect in fact to get that right, I ask this House to do what it has already done for voting rights and to award the Congressional Gold Medal to our native son. We are close to voting rights. It was filibustered, but we believe we can break that now.

I want to leave you with the Senator's own words when we told him that we were seeking the medal for him. He wrote this letter, which I ask to be entered into the RECORD, to his Republican colleagues, and he wrote a similar letter to his Democratic colleagues or former colleagues here, and I am quoting the Senator: ''As much as I would appreciate such a high honor from my peers, I would place even greater priority on a full House vote for the American citizens who live in my hometown. The right for citizens of the city where I was born and raised was not achieved when I was a Member of Congress. Witnessing the District of Columbia obtain the right to be represented in the House with votes cast by Republicans would mean more to me than any honor that I could achieve as an individual.''

I said he was modest. He means it. I think he means that sentiment. I ask that Senator Brooke be awarded the Congressional Gold Medal.

MARCH 21, 2007.

DEAR DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS: I have written to Republican Members of the House as a life-long Republican and a native Washingtonian, who was privileged to serve as the first African American elected by popular vote to the U.S. Senate (Massachusetts from 1967–1979). I am writing to Democrats as well to thank you for your long support of voting rights and home rule for my hometown, and to ask you to cast your vote for H.R. 1433, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007. I grew up in the District when it was as segregated as other Southern cities, including the city's public schools, and I was educated at Howard University. We had no local or federal rights, even to govern ourselves or to vote for President, and no one to represent our concerns in the Congress. A Democratic Congress changed all of that when Democrats and a Republican president granted the citizens of the nation's capital home rule and a delegate to the House. Now you have another historic opportunity to grant these tax-paying citizens the full representation in the ''People's House'' that they deserve.

At 87 years of age, I have had rare privileges and honors as an American citizen that few Americans, particularly residents of the District have never enjoyed. At a recent press conference at the Capitol held by senators to celebrate my recently published autobiography, I learned that members of my congressional delegation and others were seeking for me the highest congressional honor, the Congressional Gold Medal. I could not help but be overwhelmed, but I had to say that as much as I would appreciate such a high honor from my peers, I would place even greater priority on a full House seat for the citizens of my hometown.

I was elected as the nation's first Black attorney general and then as the first African American elected by popular vote to the United States Senate when Black Americans running for state wide office seemed the stuff of fantasy. However, I had to leave my hometown to become a Member of Congress or be represented at all. Nothing would mean more to me, particularly at this stage in my life, than witnessing Democrats and Republicans voting together to afford voting rights to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

I believe that Voting Rights Reauthorization in 2006 and the D.C. House Voting Rights Act of 2007 are equivalent in their historic purposes and deep meaning. Both bills are the same in extending long-denied congressional voting rights, and in the District's case, to an African American city as well. I lived in the District until I joined the Army and was proud to serve as a combat infantry officer in [captain during] WWII. The experience of living in a segregated city and of serving in our segregated Armed forces helps explain why the pending D.C. House Voting Rights Act is so important to me personally.

I have been heartened by the strong support of the Democratic leadership and committee chairs and members who are swiftly bringing this bill to the floor early in the session. The bill has passed twice by overwhelming majorities in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and this year by a two-to-one vote by the Judiciary Committee. I ask that you join the large majorities in those committees and vote for H.R. 1433.

I am grateful for your work and attention to voting rights for all Americans.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BROOKE,
U.S. Senator, Retired.

MARCH 21, 2007.

DEAR FELLOW REPUBLICAN: As a proud life-long Republican, an African American, and a native Washingtonian, I was not destined to become a United States Senator when I was elected in 1966. Yet, I served with some of you as a senator from Massachusetts (1967–1979). It is the Republican Party that gave me the opportunity not only to run, but also to serve statewide in offices that even now are still rare for African Americans to achieve. The Republican Party allowed me not only to represent others. The Republican Party allowed me to be represented in the Congress of the United States. I am asking you to do the same for the tax paying citizens of my home town and to vote for passage of the District of Columbia Voting Rights Act of 2007.

Last year, I was especially proud to watch my party lead the passage of the reauthorization of the historic 1965 Voting Rights Act and to see a member of my party, Representative Tom Davis of Virginia, initiate a similar bill for the District of Columbia. Now you have before you another historic voting rights bill. At 87 years of age, I have had rare privileges and honors as an American, including the nation's highest honor generously given to me two years ago by President George Bush. At a recent press conference at the Capitol held by senators to celebrate my recently published autobiography, I learned that members of my congressional delegation and others were seeking for me the highest congressional honor, the Congressional Gold Medal. I could not help but be overwhelmed, but I had to say that as much as I would appreciate such a high honor from my peers, I would place even greater priority on a full House seat for the American citizens who live in my home town. This right for citizens of the city where I was born and raised was not achieved when I was a member of Congress. Witnessing the District of Columbia obtain the right to be represented in the House with votes cast by many Republicans would mean more to me than any honor I could achieve as an individual.

I will always be grateful to the Republican party that pressed and strongly supported my candidacies, as the nation's first Black attorney general and then as the first African American elected by popular vote to the United States Senate. Republicans were first in their willingness to break ancient barriers, in the 1960's, when Black Americans running for statewide office seemed the stuff of fantasy. I was able to run and win because the Republican Party never wavered because of my race in a state where only two percent of the residents were Black. I hope you will not hesitate now in granting my hometown a vote in the House of Representatives for the first time in the two centuries of the city's existence as our nation's capital.

The Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006 and the D.C. House Voting Rights Act of 2007 are equivalent in their purposes and their deep meaning. Both bills are the same in extending long-denied congressional voting rights, and in the District's case, to a majority Black city as well. I grew up in the District when it was as segregated as other Southern cities, including the city's public schools, and was educated at Howard University. We had no local or federal rights, even to govern ourselves or to vote for President, and no one to represent our concerns in the Congress. I did not live elsewhere until I joined

the Army and was proud to serve as a combat infantry officer during WWII. The experience of living in a segregated city and of serving in our segregated Armed forces perhaps helps explain why my party's work on the Voting Rights Act reauthorization last year and on the pending D.C. House Voting Rights Act has been so important to me personally. The irony, of course, is that I had to leave my hometown to get representation in Congress and to become a Member. Nothing would mean more to me, particularly at this stage in my life, than witnessing Republicans and Democrats voting together to afford voting rights to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1433 has been passed twice by overwhelming majorities by the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and once by a two-to-one vote by the Judiciary Committee. I ask that you join those Republicans and Democrats in voting for H.R. 1433 on the House floor.

I am deeply grateful to you for your work and attention to voting rights for all Americans.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BROOKE,
U.S. Senator, Retired.

Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, the Massachusetts delegation, Congressional Black Caucus Chair CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK, and I are proud to introduce the Edward William Brooke III Congressional Gold Medal Act. Senator Edward Brooke has been much honored as an outstanding two-term senator (1967–1979) who is still remembered for his courage and independence on the difficult issues of his time—from the Vietnam War to his leading work in the passage of the Fair Housing Act of 1968. President Bush awarded Senator Brooke the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2004. At 87, his autobiography, Bridging the Divide: My Life tells the Senator's remarkable story. That story began here in the District of Columbia, where Senator Brooke was born and raised, and graduated from Dunbar High School and Howard University. Senator Brooke rose to the rank of captain in the segregated 366th Infantry Regiment in the U.S. Army, and won a Bronze Star Medal and the Distinguished Service Award. His autobiography reads like a personal and political adventure of a man born in the segregated capital, a city with no local elected officials or Members of Congress, who went on to become the first African American official elected statewide, when he won election as Attorney General, the second highest office in the state, and the only Republican to win statewide election that year. In 1966, Senator Brooke became the first African American elected by popular vote to the Senate of the United States. ''Trailblazer'' does not aptly describe the courage it took for an African American to run, much less win state-wide office as a Republican in a predominately Democratic state, where 2 percent of the population was African American.

I take special pride and pleasure in introducing this bill in the House, along with the Massachusetts delegation and the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus. My Massachusetts colleagues justifiably claim Senator Brooke as a son of Massachusetts. We in the District concede that Massachusetts voters also deserve credit in refusing to allow racial barriers, that still remain formidable in most States, overwhelm Senator Brooke's qualifications for high office. However, I hope that Massachusetts citizens will forgive the residents of the Senator's hometown if we insist that Edward William Brooke III be counted the adopted son of Massachusetts. Senator Brooke's family, the District of Columbia Public Schools, Howard University, and the proud African American community both sheltered and prepared him for his remarkable life and service to the people of Massachusetts and the Nation.

We are especially grateful for the Senator's devotion to H.R. 328, the District of Columbia Fair and Equal House Voting Rights Act of 2007. Senator Brooke has worked devotedly for passage of the pending legislation. While in the Senate, he never forgot that his hometown had no Senator and needed him, too. Speaking on the Senate floor for passage of the Voting Rights Amendment in 1978, Senator Brooke made it clear, as he does today, that this matter also was personal for him. He said, in part, ''[M]y enthusiastic endorsement of House Joint Resolution 554 is based primarily on fundamental concepts of liberty and justice, but my support and interest are also intensely personal, for my roots are in Washington, DC. I was born and raised here. I attended and graduated from Shaw Junior High School, Dunbar High School, and Howard University. For as long as I can remember, I have fought, along with family and friends and colleagues, to attain the goal of providing for the citizens of the District of Columbia the same rights and privileges that other citizens throughout the Nation have enjoyed.'' Because the Congressional Gold Medal is the highest honor that Congress can bestow, it is necessary that at least 290 Representatives and 67 Senators sign on as cosponsors. I urge every Member of the House and Senate to become cosponsors before the end of Black History Month on February 28th.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, rarely, and rightly it is rare, do we honor one of our own with the highest civilian honor we can bestow, the Congressional Gold Medal. But rules are made to be broken, and just as Ed Brooke broke an unwritten rule and became the first African American popularly elected to the Senate since Reconstruction, we should break another and honor his courage and achievements.

Just as it may be hard for college students of today to imagine segregated bathrooms and drinking fountains, it is hard for all of us to imagine a Congress without African Americans and others of color. So it is especially important to think back to the historic day when this humble man took the oath of office in the Senate 41 years ago on January 3, 1967. The America of that time, as my colleague has noted, was not far past the struggles that led to the passage of the Civil Rights Act, which this Chamber voted a couple of months ago to honor with a commemorative coin.

Mr. Speaker, many of us know the general outline of Ed Brooke's life: a soldier in the Second World War, a lawyer whose 1966 book ''The Challenge of Change'' focused on African Americans in the United States and on politics. I doubt that many Members know though that he was actually a native of the District of Columbia, as the gentlewoman noted.

Born here October 26, 1919, he was a graduate of both Harvard and Boston University and followed in his father's footsteps as a lawyer before being elected Massachusetts Attorney General and then on to the United States Senate, where he served two terms.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was sponsored by our colleague in the Senate, Senator TED KENNEDY, also of Massachusetts, with 67 cosponsors, and he assured its passage before his unfortunate illness. We hope for him and his family the very best. Our prayers are with them. Here in the House a companion bill, H.R. 1000, was sponsored by our colleague Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, and she has collected 290 cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, this bill honors a man, Senator Ed Brooke, but it also honors an idea and an achievement, that we are all equal, and that election to the United States Senate is open to any American who can prove to the voters that his or her ideas and character are appropriate and best represent their State, regardless of race, creed or religion. We should take this opportunity to celebrate that notion.

I urge immediate passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. How much time remains, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 8 minutes left.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself 4 minutes.

I consider it a great honor to be able to stand on the floor of this House and as the Chair of the committee bring out the bill that would honor Ed Brooke. As a citizen of Massachusetts in 1972 and again in 1978, and as a fairly partisan Democrat, I was proud publicly to endorse him for reelection both times to the Senate.

The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia made the point he was the first African American elected attorney general and then to the Senate only shortly after this country officially said segregation was morally and legally wrong. 1954 was the Brown v. Board of Education decision, not made final until 1955 in its decree. Seven years later Ed Brooke is elected attorney general. And as we look back now, it is probably difficult for some people to understand what an important accomplishment that was. But he is not a man who should be honored simply for having broken those barriers, because having gotten the opportunity, he used it.

The committee I chair has jurisdiction over housing. As I work in the housing area, I find myself frequently trying to preserve some of the pioneering efforts on behalf of affordable housing that Ed Brooke created. I was very proud about a month or so ago when he called to say that he liked what we were doing.

I was just reminded, Mr. Speaker, when I was up in our State of Massachusetts over the weekend, that it was in 1978, in his last year in the Senate, that Ed Brooke began the policy of saying that when housing had been built with Federal help with a certain restriction that set it aside for lower

income people and those restrictions expire, it shouldn't be simply sold to the highest bidder, but that public policy ought to make some efforts to preserve it for people who were in need of housing. We are still fighting that fight today.

We have something known as the Brooke amendment, one of the greatest acts of compassion ever to pass this body. It said originally that the poorest of the poor who get housing through various public programs shouldn't be expected to pay more than 25 percent of their income for housing, precisely because they have so little. That was changed, regrettably, in the eighties. I voted against it, but it was changed to 30 percent. But it is still there. It is still the Brooke amendment. It is still a major barrier to a degradation in the quality of life of lower income people, because there are those who would make them pay 40 and 50 and 60 percent of their income, depriving them and their children of the necessities of life. So it is with great pride that we fight and have fought to continue the Brooke amendment.

Senator Brooke was a leader in a number of areas. Yes, he broke the barrier of racism and became the first African American to win statewide office in Massachusetts and then to come to the Senate at a time when racism was even more virulent than it is today. We have made strides in diminishing it.

But, as I said, he didn't just do that. He was a leader in a number of areas, and particularly in the housing area. I don't believe anybody who has ever served in the Congress of the United States has a record that exceeds his.

So I am delighted to join under the leadership of our colleague Senator KENNEDY and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) in voting for this medal, the second medal, the third medal that Brooke will have gotten, because he got the Presidential Medal of Freedom and he earned the Bronze Medal in World War II, fighting in a segregated outfit, putting patriotism ahead of the indignities to which he submitted in the fight against that terrible tyranny.

This is a medal well earned by a man who exemplified the commitment to the public welfare that we could well remember today.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that because of the energy of a number of people, we are going to be awarding this gold medal to a man who so richly deserves it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I thank my good friend, the chairman of our Financial Services Committee, for the words that he said about Ed Brooke. He would be one to know, another great leader in the area of opening up housing for all. And I thank my good friend from the District of Columbia.

Ed Brooke, as Ms. NORTON has made clear, grew up in D.C., graduated from Dunbar, Harvard University, and then, of course, went on to be the editor of the Law Review at Boston University and got a Bronze Medal for his service in the military.

But I got to know Ed Brooke from a different perspective. In fact, Terry Lierman, who is now the chief of staff to our majority leader, and I were on the Appropriations staff when Ed Brooke was the ranking Republican. And what he did is incalculable in terms of school busing, in terms of women's reproductive rights, in the area of opening up federally-subsidized housing particularly, but housing throughout the Nation to all.

Ed Brooke was a temple of justice. His intellect was unparalleled. But what he exuded was a certain class, a dignity that just transcended partisanship. He was able to work with some of the, frankly, most narrow-minded Members of the Senate to get them to take votes that were the right thing to do. And he took very little credit for it. That is why this is so appropriate, to give him credit now, because he made a profound difference in the course our country took 30 years ago.

He would sit there in his calm, measured tone. He would explain why it is right to open up all of society and all of our economy to everyone who was willing to work hard and obey the law.

Ed Brooke was a model that all of us should look to for leadership. He was an extraordinary person. This is an extraordinary action we are taking today, but it is for someone who fully deserves it.

Again, I thank my colleagues here, and I thank the Congress for making this happen today.

I will yield the remainder of my time to Mr. FRANK.

Mrs. CAPITO. I continue to reserve.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am about to yield back.

Ed Brooke, in addition to being a superb United States Senator who fought very hard and very effectively for economic fairness and obviously against racial prejudice, but he also was the chief law enforcement officer of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for 4 years.

Just to give people a flavor of that, I will mention one accomplishment. It was under his attorney generalship that the Boston Strangler was prosecuted and imprisoned. So people who may not otherwise be able to relate should know. And if you saw him in the movie, I think he was played by Raymond St. Jacques, but if you go see again the movie of the Boston Strangler, you will see a part of that book. We are here to talk about a number of other parts, including a superb legislative record on behalf of social fairness.

I am prepared to yield back if the gentlewoman is.

Mrs. CAPITO. Yes.

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

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

First I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to submit their comments and material on this matter.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 682.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE 100 YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ST. MARY'S COOPERATIVE CREDIT ASSOCIATION

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1145) recognizing the 100 year anniversary of the establishment of St. Mary's Cooperative Credit Association, the ''Bank of the People,'' and the birth of the American credit union.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1145

Whereas America's first credit union was established in 1908, in Manchester, New Hampshire, in order to afford hard-working American textile workers access to credit and savings;

Whereas the St. Mary's Cooperative Credit Association, later to be named the ''Bank of the People'', would lay the foundation for the creation of over 8,500 credit unions in America today, which serve over 90,000,000 members;

Whereas on June 26, 1934, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed into law the Federal Credit Union Act, thus enabling credit unions to be organized throughout the United States under the charters approved by the Federal Government;

Whereas St. Mary's Cooperative Credit Association and other credit unions created as a result of the passage of the Federal Credit Union Act played an instrumental role in helping hard-working Americans recover after the Great Depression;

Whereas credit unions have consistently carried on the traditions set by St. Mary's and exemplified the American values of thrift, self-help, and volunteers, carving out a special place for themselves among the Nation's financial institutions;

Whereas America's Credit Union Museum, located on the site of America's first credit union, maintains a mission of ''educating present and future generations on the benefits of cooperative self-help efforts to promote thrift and sensible use of credit'' and preserves the history and tradition of America's credit unions;

Whereas credit unions operate with the credo, ''Not for profit, not for charity-but for

service'' and have consistently reflected this philosophical tradition and the cooperative spirit of ''people helping people'' that gave birth to the Federal Credit Union Act; and

Whereas 2008 will mark the 100th anniversary of the establishment of St. Mary's Cooperative Credit Association in Manchester, New Hampshire, America's first credit union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes the 100th anniversary of the founding of St. Mary's Cooperative Credit Association, the ''Bank of the People'', and the birth of the American credit union.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

□ 1630

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to myself so much time as I may consume.

House Resolution 1145 recognizes the 100-year anniversary of the establishment of St. Mary's Cooperative Credit Association, the Bank of the People, and the birth of the American credit union.

I want to thank Financial Services Chairman BARNEY FRANK for his support in bringing this legislation to the House floor.

St. Mary's Bank Credit Union is the oldest credit union in the United States. It was founded in 1908. Its mission was and continues to be to help New Hampshire residents with a wide range of affordable products and services, including checking accounts, personal loans, real estate loans, business banking and savvy financial planning.

In 1917, the New Hampshire State legislature approved a bill changing the name from St. Mary's Cooperative Credit Association to La Caisse Populaire, Ste-Marie, The People's Bank. In 1925, an amended charter allowed the institution to be called either La Caisse Populaire, Ste-Marie, or St. Mary's Bank.

There are 24 credit unions in the State of New Hampshire with 403,000 members statewide. That's almost one-third of New Hampshire's population. New Hampshire credit unions alone have more than $3.7 billion in assets. Credit unions provide an avenue for families struggling during the credit crunch in these tough financial times to get critical services and low-interest loans. In these tough times we must do everything we can to help working families drowning in debt, and credit unions are important to easing the financial hardships on New Hampshire's working families.

Today's resolution honors our Nation's first credit union from New Hampshire, but the excellent work and important contributions to New Hampshire of St. Mary's stand as a fine example of the work of credit unions all across this Nation, which provide working families access to financial services they must have to prosper.

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 100-year anniversary of the birth of the American credit union, the important role that credit unions have come to play in this country, and I urge support of H. Res. 1145.

Today more than 90 million Americans are members of a credit union. These millions of Americans are the beneficiaries of an experiment that began a century ago with the establishment of St. Mary's Cooperative Credit Association. From these humble beginnings in Manchester, New Hampshire, more than 8,000 credit unions have sprouted up that provide financial services to credit union members all across this Nation.

I would like to recognize credit unions for the important role they play in many distressed urban and rural areas. Many constituents have told me that they would not have been able to afford their own homes, start new business or even attend college without the help of their credit unions. I am also impressed by credit unions' commitment to financial literacy, which has helped credit union members become better educated consumers of financial services.

For these reasons, I support H. Res. 1145, celebrating the 100th anniversary of the American credit union.

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

Mr. HODES. I thank Mrs. CAPITO for her support of this bill, and I also thank my colleague, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, for introducing the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield as much time as she may consume to the distinguished Congresswoman from New Hampshire, CAROL SHEA-PORTER.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague for his support on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of our Nation's first credit union. In 1908, St. Mary's Cooperative Credit Association, later to be renamed the Bank of the People, was established in Manchester, New Hampshire. Manchester had textile mills then. The mill workers' resources were pooled to create credit and savings opportunities for workers, many of whom were immigrants.

In 1934, 26 years after the establishment of St. Mary's, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the Federal Credit Union Act into law, allowing for the organization of credit unions under charters approved by the Federal Government. Today there are over 8,500 credit unions nationwide, and I think it's fair to say that St. Mary's truly laid the foundation for the success of credit unions nationwide.

This credit union model has withstood the test of time. From the Great Depression to modern-day globalization, the emphasis on local communities that is embodied in the concept of the credit union has earned these institutions a special place among our Nation's financial institutions.

St. Mary's even stayed open during the bank holiday of 1933, providing reassurance and help to its worried community. This commitment to community and access to credit and savings services is easy to see.

For example, in 1908, the cost of becoming a member of the St. Mary's Cooperative Credit Association was $5. Today, after 100 years, the cost of signing up for anyone who lives or works in New Hampshire is $5.

That is pretty remarkable.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am proud to honor St. Mary's 100th anniversary, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H. Res. 1145.

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

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1145.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL INFANTRY MUSEUM AND SOLDIER CENTER COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3229) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the legacy of the United States Army Infantry and the establishment of the National Infantry Museum and Soldier Center, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3229

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 ''National Infantry Museum and Soldier Center Commemorative Coin Act''.

SEC. 2. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) $1 SILVER COINS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall mint and issue not more than 350,000 $1 coins in commemoration of the legacy of the United State Army Infantry and the establishment of the National

Infantry Museum and Soldier Center, each of which shall—

(1) weigh 26.73 grams;

(2) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and

(3) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(b) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 3. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the courage, pride, sacrifice, sense of duty, and history of the United States Infantry.

(2) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act, there shall be—

(A) a designation of the value of the coin;

(B) an inscription of the year ''2012''; and

(C) inscriptions of the words ''Liberty'', ''In God We Trust'', ''United States of America'', and ''E Pluribus Unum''.

(b) SELECTION.—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

(1) selected by the Secretary, after consultation with the National Infantry Foundation and the Commission of Fine Arts; and

(2) reviewed by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee.

SEC. 4. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) QUALITY OF COINS.—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) MINT FACILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Only 1 facility of the United States Mint may be used to strike any particular quality of the coins minted under this Act.

(2) USE OF THE UNITED STATES MINT AT WEST POINT, NEW YORK.—It is the sense of the Congress that the coins minted under this Act should be struck at the United States Mint at West Point, New York, to the greatest extent possible.

(c) PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.—The Secretary may issue coins under this Act only during the calendar year beginning on January 1, 2012.

SEC. 5. SALE OF COINS.

(a) SALE PRICE.—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

(1) the face value of the coins;

(2) the surcharge provided in section 6 with respect to such coins; and

(3) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) DISCOUNT.—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

SEC. 6. SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All sales of coins issued under this Act shall include a surcharge of $10 per coin.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be paid to the National Infantry Foundation for the purpose of establishing an endowment to support the maintenance of the National Infantry Museum and Soldier Center following its completion.

(c) AUDITS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall have the right to examine such books, records, documents, and other data of the National Infantry Foundation as may be related to the expenditures of amounts paid under subsection (b).

(d) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no surcharge may be included with respect to the issuance under this Act of any coin during a calendar year if, as of the time of such issuance, the issuance of such coin would result in the number of commemorative coin programs issued during such year to exceed the annual 2 commemorative coin program issuance limitation under section 5112(m)(1) of title 31, United States Code (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act). The Secretary of the Treasury may issue guidance to carry out this subsection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to advise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The oldest and largest branch of the U.S. Army, the U.S. Army infantry, was established on June 14, 1775, when the Continental Congress ordered the formation of 10 companies of riflemen. The riflemen comprised the first armed force of a new Nation, a Nation destined to become the greatest democracy the world has ever known. Since that time, the infantry has gone where other forces could not go and accomplished missions others could not attempt.

The story of the Queen of Battle has been written by individual infantrymen who have done their duty with pride, courage and honor. Their suffering and sacrifices won our freedom, preserved that freedom for over two centuries and will guarantee it in the future. Some were called heroes, some were not, but they were all members of a band of brothers who fought for their country in the cause of freedom.

For more than two centuries the United States infantry has fought alongside other armed forces to protect their freedom. Their missions have sent them around the world and literally brought them face-to-face with the enemy.

From the Siege of Boston of 1775 to San Juan Hill, to the Battle of New Orleans, to the Argonne Forest, where Sergeant York distinguished himself, to the beaches of Normandy, they hunted the enemy in the Shau Valley, parachuted into Panama, and currently subdue our enemies on cold mountainside and hot desert sands in both Iraq and Afghanistan. When policymakers finished talking, when debate has ceased, when negotiations have failed and orders are given, it becomes the mission of the United States infantry to execute our national policy.

Their courage, pride and sense of beauty to country and each other stood tall above any fear they faced. But the battle for our freedom has been costly. As many as 80 percent of all the servicemen and women who have died serving their country were part of the infantry.

To honor the infantry's decorated history, the National Infantry Foundation, in coordination with the United States Army, have broken ground on a new world-class museum honoring them. Located on a 200-acre site of Fort Benning, Georgia, the National Infantry Museum will serve as a tribute to the infantry's legacy of valor and sacrifice. This museum will honor these soldiers for their selfless service to our country, while also preserving for all time the artifacts so poignantly telling their stories.

It will tell the story of our ground soldiers, from the colonial period to Operation Iraqi Freedom. Lessons of the past will be retold to help lead us in the future.

Our children must learn and know that there are values and beliefs worth living for and worth dying for, that the freedom and liberty we enjoy today has come at a high price, and that the American values of patriotism, duty, courage and leadership are the hallmarks of the infantry and must be preserved.

With 290 cosponsors, this bipartisan legislation honors the legacy of the United States infantry with the minting of the infantry coin. Money raised from the sale of the coins will go towards maintaining the National Infantry Museum.

I applaud the efforts of the National Infantry Foundation, its rich history deserves to be kept alive for all who follow. These heroes are perhaps too humble to tell their own story, so we will have to do it for them.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia for authoring this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3229, the National Infantry Museum and Soldier Center Commemorative Coin Act sponsored by our colleague from Georgia, Representative WESTMORELAND, and urge its immediate passage.

This legislation, as we have heard, authorizes the minting and sale of up to 350,000 silver $1 coins in the year 2012, with surcharges on the sale of the coin going to fund work on the National Infantry Museum and Soldier Center being built in Patriot Park at Fort Benning near Columbus, Georgia.

The new National Infantry Museum will honor the legacy of the United States infantry on a 200-acre site that links Columbus, Georgia, with Fort Benning, the home of the infantry. The museum's galleries will trace infantry history from colonial times to the present and be designed to attract and educate all segments of the population with interactive learning, opportunities, high-tech classrooms, theatres and dramatic venues for sacred ceremonies.

An active education program will make the venue a must-see attraction for school groups and students of all ages. The focus of the educational effort will be to teach history, as the history of the United States Army Infantry parallels the history and growth of our country. Additional instruction will focus on leadership skills and the Army values of loyalty, duty, selfless service, respect, honor, integrity and personal courage. Research done by an internationally known museum planning firm estimates annual visitation of up to 400,000, which will make it one of Georgia's top tourist attractions.

In addition to the museum, there will be a 7-acre parade field for infantry and basic training graduations and change-of-command ceremonies. A Walk of Honor flanked by gardens and memorials will lead visitors to the museum and a recreated World War II-era Company Street, featuring the headquarters and sleeping quarters used by General George S. Patton in 1941 will take visitors back to the scenes of our country's largest wartime buildup. The facility will include a 3–D IMAX theater restaurant and museum store.

Visitors to this museum that is scheduled to open in just over a year will meet the infantryman face-to-face and join him on his journey. They will come to understand why an infantryman does what he does, why he puts himself in harm's way in defense of an idea. Surcharges on the sale of these coins will raise funds for a long-term endowment to ensure the maintenance of this important facility.

The infantryman is historic, and it is a heroic idea to build this museum to the infantry. I urge passage of this legislation, commend my colleague for offering it, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) such time as he may consume.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) and 288 other bipartisan cosponsors in support of H.R. 3229, the National Infantry Museum and Soldier Center Commemorative Coin Act.

In the history of organized military operations, the infantry occupies a unique place of honor. Life as an infantryman is a constant barrage of exercise and training often in brutal situations that simulate combat zone operations.

Due to the very nature of an infantry position of work with arms, bombs, and physical stress, casualties occur in both war and peacetime situations. The infantry is the main combatant in war. It fights the battle at the root and cuts off the enemy at the knee. It is at once the most fearless, courageous, noble, intelligent and selfless branch of the military.

□ 1645

From crossing the ice-filled Delaware River to walking the streets of Baghdad, it is the infantryman who is willing to pay the ultimate price to protect American freedoms.

I am proud to represent ''The Home of the Infantry,'' Fort Benning, here in Congress, and I am humbled and honored to be a cosponsor of this legislation. A great nation is measured in part by how it remembers those who defended, preserved, and contributed to its heritage. The United States Army Infantry has contributed greatly over the years at a tremendous human cost, and it is incumbent upon those of us serving in Congress to pay tribute to their sacrifices.

The minting of the infantry coin will not cost the taxpayers any money and the sale of the coins will completely cover the cost of the minting. The mint will actually receive a small profit from every coin that is sold. Money raised from the sale of the coins will help make sure that the National Infantry Museum located at Fort Benning will always be the keeper of the history, artifacts, and memories of our brave Army Infantry.

The National Infantry Museum sits on a 200-acre site that will serve as a tribute to the infantry's legacy of valor and sacrifice, and will also serve as a functional area for basic training graduations and other special and community events. The museum will honor infantry soldiers for their selfless service to our country while also preserving for all time the history that so poignantly tells their stories.

I want to thank Major General (Retired) Jerry White and Colonel (Retired) Greg Camp for their years of hard work and dedication in making the National Infantry Museum a reality. In addition, I would like to thank Congressman LYNN WESTMORELAND as well as Edward Jones from Congressman WESTMORELAND's office, and Jonathan Halpern and Ed Larkin from my staff for their steadfast efforts on this project.

I urge my colleagues to please join me in supporting this legislation and in supporting our proud Army Infantry.

I urge the adoption of this legislation.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. It is my honor to be here today, and I do want to thank my colleague, SANFORD BISHOP, for his hard work and helping me get the required number of signatures to get this commemorative coin, and anybody who has ever done that knows what a challenge it is to get the number of signatures required. I want to thank him and his staff; and also Edward Jones from my staff for all of their hard work and dedication that we have had over the months trying to get the requisite number of signatures.

For more than 200 years the United States Infantry has sought to protect our freedom. H.R. 3229 will honor the legacy of the United States Infantry with the minting of a commemorative coin. Eighty percent, as has been mentioned before here today, of American casualties are young men and women who have lost their life in battle were members of the infantry.

The Infantry Museum Foundation, in coordination with the United States Army, have already broken ground on this new National Infantry Museum. It has been my honor to visit it, and with General White walk through the street, the World War II street, to see the buildings that will afford our young men and women an opportunity to see what Army life was like during World War II. It also has the parade field which is now under construction, and will be a place where many ceremonies in the future will be held. Also, this building is going to be a green building. It is high tech. There is geothermal heating and cooling in the building. And as Mrs. CAPITO mentioned, a professional museum planner has worked very hard on this.

I would like to tell one story General White told me. In doing some of the exhibits, they have one exhibit where paratroopers are flying on a plane to jump out, and the architect of this one ride told General White, ''I don't know how we are doing on this. A lot of the people who are testing it are getting motion sickness, almost to a point of losing their lunch.''

And General White said, ''Then you're almost there.''

This museum is going to be a place where people can go in and feel the sense of battle that these young men and women feel.

And as you know, Fort Benning is the place where about 80 percent of our young men and women go that are going into harm's way in Iraq and Afghanistan and other places that we may send them, and it will give a great opportunity for them to go and see some of the legacy that has come before them and also give their families a chance to visit this great facility.

So it is with great honor that I introduce this bill, and I want to thank all of the cosponsors of this bill. It was amazing the number of people that I would go up to and ask to sign this legislation that said, you know, I spent 3 months of my life at Fort Benning going through my military boot camp; and so I hope that when this thing is open next year, that these Members that have gone through there and experienced that type of military life will

come down and join us in a grand opening.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to please support this resolution.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3229, and would like to commend my good friend from Georgia, Congressman LYNN WESTMORELAND, for offering it.

The bill before us today will allow coins to be issued in support of the National Infantry Museum and Soldier Center during the year 2012. The coins will be emblematic of the courage, pride, sacrifice, sense of duty, and history of the infantry, and the proceeds received from issuance of the coin will be used to establish an endowment to support the maintenance of the National Infantry Museum and Soldier Center.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Armed Services Committee who previously had Ft. Benning—the Home of the Infantry—in my district, I have long supported the efforts of the National Infantry Foundation to establish the new National Infantry Museum and wholeheartedly support the issuance of this coin in support of the museum.

The National Infantry Museum and Soldier Center at Patriot Park will honor the 233-year heritage of the Army's largest branch, the infantry. This museum will be instrumental in helping to educate future generations about the vital role of the infantry in the history of our Nation. Furthermore, this building will honor the men and women who serve in and support the infantry, and preserve the infantry's legacy of service.

This legacy of service is indeed quite remarkable, Mr. Speaker. The first successful and systematic training of the U.S. infantry can be tracked back to Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, in 1778. It was not until 1826 that a formal post for infantry training was established, and over the course of history, the Infantry School has existed at the Jefferson Barracks in Missouri, Ft. Leavenworth in Kansas, in Monterrey, California, at Ft. Sill in Oklahoma, and at Fort Benning—the "Home of the Infantry"—since 1918. Through the years the Infantry School at Ft. Benning has gradually emerged as the most influential infantry center in the modern world. The school has either trained in its officer courses or honed in its command structure some of the Nation's most prominent military figures, including five-star generals Omar Bradley, Dwight Eisenhower, and George Marshall, as well as George Patton and Colin Powell. And, Mr. Speaker, over the course of American history, nearly 80 percent of all servicemen and women who have died serving our Nation were part of the infantry.

This museum has one mission, Mr. Speaker: to honor the infantryman and his more than two centuries of proud service to our great Nation. This coin will support this mission.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following correspondence:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 22, 2008.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman, Financial Services Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK: I am writing regarding H.R. 3229, the "National Infantry Museum and Soldier Center Commemorative Coin Act."

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means maintains jurisdiction over bills that raise revenue. H.R. 3229 contains a provision that establishes a surcharge for the sale of commemorative coins that are minted under the bill, and thus falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

However, as part of our ongoing understanding regarding commemorative coin bills and in order to expedite this bill for Floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of Conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3229, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the record.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2008.

Hon. CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing in response to your letter regarding H.R. 3229, the "National Infantry Museum and Soldier Center Commemorative Coin Act," which was introduced in the House and referred to the Committee on Financial Services on July 30, 2007. It is my understanding that this bill will be scheduled for Floor consideration shortly.

I wish to confirm our mutual understanding on this bill. As you know, section 7 of the bill establishes a surcharge for the sale of commemorative coins that are minted under the bill. I acknowledge your Committee's jurisdictional interest in such surcharges as revenue matters. However, I appreciate your willingness to forego Committee action on H.R. 3229 in order to allow the bill to come to the Floor expeditiously. I agree that your decision to forego further action on this bill will not prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation. I would support your request for conferees on those provisions within your jurisdiction should this bill be the subject of a House-Senate conference.

I will include this exchange of letters in the Congressional Record when this bill is considered by the House. Thank you again for your assistance.

BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge passage of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I encourage passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3229, 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.

MOTHER'S DAY CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2268) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the establishment of Mother's Day, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2268

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 "Mother's Day Centennial Commemorative Coin Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress hereby finds as follows:

(1) Anna Jarvis, who is considered to be the founder of the modern Mother's Day, was born in Webster, West Virginia on May 1, 1864.

(2) A resident of Grafton, West Virginia, Anna Jarvis dedicated much of her adult life to honoring her mother, Anna Reeves Jarvis, who passed on May 9, 1905.

(3) In 1908, the Andrews Methodist Episcopal Church of Grafton, West Virginia, officially proclaimed the third anniversary of Anna Reeves Jarvis' death to be Mother's Day.

(4) In 1910, West Virginia Governor, William Glasscock, issued the first Mother's Day Proclamation encouraging all West Virginians to attend church and wear white carnations.

(5) On May 8, 1914, the Sixty-Third Congress approved H. J. Res. 263 designating the second Sunday in May to be observed as Mother's Day and encouraging all Americans to display the American flag at their homes as a public expression of the love and reverence for the mothers of our Nation.

(6) On May 9, 1914, President Woodrow Wilson issued a Presidential Proclamation directing government officials to display the American flag on all government buildings and inviting the American people to display the flag at their homes on the second Sunday of May as a public expression of the love and reverence for the mothers of our nation.

SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) DENOMINATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall mint and issue not more than 400,000 $1 coins each of which shall—

(1) weigh 26.73 grams;

(2) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and

(3) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(b) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the 100th anniversary of President Wilson's proclamation designating the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day.

(b) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act there shall be—

(1) a designation of the value of the coin;

(2) an inscription of the year ''2014''; and

(3) inscriptions of the words ''Liberty'', ''In God We Trust'', ''United States of America'', and ''E Pluribus Unum''.

(c) SELECTION.—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

(1) selected by the Secretary after consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts; and

(2) reviewed by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee established under section 5135 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) QUALITY OF COINS.—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) COMMENCEMENT OF ISSUANCE.—The Secretary may issue coins minted under this Act beginning January 1, 2014, except that the Secretary may initiate sales of such coins, without issuance, before such date.

(c) TERMINATION OF MINTING AUTHORITY.—No coins shall be minted under this Act after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) SALE PRICE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of the face value of the coins, the surcharge required under section 7(a) for the coins, and the cost of designing and issuing such coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, and marketing).

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS AT A DISCOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) DISCOUNT.—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.

(a) SURCHARGE REQUIRED.—All sales shall include a surcharge of $10 per coin.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges which are received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid by the Secretary as follows:

(1) ½ to the Susan G. Komen for the Cure for the purpose of furthering research funded by the organization.

(2) ½ to the National Osteoporosis Foundation for the purpose of furthering research funded by the Foundation.

(c) AUDITS.—The Susan G. Komen for the Cure and the National Osteoporosis Foundation shall be subject to the audit requirements of section 5134(f)(2) of title 31, United States Code, with regard to the amounts received by the respective organizations under subsection (b).

(d) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no surcharge may be included with respect to the issuance under this Act of any coin during a calendar year if, as of the time of such issuance, the issuance of such coin would result in the number of commemorative coin programs issued during such year to exceed the annual 2 commemorative coin program issuance limitation under section 5112(m)(1) of title 31, United States Code (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act). The Secretary of the Treasury may issue guidance to carry out this subsection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous materials therein.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2268, a bill introduced by the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) to create a commemorative coin honoring the 100th anniversary of Mother's Day. The 297 bipartisan cosponsors of this bill made clear that the Congress strongly supports recognizing the importance of Mother's Day in this way, and I am delighted to add my voice to this chorus.

Mother's Day was first proclaimed in 1908 by the Matthews Methodist Episcopal Church of Grafton, West Virginia, in honor of one mother, Anna Reeves Jarvis.

Congress designated the second Sunday in May to be observed as Mother's Day, and it was recognized as a national day to honor all mothers by President Woodrow Wilson on May 9, 1914.

The bill calls for a silver dollar to be minted in 2014 with a design commemorating President Wilson's proclamation. The $10 surcharge proceeds from their sale is to go to the Susan G. Komen Foundation, a household word and organization in combating breast cancer, and to the National Osteoporosis Foundation for research purposes.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill honoring Mother's Day and our Nation's mothers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for her support of this bill, and I am very excited it is before the House today.

There is a very special bond that exists between mothers and their children that words cannot describe. For the lucky ones among us, a mother—our, someone else's, or a mother figure such as a grandmother—has made all of the difference in our lives. The tender care, unending support, and the unconditional love of a mother truly are life's greatest blessing for a child.

Every year on the second Sunday in May this Nation honors its mothers. We seek to acknowledge their tireless support and their enduring love. My colleague has spoken about how this tradition began, but I would like to go over it because it is a proud history of tradition for our State of West Virginia.

In 1868, Anna Reeves Jarvis organized a committee in her home town of Grafton, West Virginia, to sponsor a mother's friendship day. The purpose was to reunite families that had been divided during the Civil War. However, Anna Reeves Jarvis' dream of an annual memorial Mother's Day commemorating each mother for the service she renders to humanity had not gained widespread support during her lifetime.

However, her daughter, Anna M. Jarvis, took on her mother's cause. On May 9, 1907, the second anniversary of her mother's death, Anna invited friends to her home and outlined her plan to make her mother's dream of a nationwide day in honor of mothers a reality.

Within a year, working with Andrews Methodist Episcopal Church, progress was made and on Sunday, May 10, 1908, church services were held in which mothers were honored. They were held in Grafton, West Virginia, and in Philadelphia.

This initial celebration was only the beginning. Jarvis worked for years to popularize her idea. She wrote letters to churches and business leaders, to newspaper editors and to Members of Congress. She was even able to bring the drive for a Mother's Day observance to the attention of the President of the United States.

Her efforts were rewarded. In 1910, the governor of West Virginia, William Glassock, issued a Mother's Day proclamation. By the next year, Mother's Day services were held in all States of the Union. In 1914, President Woodrow Wilson, responding to a joint resolution in Congress, issued a proclamation setting aside the second Sunday every May for ''displaying the American flag as a public expression of our love and reverence for the mothers of our country.''

Today, Mother's Day is celebrated throughout the world. In the United States, the President and governors issue proclamations recognizing mothers, churches perform services in honor of mothers everywhere, and the hearts of all are filled with all of our love for our mothers.

This bill would authorize the minting of silver $1 coins in honor of the women who have sacrificed so much for their children. It is a small token of our love and admiration, but one that will hopefully express the love we hold for our mothers. Surcharges of the sale of the coins, as my colleague mentioned, will go to the Susan G. Komen Foundation and the National Osteoporosis Foundation for research.

I chose both of these foundations because I have great admiration for the work they do for men and women, but particularly for women as we battle the difficult tragedies of breast cancer and the growing difficulties associated with osteoporosis which over 80 percent of the people it strikes are women.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution, but I would like to take this opportunity to thank my mother. She has made a difference in my life. I appreciate her unconditional love and

support, her willingness to help me when I fell, and to push me forward when I could not find the strength myself.

I love you, Mom, and thanks.

With that, being from West Virginia, I would like to say, too, that our sense of community and family is very strong. We are so very proud of Anna Jarvis' vision, her idea and her dedication to celebrate her own mother, and we are proud to be known as the birthplace of Mother's Day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but would also like to recognize my own mother, as I am sure all of us in this body appreciate our mothers. This is an important resolution, and I am proud to be the Democratic sponsor with my good friend from West Virginia, and I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2268, the Mother's Day Centennial Commemorative Coin Act. First, I would like to thank Representative CAPITO for authoring this legislation before us today.

H.R. 2268 would instruct the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue $1 coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of President Wilson's proclamation designating the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day.

As an original cosponsor of this bill, I would like to take this opportunity to thank mothers across this nation for what they have done, do, and will do to keep our families and our country, strong.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take the personal privilege of recognizing my mother, Mrs. Helen Gingrey. Ninety years young, my mother instilled in me the very values and work ethic that prepared me to serve in these hallowed halls.

Her example testifies to the fact that we owe so very much to our mothers, to our fathers, to all those who cleared the way and smoothed the paths for us to succeed and realize our potential. We should honor their work not just in word but in deed—by ensuring a smoother, clearer path for the next generation—for our children and our grandchildren.

And so, I call upon my colleagues to demonstrate their appreciation for mothers everywhere by supporting this legislation.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following correspondence:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 22, 2008.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman, Financial Services Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK: I am writing regarding H.R. 2268, the ''Mother's Day Centennial Commemorative Coin Act.''

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means maintains jurisdiction over bills that raise revenue. H.R. 2268 contains a provision that establishes a surcharge for the sale of commemorative coins that are minted under the bill, and thus falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

However, as part of our ongoing understanding regarding commemorative coin bills and in order to expedite this bill for Floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of Conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 2268, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the record.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2008.

Hon. CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing in response to your letter regarding H.R. 2268, the ''Mother's Day Centennial Commemorative Coin Act,'' which was introduced in the House and referred to the Committee on Financial Services on May 10, 2007. It is my understanding that this bill will be scheduled for Floor consideration shortly.

I wish to confirm our mutual understanding on this bill. As you know, section 7 of the bill establishes a surcharge for the sale of commemorative coins that are minted under the bill. I acknowledge your Committee's jurisdictional interest in such surcharges as revenue matters. However, I appreciate your willingness to forego committee action on H.R. 2268 in order to allow the bill to come to the Floor expeditiously. I agree that your decision to forego further action on this bill will not prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation. I would support your request for conferees on those provisions within your jurisdiction should this bill be the subject of a House-Senate conference.

I will include this exchange of letters in the Congressional Record when this bill is considered by the House. Thank you again for your assistance.

BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2268, 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.

□ 1700

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 1063, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 318, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 336, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining votes in this series will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

MARKING THE 225TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TREATY OF PARIS OF 1783

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1063, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1063.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

YEAS—414

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

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

NOT VOTING—19

Braley (IA)
Burgess
Ferguson
Gillibrand
Hinchey
Holt
Hulshof
McCrery
Meek (FL)
Ortiz
Payne
Pence
Pickering
Platts
Rush
Tancredo
Wamp
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

□ 1724

Messrs. GOHMERT and DELAHUNT changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF SANITATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 318, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 318, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

YEAS—411

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

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Culberson

NOT VOTING—21

Baca
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Donnelly
Ellison
Ferguson
Foster
Gillibrand
Holt
Hulshof
McCrery
Meek (FL)
Ortiz
Payne
Pence
Pickering
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Tancredo
Wamp
Wilson (SC)

□ 1731

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE SACRIFICES AND CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 336, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 336.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]

YEAS—417

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

NOT VOTING—16

Baird
Braley (IA)
Cooper
Ferguson
Gillibrand
Holt
Hulshof
McCrery
Meek (FL)
Ortiz
Payne
Pence
Rush
Tancredo
Wamp
Wilson (SC)

□ 1739

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to § 20702(b) of H.J. Res. 20, P.L. 110–5, I am notifying the House that I am designating Ali Qureshi, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer for Operations and Walter Edwards, Deputy CAO for Customer Solutions to act in my stead in the event of my death, resignation, separation from office or disability until a Chief Administrative Officer is appointed pursuant to 2 U.S.C. § 75a–1.

Sincerely,

DANIEL P. BEARD.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6063, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–707) on the resolution (H. Res. 1257) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6063) to authorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1745

ENERGY PRICES

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, this weekend, the national average of a gallon of gasoline broke the $4 mark. This is an all-time high, and our citizens deserve action from Congress.

The Democratic leadership needs to pull their heads out of the sand and join us in developing a strong national energy policy. The Republican plan proposed will develop and increase our domestic supply of oil, which will drive down the cost of gasoline at the pump. In Louisiana, we take great pride in our offshore drilling, and we drill in an environmentally safe way. Everyone in Louisiana knows that the best place to fish is right next to an oil rig in the Gulf.

I call on Speaker PELOSI and the Democrats in Congress to stop locking relief at the pump and finally join us in passing legislation that will remove the obstacles that limit our refining capacity, explore alternative sources of energy, and increase the supply of domestic oil and gas to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

These are all policies which will lower gas prices. This energy crisis is real. The time for Congress to act is now.

WE'VE GOT TO WAKE UP AND DRILL

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I was privileged enough to go with a number of Congressmen two weeks ago to the Middle East and went to Saudi Arabia. We had some great meetings over there. We met with the Minister of Petroleum and many of the other people who are directly involved with the oil situation, and here is their response to us as we complained to them about the high price of gasoline. Now, keep in mind America imports 60 percent of its oil. This is what these guys said to us: ''You have the nerve and the audacity to come here, all the way to Saudi Arabia, to complain about your oil prices when you won't even drill yourself, when you won't even build refineries.''

President Bush was there a month earlier, and they increased the capacity to 300 million barrels a day. And we can't even buy it because we don't have the refineries. We've got to get our head out of the sand.

China right now, with Cuba, is drilling 45 miles off the coast of Florida. We've got to wake up and drill and use our own resources.

HONORING THE PEOPLE OF HUGO, MINNESOTA

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the people of Hugo, Minnesota.

It was just several weeks ago that the people of Hugo encountered a terrible tragedy; it occurred at 5 o'clock on a quiet Sunday afternoon. A tornado touched down in Hugo, and within 30 seconds over 50 to 60 homes were completely flattened, between 150 and 200 homes were uninhabitable. But the wonderful spirit, Madam Speaker, among the people of Hugo, the fire department, the police department, the State Patrol, almost instantaneously had a wonderful textbook outpouring of rebuilding.

Within one week, the community of Hugo had so many volunteers they had to turn them away. They completely removed all the debris from the city within one week, and now they're on the road to rebuilding.

I congratulate Mayor Fran Miron. I congratulate City Administrator Mike Ericsson. And I congratulate all the people of Hugo who have exuded the spirit of Minnesota, the loving experience of loving a neighbor. And that's what people in Hugo do best, they love each other.

So congratulations to the people of Hugo. You will rebuild. You will be back. And I'm so honored to represent you here in this great House.

THE DRILL-NOTHING CONGRESS

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about the drill-nothing Congress. I wish I had thought of that phrase, but it's the headline in Investor's Business Daily, Monday, June 9.

The average price for regular gas at $4 a gallon over the weekend. Gas prices have risen 75 percent since NANCY PELOSI took over. Where is the energy independence Democrats promised 2 years ago? That's the subheadline.

Now I am going to quote from the article. In November, 2006, House Speaker-Elect NANCY PELOSI issued a press release touting the Democrats ''common-sense plan to help bring down skyrocketing gas prices.'' She accused the oil companies of price gouging. The price of gasoline, when the Democrats took control of Congress, was around $2.25 per gallon. The average price of regular gas crept over the $4 per gallon barrier over the weekend, as measured by AAA and the Oil Price Information Service.

This represents a more than 75 percent increase in the retail price of a gallon of gasoline on Pelosi's watch. Call it the Pelosi premium we are all now paying.

Madam Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the rest of the June 9, 2008, article of Investor's Business Daily.

A Gallup poll released in May showed that 57% of the American people wanted the U.S. to drill in coastal and wilderness areas. The percentage of Americans who bought Pelosi's line about price gouging fell from 34% in May 2007 to 20% in May 2008. It could be a winning issue for the Republicans and John McCain.

More than 15 billion barrels of oil have been sent down the Alaskan pipeline from Prudhoe Bay, some 60 miles to the west of ANWR, over the past three decades, much more than the six months' supply expected in the beginning by those who predicted a similar environmental disaster there.

The local caribou and other critters have thrived. Yet, Pelosi and the Democrats want to keep ANWR's estimated 10.6 billion barrels of oil off the market and out of our gas tanks.

Buried in a Department of Interior Appropriations bill passed in December 2007 was an amendment proposed by Rep. Mark Udall, D–Colo., passed by a 219–215 vote in June, that prevented the establishment of regulations for leasing lands to drill for oil shale.

The Western U.S. is estimated to have reserves of a trillion barrels (yes, that's the real number) trapped in porous shale rock, an amount three times the oil reserves of Saudi Arabia. On May 15, 2008, the Senate Appropriations Committee in a 15–14 party line vote rejected an amendment by Sen. Wayne Allard, R–Colo., to allow oil shale drilling and overturn the Udall moratorium.

The U.S. Congress has voted consistently to keep 85% of America's offshore oil and gas off-limits, while China and Cuba drill 60 miles from Key West, Fla. The U.S. Minerals Management Service says that the restricted areas contain 86 billion barrels of oil and 420 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

There are 3,200 oil rigs off the coast of Louisiana. During Katrina, not a single drop was spilled. More than 7 billion barrels have been pumped from these wells over the past quarter-century, yet only one thousandth of one percent has been spilled.

A study by Louisiana's Sea Grant college shows that there's 50 times more marine life around oil platforms that act as artificial reefs than in the surrounding mud bottoms. Some 85% of Louisiana fishing trips involve fishing around these offshore rigs.

The Flower Garden coral reefs lie off the Louisiana-Texas border. They are surrounded by oil platforms that have been pumping for 50 years.

According to federal biologist G.P. Schmahl, ''The Flower Gardens are much healthier, more pristine than anything in the Florida Keys. It was a surprise to me. And I think it's a surprise to most people.''

We would suggest that John McCain revisit his reservations about ANWR and run against the drill-nothing Congress. Energy development and the environment are not mutually exclusive.

In fact, we would suggest that the first joint town hall meeting with Barack Obama proposed by McCain be held on one of those offshore Louisiana rigs.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BERKLEY). The Chair will recognize Members for Special Order speeches without prejudice to the resumption of legislative business.

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 Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RETURN SOVEREIGNTY TO IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I have believed for a long time now that the best way to bring peace to Iraq is to launch a diplomatic surge to encourage regional and international partners to get involved in addressing Iraq's problems.

The first step in this process would be to withdraw all of our troops and military contracts, which would create a positive climate, a climate that would allow diplomatic efforts to actually begin. But today, the administration is taking our country in quite the opposite direction. It is negotiating long-term security arrangements with the Iraqi Government, arrangements that could actually keep us bogged down in Iraq for decades and destroy Iraq's sovereignty.

It is hard to know exactly what the administration is demanding in the negotiations because it has refused to share the information with Congress. Reports, however, and whatever we can find out, indicates that the administration is asking for unilateral authority over all U.S. military operations in Iraq, the right to arrest and detain Iraqi citizens, legal immunity for American military contractors, control over Iraqi borders and air space, and perhaps permanent bases, making Iraq a virtual American colony.

All this has brought a wave of protest from Iraqis of all political and religious stripes. It seems that we have finally succeeded in uniting the Iraqis against us. An Iraqi Government spokesman actually has said, ''The Iraqi Government's vision differs from that of the Americans, who think the agreements will give them almost totally a free hand in Iraq, and that, as a military force, they must have absolute powers.''

In addition, members of the Iraqi Parliament representing the majority of parties in that body wrote a letter to the Congress which was released just last week by my colleague on the Foreign Relations Committee, Representative DELAHUNT, the chairman on the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight. This letter includes a demand for the withdrawal of American troops. It said, in part, that ''the majority of Iraqi representatives strongly reject any military security, economic, commercial, agricultural investment or political agreement with the United States that is not linked to clear mechanisms that obligate the occupying American military forces to fully withdraw from Iraq in accordance with the declared timetable, and without leaving any military bases, soldiers, or hired fighters.''

Madam Speaker, by moving for a permanent military presence in Iraq, the administration is sending the wrong message to the Iraqi people. The American people are also getting that message, along with the rest of the world. It says to the Iraqi people that they will continue to live under foreign military occupation with no end in sight. It tells the American people that the occupation will continue to drain our resources at a time when our citizens are facing dire economic problems at home. And it proves to the world that the administration is determined to tie the next President to the failed policies of the past.

The best course for America is to begin the immediate, responsible redeployment of our troops and military contractors out of Iraq, as this House has mandated. But since the administration is clearly unwilling to do that, the next best thing is for Congress to demand full knowledge of the negotiations, with the right to approve any agreements.

Madam Speaker, the United States must give full national sovereignty back to Iraq, and we must stop acting like an arrogant occupying power. After more than 5 years of bloody occupation, this is no time to talk about staying in Iraq forever. Instead, it is time to give the Iraq people back their independence. And it is time to bring our brave troops home.

□ 1800

MAGINOT LINE OF INDIFFERENCE

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, the United States has gone to war numerous times to protect the sovereignty of nations. Sixty-four years ago on June 6, thousands of GIs went ashore in France because its borders were invaded by the Nazis. In fact, most of the European countries and north Africa had their sovereign borders overrun by the Nazis.

In the Pacific, the United States fought the Japanese because they had invaded the borders of our territories and the borders of China and Indochina. Americans died. Over 400,000 died protecting all of those borders during World War II.

After World War II, the United States defended the borders of Western Europe nations against that ''evil empire'' of the Soviet Union and Soviet Communism. In fact, we still have troops in Western Europe. Sixty years later, we still defend those borders. And that is a long time. Then there was the Korean War. In its aftermath with 50,000 Americans killed, we fulfilled our commitment to defend South Korea, and we still have 30,000 troops on that border with North Korea, 50 years plus defending someone else's border. We defend the borders of Iraq and part of the Balkans even to this day.

But Madam Speaker, I wonder why we don't have the same commitment to America's borders? Doesn't that bother anyone? Having been to the southern border of the United States numerous times and seeing the ''Maginot Line of Indifference,'' I am puzzled why we seem to ignore the thousands of trespassers, or invaders, if I can use that term, that come from all nations and cross our border without permission.

When Mexico invaded the United States at Brownsville, Texas, in 1846, we went to war to defend the southern border. When the outlaw, now folk hero, General Pancho Villa and his bandits came into the United States from Mexico to commit crimes in New Mexico, the United States sent General Blackjack Pershing to go after him, even if it meant going to Mexico.

That was during a time when our sovereignty was important to the Nation and to the Federal Government. But the invasion now is much worse. Some estimates put the number of illegals in the United States between 15 and 35 million people. Why don't we have the same moral resolve we had in World War II and Korea to defend our borders from this stealth invasion? It is the duty of government to protect the citizens of this Nation and the States.

I will read from the Constitution, something we probably ought to do more of in this Congress. Article IV section 4 of the United States Constitution says, ''The United States shall guarantee to every State in this union a Republican Form of Government and shall protect each of them against invasion.'' Invasion means intrusion or encroachment. Why doesn't the Government just simply follow the Constitution and prevent invasion into the United States?

Now some Chamberlain appeasers want to just tell the illegals they can stay. After all, we can use the cheap plantation labor, the appeasers say. Never mind the crimes some of them commit, never mind how they take some social services without paying for them, never mind how some live off Americans and lawful immigrants. Never mind it is illegal to be in the United States without permission.

So why, Madam Speaker, do we defend the borders of other nations but not our own? The Feds say they are trying. But the proof, or the lack of it, is in the results. The border with Mexico is violent. The border is porous, and the border is being invaded. The most powerful nation in the history of the world can stop the secret invasion if it first had the moral resolve to do so, and second, the courage to do whatever is necessary to stop the onslaught of invaders.

Maybe we should even use the National Guard or returning troops from Iraq on our southern border. But doing so would take leadership that is committed in word and deed to protecting the sovereignty of this Nation.

The United States is worth it, Madam Speaker, even if the amnesty crowd and Mexican President Calderon doesn't like it.

And that's just the way it is.

CELEBRATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROBERT J. DOLE VA MEDICAL CENTER IN WICHITA, KANSAS

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to congratulate and to pay tribute to the Robert J. Dole Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in my home State in Wichita, Kansas, for 75 years providing outstanding services and care to our Nation's heroes, our veterans.

Caring for those who have borne the battle is our Nation's utmost responsibility. And for 75 years, the Dole VA Hospital has helped our Nation honor this commitment. Let us take time today to pay tribute to the work of the Dole VA leadership staff and volunteers and the Kansas veterans they

serve each day. Veterans are the people I hold in highest regard only to be exceeded by those individuals who serve those veterans.

Under the skillful leadership of the VA Network 15 Director Dr. Peter Almenoff and hospital director Tom Sanders, the Dole VA Hospital has worked to fulfill its mission: ''To improve the health and wellbeing of veterans we are honored to serve.'' In fact, the Dole VA has received national acclaim in its service to veterans. On a recent rating of VA hospitals for quality of veterans' care, the Dole VA hospital ranked third in the Nation. Our country is fortunate to have these individuals who made the commitment to serve these veterans. What we do in Washington, D.C., pales in comparison to what these individuals do each and every day for our veterans.

On November 16, 1933, the first patient, a veteran of the Spanish-American War, was admitted to the hospital. At that time, there were 150 beds. By the end of 1933, all beds had been filled. In 2008 over 2,000 admissions were recorded at the hospital. The Center now provides a full range of primary, acute and extended care services to veterans from 59 counties in Kansas. Many of these counties make up the First Congressional District that I represent. And despite covering more than 57,000 square miles, the First District is without a VA hospital of its own. Veterans in central and western Kansas rely on the care and services provided by the Dole VA. We are blessed to have such an outstanding facility in Kansas available to those who have given so much on our behalf.

Last month, I had the opportunity to participate in the 75th anniversary jubilee in Wichita attended by the hospital's namesake, former United States Senator Bob Dole, a member of the country's greatest generation and an unending advocate for veterans. Also attending the celebration was the Veterans Department Secretary James Peake, Kansas Senators PAT ROBERTS and SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas Congressman TODD TIAHRT, and Wichita Mayor Carl Brewer.

We listened to Dole speak of his own military service and recovery from wounds he received in World War II in a VA hospital, as well as his leadership in building the World War II Memorial, as co-chair of the President's Commission on Care for America's Returning Wounded Warriors. With his legacy of service and sacrifice to our country and its veterans, Senator DOLE is an appropriate namesake and inspiration for the hard work and dedication of the leadership, staff and volunteers at the Dole VA.

Again, I wish to congratulate the Dole VA Medical Center for 75 years of care to our country's veterans. On behalf of veterans in Kansas, I thank them for their service.

A RED HERRING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, the New York Times CBS spring poll has reported that 68 percent of Americans favor putting restrictions on what is called free trade to protect our domestic industries. That is the highest level of concern since the poll began asking the question in the 1980s, and a 12 percent rise just since 2000.

Only 14 percent of Americans surveyed last year by the Pew Global Attitudes Project said increase in trade was very good for our country. And the American people, by a healthy majority, view NAFTA and NAFTA-like trade agreements as flawed and costing our people more job washout every day. In other words, a majority of people in our country not only believe something is wrong with current U.S. trade policy, enough of them have now been hurt directly by unfair trade that they now know personally what a bad trade deal can yield. When you are almost $1 trillion in trade deficit, something is fundamentally wrong.

So what does one of America's premier newspapers place on its editorial page this week in response? Do they look inside the gaping job loss and trade deficits our Nation is experiencing and attempt to reshape the policy to again produce a better yield in jobs for our people and Nation? No. They put their head in the sand. And they do so in the form of an editorial that is nothing more than a red herring. Actually, this looks like a herring to me. A red herring. You've heard that old expression which means someone distracts attention from the real issue. They state a half-truth and then wage a fierce argument against that falsehood as if the falsehood were true. It is an old trick.

The New York Times article written by Eduardo Porter, is a complete red herring. He said that people who worry about job loss in America related to trade want to stop trade. He said that those people are isolationists. Nothing could be more untrue.

I say to Mr. Porter the vast majority of the American people want to fix what is wrong with these trade deals. And there is plenty wrong. If he fails to grasp that, he might, as the old expression goes, ''fail to see the wall in front of his face and run right into it.'' Mr. Porter alleges that the majority of Americans who favor putting restrictions on free trade to protect domestic industries will push the new President to be undiplomatic and unreasonable when it comes to what Porter calls economic protectionism.

Mr. Porter, reciprocity is not protectionism. With nearly $1 trillion net trade deficit sucking more and more jobs out of this country, he should be championing balancing our trade agreement and creating jobs here in America again. But he opines that other countries, like Canada, Sweden and Germany, in which fewer people favor such measures, are scared that a new trade model would bring about what he calls a trade war. Yeah, you scare them, right? Try to scare the American people.

What Mr. Porter does not understand is that America's hostility is not to international trade, but to trade agreements and deficits that cause job outsourcing, job losses and cuts to middle-class benefits and health coverage. Americans support trade that wins for them and that brings prosperity to America again. They want trade that builds a middle class here at home and abroad. They are tired of being jerked around by the multinational companies that trade them for $1 an hour worker in China who has no hope of a better life. They want that worker to get a fair deal too. They support trade that creates jobs, America used to do that before we fell into deficit, and exports American products again to customers around the world. They broadly oppose the failed NAFTA model that has sucked jobs and money away from America to corrupt and closed markets that keep their boot on the necks of workers around the world who have no rights. Porter claims trade hawks want to disengage from the world. Wrong again. Nothing could be further from the truth. Americans wants to engage. They want reciprocal trade, balanced trade and free trade that builds a middle class, not shatters it.

That is why a number of us introduced a bill he mentions offhand, the trade act, H.R. 6180 which currently has over 50 sponsors and sets guidelines for responsible trade that encourages free trade among free people. Porter says that Europe and Germany don't share our point of view and we should be more like them. I will agree with him on one account. We should be more like them because they have trade balances, not trade deficits. They are sitting pretty compared to ours. We have a $711.6 trade deficit in 2007, and they, in fact, have surpluses. So Mr. Porter ought to be fighting for a strong America. And that means free trade among free people.

Indeed, the latest monthly trade figures from April show our nation has just gone further in the hole at $60.9 billion deficit. More red ink = more lost jobs and more workers falling out of the middle class. Yet Canada and Sweden both managed surpluses of about $30 billion in U.S. dollars. Their trade numbers are moving in the right direction. Germany commanded a trade surplus of more than $185 billion. I ask Mr. Porter, why shouldn't America move its accounts to balance and surplus? Why does he favor more job washout? More loss of income for our people? More red ink? Furthermore, workers in those countries need not worry about losing their healthcare since the government provides assistance. Those countries trade in order to make money, but our trade policies have resulted in a hemorrhage of our resources.

The New York Times and Mr. Porter ought to be fighting for a strong America—and that

means a strong economy evidenced by balanced trade accounts, not deficits. A strong America means keeping and creating good jobs, with living wages and benefits like healthcare. And a strong America means trade relationships that bring strength to our economy and our trading partners', not a race to the bottom or human rights violations.

America ought to be fighting for opening the closed markets of the world, like Japan's and China's, not putting our heads in the sand while our competitors levy non-tariff barriers against America's goods and services. If we are not trading with a free country with a free market and free people, we are not trading freely at all. We are paying these countries to continue unfair economic and political practices at the cost of our own prosperity and standard of living.

We ought to be fighting for America's middle class, not outsourcing their jobs to China, India, and Mexico. We should not oppose free trade; we should support free trade among free people.

[From the New York Times, June 7, 2008]

EUROPE FEARS A POST-BUSH UNILATERALISM, THIS TIME ON TRADE

(By Eduardo Porter)

The Democrats' vocal hostility to trade is starting to scare many of America's best friends. As Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton have bashed China and a variety of free trade agreements, allies who have been yearning for an end to President Bush's in-your-face unilateralism are worried that a Democratic president may be just as undiplomatic, and unreasonable, when it comes to economic protectionism.

''It is very irresponsible, in my view, to pretend to people that we can disengage from international trade,'' Peter Mandelstam, the European trade commissioner, warned in a May interview with the BBC.

It would be a mistake to brush all this off as mere campaign posturing. The United States remains as open to trade as its European allies, and in some areas it has even fewer restrictions. But the question is, for how long?

Despite economists' assurances about trade's many benefits, American workers increasingly view globalization as a losing battle against China's cheap labor and a very personal threat to their wages and jobs. According to a poll this spring by The New York Times and CBS News, 68 percent of Americans favor putting restrictions on free trade to protect domestic industries. That is the highest share since they began asking the question in the 1980s, and 12 percentage points more than in 2000.

Workers in other rich nations feel less threatened. Only 14 percent of Americans surveyed last year by the Pew Global Attitudes Project said increasing trade was ''very good'' for the country. That's less than half the share in Canada, Germany or Sweden. Even among the French, who tend to see capitalism as gauche and occasionally drive tractors into their local McDonalds, 22 percent said more trade was very good.

The issue isn't the amount of trade. European countries actually trade much more than the United States. But their citizens appear to be more comfortable with the idea because their governments provide a stronger safety net to catch workers undercut by foreign competition and redistribute the gains from trade more equitably.

In the United States, public spending on social programs, from unemployment insurance to health care, amounts to about 17 percent of the overall economy. This is about half the level in Germany and less than almost every other rich nation. America's meager social safety net and its winner-take-all distribution of riches means workers have less to gain from trade's benefits and more to lose from any disruption.

Most economists agree that trade plays a small role in the deteriorating fortunes of less educated American workers. But as their wages have sagged, their pensions have shrunk and their health insurance has disappeared, trade has become the scapegoat. Politicians, especially but not solely from the Democratic Party, have been eager to capitalize on those anxieties.

Just this week, Democrats in the House and Senate proposed a bill that would require the president to submit plans to renegotiate all current trade agreements—before Congress considered any pending agreements and before the president negotiated any new ones. In April, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi decided to change the rules guiding approval of free trade agreements to stall the approval of one with Colombia.

The United States has an enormous stake in maintaining an open global economy. Trade means export markets for American products, as well as cheap imports for American companies and consumers. Foreign competition helps spur productivity, which has driven the spectacular increase in American living standards since World War II.

Before this country stumbles into a trade war, all political leaders would benefit from a careful examination of how other wealthy democracies have found ways to cushion economic blows on the most vulnerable and make trade more palatable to their workers.

More generous social policies are a far better choice than protectionism.

THE PRICE OF GASOLINE

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. Madam Speaker, if you went out to a gas station this morning or tomorrow morning and you asked anybody pumping gasoline what the number one issue is, they would tell you without a doubt it is the price of gasoline because it is having an impact on their food and on every other commodity that they deal with.

The American people want gasoline prices and energy prices to come down. And the thing that really amazes me about my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, is they won't listen to the American people. Eighty percent of the American people, according to recent polls say that if we have the resources here in America, we should drill for them right here. Obviously, everybody is concerned about the environment, but we can drill for oil in the ANWR and off the continental shelf and use coal shale to create a tremendous amount of gasoline and energy in this country without even relying on the foreign sources. The problem is that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will not listen to the American people.

Now I was watching Sean Hannity on Hannity and Colmes the other night, and Mr. Hannity said he couldn't figure out why the Republicans weren't talking about this and making this a big issue.

□ 1815

And if he were here tonight, I would say, ''Sean, we are doing it. We are screaming from the top of this Capitol that we ought to drill in the ANWR, we ought to drill off the Continental Shelf. We have a 500 year supply of natural gas. But the Democrats on the other side will not listen to the American people, and the price of gasoline goes up and up and up and the price of energy goes up and up and up.''

I understand that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to go to new forms of energy that are environmentally safe, and I think everybody in this body wants that.

But while we are transitioning to the new technologies, we still have to live. We still have to have heating oil. We still have to have gasoline. We still have to have energy. And the way we can get it and not depend on foreign resources is by drilling in the ANWR, drilling off the Continental Shelf, using coal shale and using natural gas. But the environmentalist lobby, and my colleagues will never admit to this on the other side of the aisle, but the environmentalist lobby has them by throat, and as a result they will not yield to the America people's will that we drill here in this country to reduce the price of energy.

Now, I believe this will be an issue in the fall campaign. I know everybody is talking about OBAMA and MCCAIN and the presidential race. But the people who are in this country are really concerned about getting to and from work and paying their bills. I would just like to say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, go to any gas station tonight, go to any gas station tomorrow, and ask anybody pumping gas this question: Do you think we ought to drill for our own oil? Do you think we should depend less on foreign resources like Saudi Arabia or Venezuela? And 80 percent of them will look you right in the eye and say, you bet. I want the price of gasoline to go down.

My Democrat colleagues, I want you to listen to them, because they are going to get more and more angry with you because you will not listen. We could bring the price of gasoline down immediately if we say we are going to drill in ANWR, drill off the Continental Shelf, because our competitors around the world are going to say, ''oh, my gosh, there is going to be competition,'' and you will see the price of gasoline and oil per barrel go down.

So, tonight, once again I will just say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, please, please listen to the American people. They want to drill in the ANWR. They want an environmentally safe way to drill in the ANWR, and we have it. They want to drill off the Continental Shelf. They want us to drill for our own oil and our own natural resources, and they don't

want to depend on Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, Mexico or anyplace else. And we should listen to them. We should listen to them.

So if Sean Hannity were here tonight, I would say, ''Sean, we are listening to you. We have heard you. We are screaming from the top this Capitol, but our colleagues on the other side of the aisle aren't listening right now.''

But if we keep this up and the American people listen, and I think they will, they are going to hold my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, they are going to hold them responsible for the cost of energy.

So I would just like to say to you, the election is coming up and everything looks pretty good for your side of the aisle, but you better do something about energy, because the American people want something done and they want it done quickly.

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

(Mr. WEINER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BROUN of Georgia 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. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DON'T ALLOW PERMANENT BASES IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished Speaker, and I thank her for her leadership.

We will in just a few minutes begin to talk about a very serious issue on universal access to health care, so I rise today to remind my colleagues that we are still in a very troubling conflict in Iraq. We are still spending billions and billions and billions of dollars. Even in the last few days I have seen the loss of young sons, young brothers, young men in my own community. We have buried a number of our fallen soldiers in the Houston, Harris County and South Texas metroplex.

We recognize that we are a nation that is willing to send her very best, her very brightest, to the front lines of Iraq and Afghanistan and places around the world to defend the honor, but yet the need for freedom and democracy. But this is a war that the American people over and over again, 60 to 70 percent have said we must bring our troops home. The American people have said enough is enough.

We honor those who have fallen. We honored them in this memorial week. I was in Aviano, Italy, and celebrated there at the Air Force base with the young men and women, the fallen, who fell on foreign soil. It was my honor and my privilege to be there, and I will do so wherever there is the opportunity to say thank you to those that live injured, for those who gave the ultimate sacrifice. We will never dishonor their service.

So I claim that today we can call the actions in Iraq, albeit my opposition to the offense or the invasion of Iraq by this country, we can call it a military success. We can call it a military success and bring our soldiers home.

What disturbs me, Madam Speaker, is that this Nation, this administration, is negotiating for foreign bases on Iraq soil, U.S. bases on the soil of Iraq, when over and over again this Congress has voted against maintaining long-term bases, U.S. bases, in Iraq. We have said it clearly. We have said it over and over again.

So I raise the question as to why is the administration engaging in negotiations for permanent military bases without the engagement and the affirmation of this Congress that has said to the administration that we do not want permanent military bases and neither do the people of the United States?

Now, I recognize that we have the responsibility of transition as the new administration comes in. I am believing that the new administration that will come in to be President of the United States will be the administration that will oppose this war and that will begin to bring our troops home.

But if, for example, we were concerned about transition, let me simply say, we are aware that we have a Central Command in the region. It is an active Central Command. It will be headed by General Petraeus for the next couple of months.

There is no reason why when that region is in need that under the Central Command the appropriate military operation can be dispatched, if necessary, to the region, to Iraq and to other places around. It seems to be a smack in the face of Congress that has over and over again said that it is time to bring our troops home, that we cannot spend millions and millions and billions more of dollars in Iraq.

It is time for Iraq to secure its own security, to defend itself, to build its own military bases. And, yes, we are quite happy to continue to train those Iraqi soldiers, which I visited with in the last couple of months. I was there. I saw them. They are committed and dedicated, the Iraqi soldiers. Their generals are committed and dedicated. Give them the opportunity to finance their own bases, to finance the military. But enough is enough. I believe the American people have spoken.

So I say to the administration, we will not tolerate permanent bases on the soil. And I want to thank the Progressive Caucus with the leadership of Congresswoman WOOLSEY and Congresswoman LEE, the Out of Iraq Caucus with Congresswoman WATERS, both of which I am a member of. We have worked on this. We have heard from the American people. We have heard testimony.

Frankly, this is an insult to the Members of the United States Congress, when we know that there are alternatives to ensuring the safety and security of the region, and we also know that the American people have spoken.

I stand with the American people. The needs are great. We must use this money for other reasons, bringing our soldiers home, training them, creating a green economy, making sure that we have the education we should and the health care that we should. It is time now to bring our troops home, and certainly it is time now to end this frivolous debate about permanent bases in Iraq.

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

(Mr. BURGESS 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.)

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. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, as many times before, I stand before this House with yet another Sunset Memorial.

Madam Speaker, it is now June 10, 2008, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, but before the sun set today in America, almost 4,000 more children, defenseless unborn, were killed by abortion on demand. And that is just today, Madam Speaker. That is more than the number of innocent lives that this Nation lost on September 11, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 12,923 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,

Madam Speaker, cried and screamed as they died, but because it was amniotic fluid going over the vocal cords instead of air, we couldn't hear them.

All of them had at least four things in common, Madam Speaker. 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 realized it immediately or not, will never quite be the same; and all the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever.

And yet even in the glare of such tragedy, this generation still clings to a blind, invisible ignorance, while history repeats itself and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims, those yet unborn.

Madam Speaker, perhaps it is 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 chief and only objective 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.''

Madam 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 that 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. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our core commitment to this self-evident truth. It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world, Madam Speaker. It is truly who we are.

And yet today another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that 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.

Madam Speaker, let me conclude in the hope that perhaps someone new who hears this Sunset Memorial will finally tonight embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies, that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express, and that 12,923 days spent killing nearly 50 million 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, Madam Speaker, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this Chamber and in this sunshine of life are also numbered, and all too soon each one of us will walk from these doors for the very last time. And if it should be that Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day to come, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries of the innocent unborn in our Nation. 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 brothers and sisters in America from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

Madam Speaker, it is June 10, 2008, 12,923 days since Roe v. 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.

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

(Mr. HUNTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SOLVING THE CHALLENGE WITH REGARD TO GAS PRICES

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I go home, as most Members of Congress do, every weekend and talk with constituents and try to get a sense of what their concerns are and make certain that we are representing them responsibly here, and upon my last visits home on the weekends over the past 3 or 4 months, their concerns are the concerns of Americans all across this country, and that is the concern of energy prices, of gas prices. They aren't just concerned, Madam Speaker; they are mad. They are mad because they see absolute and utter inaction here in the United States Congress. American values and American vision dictates that we do all we can to solve the challenge that we have before us as it relates to gas prices.

□ 1830

Four dollars a gallon, we hit that mark over this past weekend.

I wonder what price per gallon it will take to get this Democrat majority to act, to work to increase supply. Is it $5 a gallon, $6 a gallon, is it $10 a gallon? Will it happen then that this Democrat majority will then allow this Congress to vote on increasing supply?

Now, there are all sorts of things that ought to be done. The kinds of things that have been described by my friend on the other side of the aisle are appropriate, and we ought to do them. I support, strongly, conservation. We can do a lot more in the area of conservation and should incentivize conservation.

I support, strongly, finding that alternative fuel and incentivizing genius of the American people to identify what that is so that future generations won't be reliant on fossil fuel. But right now, it's imperative that we work to increase supply.

This problem isn't new. This distinction between folks on the Democrat side of the aisle and the Republican party on this side of the aisle isn't new. We have had vote after vote after vote over the past 10 or 15 years on increasing the supply of oil in this Nation, and time after time after time our friends on the other side of the aisle have not risen to the occasion. You talk about Alaska exploration, ANWR exploration, House Republicans have supported that 91 percent of the time, 91 percent of House Republicans have supported Alaska exploration; Democrats, 86 percent have opposed it.

Jay Leno, I don't know if you heard, Jay Leno said Democrats right now say that it will take 10 years if we explore in Alaska to realize any new gasoline, and then he said, that's exactly what they said 10 years ago.

It goes on and on. Coal-to-liquid technology, 97 percent of Republicans have supported coal-to-liquid technology, 78 percent of Democrats have opposed coal-to-liquid technology. Oil-shale exploration, every time it has come up 97 percent of Republicans have supported it; House Democrats, 86 percent have opposed it. Deep-sea exploration, House Republican support, 81 percent; House Democrats, 83 percent opposed.

What about increasing refining capacity? House Republicans, 97 percent support; House Democrats, 96 percent opposed. So 91 percent, in summary, of House Republicans, have historically voted to increase the production of American-made oil and gas and 86 percent of House Democrats have historically voted against increasing the production of American-made oil and gas.

It has been said that every other Nation on Earth views their natural resources as an economic asset. House Democrats, this majority, believes that natural resources in this land are an environmental hazard.

What do we do? Well, I want to commend Representative TIM WALBERG of Michigan, who is leading the fight to decrease gas prices. He has filed a discharge petition on House Resolution 3089, which will increase refining construction and capacity, boost alternative energy development, provide incentives to increase nuclear energy and allow for environmentally friendly domestic oil production.

I call on the Speaker, and I call on the leadership of this House to bring this commonsense bill to the floor. These are real solutions for the American people, American energy for Americans. It's the American vision, it's the American values that are across this land.

The American people understand and appreciate the challenges we face. They just can't understand and appreciate why this majority won't act to increase supply.

UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COHEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, this will be the first of a special order pinpointing and focusing on the need for universal health care insurance.

There will be speakers today that will point up various areas of need. But in opening this hour, I would like to say that over the past 15 years there has been incremental reforms that have expanded health care coverage to limited populations and have crowded out an increasing number of Americans from the private insurance market.

Preventable and mismanaged chronic disease, such as asthma, cancer, diabetes and heart disease, are the leading causes of death and disability in the United States and account for the vast majority of health care spending. They have affected the quality of life for 133 million Americans and are responsible for 7 out of every 10 deaths in the United States, killing more than 1.7 million Americans every year. Chronic diseases are also the primary driver of health care costs, accounting for more than 75 cents of every dollar we spend on health care in this country.

As reported by the Centers for Disease Control, in 2005, this amounted to $1.5 trillion of the trillions spent on health. Despite worldwide problems, the issue of chronic disease does not register with large segments of the public. As policymakers, we must raise the awareness of the health care crisis on this issue of the uninsured and underinsured as a primary concern in Congress.

Now, there is legislation to ensure that all Americans will have access guaranteed by law through the highest quality and most cost-effective health care services, regardless of their employment, income or health status.

The following Members will be speaking on this issue, and I call up as the first speaker the young lady from Texas, Representative Sheila Jackson-Lee.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from California for yielding, and let me add my appreciation for the vast knowledge that she brings, particularly as it relates to the comparisons of our health care, to the international system of health care, having been an ambassador and knowing, really, some of the stark contrasts between nations that are developing and have a better health care system than we have here in the United States.

I want to add my appreciation as well to Chairman JOHN CONYERS, who has single-handedly led the cause and the fight for universal access to health care, particularly as it relates to the legislation that all of us are looking forward to seeing passed, because this is legislation that clearly is enormously important.

So I want to speak today on some issues and share some stories of individuals who are suffering in the State of Texas. Maybe those who are within the sound of our voices will understand that we do not take your plight lightly. We have heard Members come on the floor of the House and talk about the spiraling gasoline prices, we have heard them talk about the crisis in the housing market.

I was in my district, and we had an hour-long program, and we really couldn't end the program. It was a television program, and all of the questions were on the foreclosure market. The producer came out and said, they don't want to ask any other questions. They just want to ask about the foreclosures.

People are hurting, and if you juxtapose the high food gasoline prices high food prices and your mortgage being foreclosed on, or no place to live, can you imagine what it is like? You can imagine, with no health insurance, catastrophic conditions, with the backdrop of the spiraling unemployment, then I would say that we have a human crisis, an American crisis where people are falling on the spear.

Yesterday, I introduced the Medicare Efficiency and Development of Improvement of Care and Services Act, MEDICS Act, of 2008. It is a complement to universal access to healthcare. But if we had universal access to health care, many of these issues would not have to be, if you will, remedied piece by piece.

Just to give you a very brief overview, the bill that I introduced has an elimination of discriminatory copayment rates of Medicare outpatient mental health services. It also prohibits and limits certain sales and marketing activities under Medicare Advantage, and it has exemptions from income and resources for determination of eligibility for low-income subsidy.

One of the key elements is if you are on Medicaid and you die, this eliminates the ability of States to collect from your estate, you don't have anything. It may be that you are leaving minimal resources to your children, and lo and behold, they want to grab that up to pay for the long-term care that you needed while you were in the hospital under Medicaid, more insult to your dignity.

So very quickly let me say that I rise to support H.R. 676, the United States National Health Insurance Act, that is sponsored and introduced by my colleague, Chairman CONYERS, of which I am an original cosponsor. I would just simply say in the State of Texas when you look at HIV and STDs, for example, there are 22,948 total AIDS cases in Harris County, this was in 2005. These are people who may have health issues we have to address.

According to the Texas Department of State Health Services, 72.9 percent of African Americans in Texas are overweight, while 60.3 percent of the Anglo white population are overweight. That bodes for an unfortunate health situation.

H.R. 676 would cover health care costs and would decrease for both families and for businesses. Currently the average family of four covered under an employee plan spends $4,225 on health care, $2,713 on premiums and $1,522 on medical services.

I would say to you that under H.R. 676 a family of four making the medium income of $56,200 would pay about $2,700 for all health care costs, including the current Medicare.

Is that not a reformation of this system? Is that not a light at the end of the tunnel? Businesses would benefit as well. They would pay a 4.75 percent payroll tax for all health care costs, including the current Medicare tax. For an employee making a median annual family income of $56,000, the employee would pay about $2,700 per year. That is the answer that we are giving tonight and why we are here on floor of the House.

We want you to know, our colleague, that there is relief. We can move H.R. 676, which is based on the traditional Medicare model and provide health care coverage for a family of four that is drastically different from the crisis that they are facing today, because today they are facing a crisis such that if they are in any catastrophic illness you can be assured that they will have no relief.

Let me close by sharing with you two very painful stories, and you can understand why, might I say to you, there are pages and pages of stories of those who are suffering in this dilemma of having to pay for all of these expenses and short-changing their families on health care.

The lack of health care leads to death. Impossibly high gas prices can lead you to public transportation, it may lead you to walking. It may lead you not to going to places where you have not often gone, but you are still alive and might even be healthy. The lack of food may mean that you have a little less on the table, and it may mean your health, but it actually will not kill you directly.

Certainly we know that we want better education and our troops home. But if you do not have good health care, it can lead to your death. Whether it's preventive health care, whether it's mental health services, it can actually lead to the death of your loved one. Poor health care can lead to the death of your loved one.

We are speaking of life and death. This story is from Mike. ''I lost my job as an RN for advocating for better staffing ratios and patient safety.'' That means here is a registered nurse who is trying to fight for better quality of health care, got fired. ''With that job loss, I lost my medical insurance. On New Year's Day I had an ocular stroke. I was having symptoms for a couple of days prior, but without medical insurance, decisions are made in a different manner.''

□ 1845

''I put off the treatment because I didn't have money to pay. In the process I delayed treatment, and now I am blind in that eye. If I had insurance, I would have sought treatment sooner. I am a health care professional who delayed treatment decisions because of the cost and lack of insurance.''

This person could have died. Now they are blind which limits I imagine some of their occupational opportunities. They are blind because America allowed them to live without health insurance.

This is my final testament to the crisis we are in. This is from Robin: ''My daughter has a developmental disorder, something in the autism spectrum, her pediatrician has guessed. I am not certain of the extent of the diagnosis of her disorder due to the lack of my funds, being a single mother, and lack of quality health insurance. I can scrape together money to take her to the doctor if she has any routine sickness, and I push my budget the best I can to pay for 30 minutes of private speech therapy a week to complement what the school system provides. But there is so much more she needs. She could do so much better with medication that could possibly help her lead a decent life. If I could afford to get the extensive tests and evaluations, and even then, who knows if I could afford the medicine. She cannot qualify for SSI or Medicaid; they say I make too much money. That is an outrage. She cannot qualify for CHIPs; again, they say I make too much money. But I don't. Once I pay for day care, speech therapy, clothing, car insurance, food and shelter, transportation, the rising cost of gasoline, $38,000 gross without child support is not enough money. Can you imagine that they say $38,000 kicks her out of Medicaid and the CHIP program, especially when all your daughter can qualify for is a super-expensive health insurance risk pool. What can I do? I want the American dream, but I cannot have it. I am stuck in this old, falling-apart apartment with an old car and inadequate health coverage with my sweet, 7-year-old daughter. God help us, she deserves better.''

God help America. America deserves better. This universal access to health care is what we all should believe is the American dream.

I close by simply saying what our Founding Fathers said: We all are created equal with certain inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I will just simply say that God has to help us come to our senses and pass this legislation, H.R. 676, authored by my dear friend, John Conyers, and cosponsored by so many of us, otherwise God help us.

I thank the gentlelady for her great leadership on this issue.

I regard health care as one of the most pressing issues facing this country and the world. I have been a staunch supporter of legislation that aims to eliminate health disparities in this country, fight the HIV/AIDS pandemic, combat the childhood obesity crisis facing this Nation, and provide health insurance coverage for all Americans. Most of all, I strongly believe that quality healthcare should be affordable and accessible to all.

Yesterday, I introduced the Medicare Efficiency and Development of Improvement of Care and Services Act (MEDICS Act) of 2008. For decades, Democrats have been fighting to fix the broken America's healthcare system and this initiative is an important tool to make sure that our most vulnerable get the healthcare they need.

As a long supporter of Universal Health Care, I happy to announce that this legislation puts our healthcare system on the correct path of providing access to health care for our Nation's low income, minority and elderly populations. On Friday June 6, 2008, my colleague Senator MAX BAUCUS introduced a health care reform bill that addresses these key problematic issues continuing to plague our health care system. I am happy to announce that The MEDICS Act is the companion bill to Senator BAUCUS' legislation, uniting Congress on one accord to push for crucial healthcare reform. In 2007, there was an estimated 47 million people uninsured in our Nation. This is un-American and unacceptable. Now is the time to ensure that every citizen has access to the proper health care benefits they need.

In my house companion I have added a section requiring that within one year of enactment the Secretary, in coordination with the Association of American Medical Colleges, shall submit to Congress an effective plan to increase the number of primary care physicians particularly those practicing in counties, cities, or towns ''underserved'' or with a disproportionate number of Medicare-eligible and/or Medicare recipients. Without our primary care physicians, which act as the gateway to care we can never move towards an effective universal healthcare plan.

According to the Texas Department of State Health Services, Texas HIV/STD Surveillance Report, there were 22,948 total AIDS cases in Harris County in 2005; a figure which almost doubled the next closest county in Texas.

According to the Texas Department of State Health Services, 72.9 percent of African Americans in Texas are overweight or obese while 60.3 percent of White residents are obese.

The need for a high-quality, accessible and affordable health care system has never been more urgent. There are currently 47 million uninsured Americans, 8 million of whom are children. Another 50 million are underinsured. Although the U.S. spends twice as much on health care per capita as countries with universal coverage, the World Health Organization ranks us 37th in overall health system performance.

This Congress, I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 676, ''The United States National Health Insurance Act,'' introduced by my colleague Congressman CONYERS. This act would allow for every American to receive heath Insurance.

H.R. 676 would create a publicly financed, privately delivered health care system that improves and expands the already existing Medicare program to all U.S. residents, and all residents living in U.S. territories. The goal of the legislation is to ensure that all Americans will have access, guaranteed by law, to the highest quality and most cost effective health care services regardless of their employment, income or health care status. You, the American people called for universal health care, as it was one of the most prominent issues for Americans in the 2006 elections.

The need for a high-quality, accessible and affordable health care system has never been more urgent. There are currently 47 million uninsured Americans, 8 million of whom are children. Another 50 million are underinsured. Although the U.S. spends twice as much on health care per capita as countries with universal coverage, the World Health Organization, ranks us 37th in overall health system performance. Major American corporations such as General Motors bear the brunt of an outdated health care system because they are at a competitive disadvantage relative to their international counterparts who pay less for health care. A Harvard study found that almost half of all bankruptcies are partially or fully related to health care bills.

Universal health care would not cause a financial burden on American families. According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO), ''If the U.S. were to shift to a system of universal coverage and a single payer, as in Canada, the savings in administrative costs [10 percent of health spending] would be more than enough to offset the expense of universal coverage.''

Under H.R. 676, health care costs would decrease for both families and for businesses. Currently, the average family of four covered under an employee health plan spends a total of $4,225 on health care annually—$2,713 on premiums and another $1,522 on medical services, drugs and supplies. This figure does not include the additional 1.45 percent Medicare payroll tax levied on employees. Under H.R. 676, a family of four making the median family income of $56,200 per year would pay about $2,700 for all health care costs, including the current Medicare tax.

Businesses will also save money under universal health care, as set forth by H.R. 676. In 2006, health insurers charged employers an average of $11,500 for a health plan for a family of four. On average, the employer paid 74 percent of this premium, or $8,510 per year. This figure does not include the additional 1.45 percent payroll tax levied on employers for Medicare. Under H.R. 676, employers would pay a 4.75 percent payroll tax for all health care costs, including the current Medicare tax. For an employee making the median annual family income of $56,200, the employer would pay about $2,700 per year.

Our plan, H.R. 676, ''The United States National Health Insurance Act,'' guarantees every resident of the United States access to a full range of medically necessary services, including primary care, prescription drugs, mental health care and long term care. There are no co-pays or deductibles under this program. The role of the government would be limited to collecting revenues and disbursing payments; care would continue to be delivered privately. Patients could continue to use the same hospital, physician or health clinic from which they currently receive services. H.R. 676 is supported by over 210 labor unions and more than 100 grassroots groups across the country. The former editor of the New England Journal of Medicine, two former Surgeons General and 14,000 physicians support national health insurance.

H.R. 676 is based on the traditional Medicare model, in which the government negotiates and pays service fees for private and

public providers and mails its enrollees a card that gives them access to the doctors and hospitals of their choice. This system does not divert profits to insurance companies. This legislation is focused, first and foremost, on serving the American people, not on generating profits for big companies.

Lack of health-care is no longer just a concern of those living in poverty. According to recent reports, more than one-third of the nearly 47 million uninsured Americans coming from households with family incomes of $40,000 or more, lack of health insurance has become a worry of the middle class.

There is no reason why this country should continue down a dreadfully deleterious road of denying healthcare to any citizen of this country who needs it. Many of the health conditions, such as diabetes, obesity, kidney failure, cancer, hypertension and HIV/AIDS, the prevalence of which plagues our community the most, could be curtailed or even prevented if everyone had access to health insurance. I will continue to fight hard for the most effective policy measures that aim to narrow the racial health disparity gap.

Ms. WATSON. I thank you, and call on the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, Congresswoman WATSON. And I want to thank Chairman CONYERS for organizing this special order and for his leadership on universal health care.

I am glad to join with my colleague, DIANE WATSON, and JAN SCHAKOWSKY is here, and we just heard from SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, to highlight the need for health care for not just some Americans but all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, more than 47 million Americans are uninsured, an increase of 6 million since this administration took office. Nearly 10 million of those uninsured are children, children under the age of 18. It is unforgivable that a country as wealthy as the United States of America cannot find a way to provide health insurance to its entire population.

Actually, when there is a will, there is said to be a way. So the United States must not have the will to provide health coverage to every single American.

Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIP, are important safety nets for children whose families cannot afford to purchase health insurance. However, even with these programs, 10 million children still lack health insurance. Currently, Healthy Families, which is what CHIP is called in the State of California, Healthy Families serves 1.2 million children, more than 10,000 children in my district. And last year we, the Congress, had the opportunity to expand CHIP to provide services to nearly 4 million more children. This legislation would have provided health care to an additional 607,000 children in California, and would have provided CHIP coverage to many of the 5,000 children without health insurance in my district.

Unfortunately, however, the administration recklessly vetoed this expansion. Imagine when the United States is spending over $338 million a day in Iraq, we can't find $35 million over 5 years. So divide that, 5 into 35 is 7, so that would be $7 million a year to provide an additional 4 million children with health insurance.

What are these priorities?

No child should be denied quality care because his or her parent cannot afford to purchase health insurance. No parent should have to choose between medicine for his or her child and food on the table.

Mr. Speaker, even if we are able to insure every child, that still leaves nearly 40 million Americans without health insurance. We hear stories every day about people who lack medical care and whose only option is to go to our already overcrowded emergency rooms to seek care. Our Nation's health centers, hospitals and emergency rooms are doing everything they can to provide medical care to the uninsured and underinsured, but they cannot fill the need.

Actually, when an emergency room is the care center, the underinsured and uninsured do not get access to important preventive care and they do not get access to screenings to prevent disease or catch and treat them early. The shame is that we can detect and treat diseases when caught and treated early. So many uninsured, for example, who are surviving cancer and other serious diseases could have been treated with access to screenings and treatment.

No one should have to put off important medical screenings like a mammogram because she cannot afford the cost and doesn't have the time for a wait list for free screenings. If a woman is diagnosed with breast cancer, she should not have to choose between food on the table or rent. What an awful choice to be asked to make, particularly if you have a family to support. No one should be denied necessary medical care because they cannot afford it. We must refocus our priorities. We must use the money that we are spending on Iraq to invest in our Nation's health care system. The 47 million Americans without health insurance deserve no less.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to find the best possible solution to address this crisis, and I thank you again, Congresswoman WATSON, for holding this special order.

Ms. WATSON. We thank you for your depth of understanding of the issue.

Now I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Thank you, Congresswoman WATSON, for organizing this and allowing me to participate tonight. I also want to thank our colleague, Representative CONYERS, for his long-time passionate leadership on universal health care. I don't know if he is going to get here tonight, but he certainly has been a steady and consistent voice for health care and health care reform. Thanks to his efforts and that of so many others, I believe we are on the brink of accomplishing this long-awaited goal, and that this time we will be successful in providing affordable, guaranteed health coverage for all Americans.

When I first ran for office in 1990 for the State legislature, I proclaimed that as my goal in public service, that one day to be able to contribute to the victory of allowing all Americans to receive health coverage. I have always felt that this richest nation in the world, that it is a shame and really an embarrassment that Americans, unlike citizens and residents of every other industrialized nation in the world, that we don't make health care accessible to all of our citizens. It is unacceptable and in many ways un-American. It is not in the tradition of our country, which is to take care of each other.

There are lots of people across the country who are ready to make this fight. Another one of the heroes I wanted to highlight tonight is my friend and until recently when he retired from active practice my physician, my personal physician, Dr. Quentin Young of Chicago. Quentin Young was the chairman of medicine at Cook County Hospital. He was the president of the American Public Health Association. He is a founder of Health and Medicine Policy Research Group in Chicago, and a co-founder of the Physicians For a National Health Program. And in each of his roles, expanding access to quality health care has been his top priority. He is one of the most articulate and passionate and consistent long-term spokespeople for single payer health care in our country, for providing affordable, comprehensive and quality health care for all.

And as Dr. Young frequently says, ''We feel universal health care is no longer the best answer, it is the only answer. There was a time when there were alternatives that might have worked, but that day is passed.''

He goes on to say, ''I certainly think it is attainable. It has been attained in certain countries that aren't very different from us. I totally come down on the side of health care being a human right. It is very hard for me to see a coherent let alone a moral or decent argument against it because illness doesn't distribute itself according to the ability to care for yourself and be cared for. It strikes children. It strikes the poor. It strikes the most needy, and the most ill-protected disproportionately. That is the correlation.''

Cardinal Bernardin, also from Chicago, a hero on health care, said it best. He said, ''Health care is so important to human life and dignity that it is the responsibility of society to offer access to decent health care to every person.''

And I was pleased that he didn't say every citizen. He said every person. So the answer is that it should be considered a right guaranteed by society, which means it must be a responsibility of government.

And as we enter this new round of discussions, more and more people and organizations have come to agree with Dr. Young and JOHN CONYERS' conclusions. New coalitions have formed, including small and big businesses, consumer and labor groups, providers and the faith community, and organizations representing people with disabilities and living with chronic diseases. The time has come for action.

In 2002, the Institutes of Medicine estimated that 18,000 people a year died because they were uninsured. They were unable to afford preventive services, screenings that would have provided early warnings, prescription drugs or medical care. Today the Urban Institute estimates that annual death from uninsurance are up to 22,000 people every year. That is 432 people each week, 60 people each and every day who die because the United States of America alone in the industrialized world does not guarantee affordable health care to our people. It is a horrendous statistic.

But it is only a partial description of the catastrophes we face. Our health care system is becoming completely dysfunctional for patients and for those who care for them.

Even being covered by insurance is no guarantee. The Commonwealth Fund has just released a new study that concludes between 2003 and 1997, the number of uninsured Americans grew by 60 percent. There are now 25 million insured people who could face financial catastrophe if they become sick or injured.

Consider this: One in five Americans under the age of 65, many of them insured, live with medical debt. I say under 65 because many people are waiting for that birthday, can't wait to get there because then finally Medicare, a national health insurance for people over 65 and those with disabilities who qualify, do get health care.

□ 1900

Medical bills are the leading cause of about half of all personal bankruptcies. High deductibles and co-pays, limits on payments, denials of needed care, all of these shift burdens to individuals and families who are already struggling. These numbers are staggering, and it's a national shame that while spending 50 percent more than any other country in the world on health care, we fall so dismally short in providing a health care guarantee.

But it's also important to remember that behind each number is a person, our friends, our neighbors, our family, our colleagues, ourselves; people like the Wells family from Illinois, who accumulated over $175,000 in medical expenses while waiting for their employer's 6-month waiting period for coverage to expire.

Or Susan, who can't afford the tests her doctor wants her to have to deal with her high blood pressure; or Constance, who moved back to Illinois to care for a family member and can't find a job that provides affordable benefits.

I want to close by saying that winning the fight for guaranteed health care for all is not just the right thing to do, it's the smart thing to do. Too many potential entrepreneurs are locked into jobs that provide health care, unable to leave and create new businesses that keep our economy strong and provide new jobs.

Too many businesses that are providing coverage for their workers are competitively disadvantaged because their foreign competitors operate in countries with national health care. They too want us to get it together and adopt universal health care.

So, again, I want to thank Congresswoman WATSON and again, I want to thank Congressman CONYERS for his leadership.

Ms. WATSON. We would like to thank you, the Honorable JAN SCHAKOWSKY, for a thorough analysis of what the problem in access to health care really is. Thank you.

The Representative from Kansas, NANCY BOYDA, Dr. Representative CHRISTIAN CHRISTENSEN, Mr. Speaker, you were on our list to make a presentation in this hour. Would you like to do it? And I don't know what's protocol. Mr. Speaker, Representative SCHAKOWSKY will take your place temporarily so you can make your presentation if you choose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I couldn't have a better substitute.

Ms. WATSON. I just want to say that Members in this first hour have struck a chord with the American people and the needs. And when we talk about homeland security, it is not the land, it's the people on the land. And I am very disturbed that we're losing too many of our people who help defend this land to all kinds of diseases and health problems that need not be. With the proper kind of access to health care, we wouldn't be seeing so many of our viable citizens perish. We could do something about it.

So we intend, Mr. Speaker, to have a series of these discussions with America. And we do hope that maybe we can pull in CNN, Nightline, that's ABC, Channel 7, to hold a periodic series of these discussions about access to health care.

We do hope that you're able to make your presentation at this time, Mr. Speaker.

All right. I understand that you won't be speaking at this time, so let me—how much time do we have left on this hour?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thirty minutes.

Ms. WATSON. I would just like to read some of the 51 stories of Americans with cancer who suddenly find themselves overburdened with medical bills, and they have gaps in their coverage. These are real people, Mr. Speaker. These are real Americans who are calling out to us.

As you know, we've had two very fine proposals coming from Senator HILLARY CLINTON and Senator BARACK OBAMA that would address access to health care.

Over on our side, in our House, we have the valiant efforts over the years of Congressman JOHN CONYERS, JR. He would have been here today, but there was a conflict. But he will continue the drum beat and the call for us to get down to business so we can have accessible health care.

I'd like to take some time to read you the plight of real Americans. This one is Susan M. She said, ''My husband, Tom, was diagnosed with lymphoma in 1996, just 4 months after our daughter was born. He underwent three series of chemotherapy before dying of encephalitis in 2001. At that time the entire family was insured through his employer.

''The monthly premiums went to $900 per month, and since I had left my job to care for him, I didn't have many options. I was able to get the kids covered by Medicaid, and I signed up for Ingram Health, which only covers doctors visits and prescriptions, not hospitalization or long-term treatment. This carried us along until a mammogram showed I had breast cancer in 2006, then I was put in to the breast and cervical cancer program. I received excellent care and am currently cancer-free.

''Earlier this year I took a contract position for 6 months at 20 to 30 hours per week. Working again helped my attitude tremendously. The depression I had struggled with for 10 years started to lift, and I was feeling positive about my future prospects.

''But, of course, the extra income meant that my kids were no longer eligible for Medicaid. So I had the added stress of finding insurance for them. I was afraid that my eligibility in the breast and cervical cancer program was also in jeopardy, so I never told my case manager about working.

''Now, the contract has run out and I'm looking for work again. I'm afraid that my coverage under the breast and cancer program will end before I can

get a job with benefits. And the bill for the children's insurance will be due in a few weeks. And I worry about what impact a pre-existing condition will have on my job prospects.

''It doesn't seem fair that my health should be tied so punitively to a job. It just adds to the emotional stress, which is already too high.

''Thank you for reading and thank you for caring.''

That was from Susan M.

Jennifer G says, ''My mother suffered and died with ovarian cancer. It was terrible. And as with many ovarian cancers, hers was not detected until it was way too late for successful treatment.

I am 36 years old now. My husband and I are finished having children. My doctor recommended that I have a hysterectomy because my risk of getting ovarian cancer is much higher now.

I am lucky enough to have health insurance. Unfortunately, an accountant working for the insurance company is able to override what my doctor recommends because they don't want to pay for it. They would rather take the gamble that I may or may not get the cancer. I, of course, would rather not gamble with my life.

''I am all for everyone having health insurance and having access to whatever health care they need. However, being covered by health insurance does not guarantee that you will get the treatment you need or any treatment that your doctor might recommend.

''It is not enough to demand coverage for all people. Insurance companies would still have the power to say no any time they want to save some money.

''And I don't have the solutions. I can just recommend that this is a problem on two levels. Getting some kind of universal health care coverage will just be the first step. Getting insurance companies to cooperate with doctors decisions will be the next step. This is where much of the reform will need to happen.

''Plus, I know several people who are fighting cancer and recovering from cancer. All of them have health insurance. Most of them are being denied coverage for medicine to fight their cancer. It is pathetic to have health insurance and not be able to count on it to help you when you need it the most.''

And Mr. Speaker, just this morning, I was called to be told that one of our dear friends and PR persons died of cancer at 2 a.m. this morning. Her name was Pat Tobin. She came from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to Los Angeles a couple of decades ago. She has a daughter, a sister.

And we went to her bedside on Friday, and I could see at that point that she possibly would not make it through the night. But she did. She made it until 2:00 a.m. this morning.

And I tell about that particular account because if we could set priorities in this country to cover the health needs of all Americans, rather than pour billions of dollars into a conflict 10,000 miles away, that I see never ending, and I see us involving ourselves in sectorial problems that we don't even understand. We don't even understand the language the people speak. How in the world could we understand their customs and their conflicts with each other?

If we could take that money out of the gopher hole it's in and put it into research in this country to stop this deadly epidemic of cancer throughout our land, wouldn't this make our country stronger?

We're losing 4,000, we have lost 4,090 people, and countless innocent Iraqis and others. I hear it could be as much as 300,000.

But no, we stupidly, stupidly and incorrectly continue to dump monies, and we don't even take care of our own domestic priorities.

We argued over health care for children? Every child in this country, whether that child is here with legal papers or not, not only deserves an education, but deserves health care. What kind of country are we that let its own people die because insurance companies are saying oh, no, that's too much?

And we never see their actuarial data, by the way, Mr. Speaker. That actuarial data could go into investments that fail. We don't know it. They just up the premium.

And when you have a catastrophic illness or a long-term illness, it could bankrupt you. Look at Ed McMahon, Tonight Show host, along with Johnny Carson, for decades. And now he's on CNN on the Larry King Show, talking about his broken neck and his injuries, and now his Malibu home is in foreclosure.

□ 1915

That's an American of prominence who was worth at one time $100 million. But a catastrophic illness could run you into bankruptcy. And that story is told many, many times.

I will not take the time now, Mr. Speaker, but these are actual people with actual stories. And we are the policymakers, and we're going to continue to tell their stories night after night until we, as a body, until we, as the Congress, can come together and set our priorities on what is really necessary to keep America strong. And it might take a new administration.

So we're going to lay the groundwork for the next President and Commander in Chief of these United States to choose prosperity, to choose health care, to choose education, to choose social services over profiteering by your best buddies in the oil industry. You can read between those lines. And we hope that the next President of the United States will set, as its higher goal, to keep America healthy and be sure that every single American and persons here can get that kind of health care. So together we can conquer.

We should not lose another person to cancer. We should not in this country because we should have done the kind of in-depth research and tests so that we could come up with various prescriptions and remedies to save the lives of so many worthy people.

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker, for this time. We will be back again another night.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It is indeed an honor to join with the previous speakers and you, Madam Speaker, to speak on this subject that you and Chairman CONYERS and others have brought to this fight.

It has been a long fight. Chairman CONYERS and Mr. DINGELL and Mr. DINGELL's father I think have had sponsorship of issues such as this since the 1940s, 60-some-odd years of efforts and introduction of legislation and debate and discussion, but no bill yet. But we've come a long way. We've come a long way since the 1940s.

Madam Speaker talked about the individuals who suffer from cancer and should not have lost their lives because we didn't have adequate research. I have penned a letter to the Speaker and to Chairman OBEY, who I know are concerned about this issue, asking that we increase NIH funding in the President's 2009 budget for research on cancer, diabetes, heart disease, AIDS, Parkinson's, and Alzheimer's disease so that we double the amount that we had in the budget as requested by Congress.

In the President's fiscal year 2009 budget, the request for research at the National Institute of Health for cancer, diabetes, heart disease, HIV/AIDS, Alzheimer's, and Parkinson's, this could be doubled, and only a day or so's worth of money that we use for our war efforts would have to be transferred to make this available.

You know, I think about what the Speaker was talking about, the loss of lives, and I had to think about Senator KENNEDY. Not that one life is greater than another life. But Senator KENNEDY is a colleague who has been in this hall and is fighting cancer. We hope he will have a successful fight. But when we see him struck with cancer, and others—and we know there are people dying every day of cancer—it just seems to me that it's a shame that we don't put more and more money into saving lives and we don't use the great wealth of this Nation, the intelligence of this Nation, the great scientific powers of this country to invest in medical research in saving lives rather than weapons of mass destruction often brought to us by people who benefit from them and have brought the military industrial complex that President Eisenhower warned us about, even President Nixon had concerns about; and that helped take us from 9/11 into an escalating budget expense of military weapons that caused this country's budget to be spent so much

and its great talent and abilities in a scientific way to be used on weapons of mass destruction and other arms of the military industrial complex rather than science and research to save lives and save humanity.

Who knows which person, which young person or older person, could do something to save other people's lives let alone give love and hope to families?

And so with national health care insurance, we could cover people, we could save lives because if we had insurance for the people, you could scope out illnesses earlier whether you're wealthy or poor. You would have the same opportunity to have preventative care, early treatment, and diagnosis of illnesses that can cause loss of life. And that early detection can save lives.

Right now if you're poor, you don't have the opportunity to have that early detection and your life is taken. And that's an inequity that this country should not allow to continue and shouldn't have permitted for all of these years.

There are so many accomplishments that we have seen in this country, particularly in this year. We've seen our Nation become a more perfect union in so many ways. But the fundamental right to health care is one that we have not recognized yet and we must.

We're all here because of the grace of God, and it seems like we should all have the—at our access and at our disposal what God's creatures have been able to discover, refine, produce, in the way of medical care to keep people alive. That just seems like a minimum thing.

And this country is the only great industrialized country on the face of the earth without some national health care policy. It seems like in this area, we are not the first in the Nation, in the world, but we're last in the world. And that's terrible.

There are doctors that serve in this body, and they're to be admired for giving their time. And I'm sure—I have many friends who are doctors who give a lot of charity care. But it shouldn't have to be doctors providing charity care to treat people that otherwise wouldn't be treated. It should be something that we all give. And I think that that's the real social need in this country. And when people talk about values and social consciousness and really religious thought and caring about others, it really begins with caring about people's health and sacrificing maybe some of our own resources to have a government system that can help others with their health care.

So I'm pleased, Madam Speaker, to speak as I have. You have inspired me with your remarks, the letters you read; and I'm just pleased that Chairman CONYERS has this issue before us.

Madam Speaker, I enter the following for the RECORD.

Speaker NANCY PELOSI,
H–232, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.
Chairman DAVID OBEY,
Committee on Appropriations, H–218, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND CHAIRMAN OBEY: I am writing to request that NIH funding in the President's FY09 budget for the research of cancer, diabetes, heart disease, AIDS, Parkinson's disease and Alzheimer's disease be doubled in the final FY09 budget set forth by Congress.

The following are the estimates included in the President's FY09 Budget request at the National Institutes of Health (NIH): Cancer: $5.654B; Diabetes: $1.033B; Heart Disease: $2.111B; Global Fund to fight HIV/AIDS, Malaria, and Tuberculosis under National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases: $300M; Alzheimer's Disease: $644M; Parkinson's Disease: $186M.

These debilitating diseases affect millions of people each year across the globe. Families are torn apart, emotionally and financially, by the effects of their contraction. Congress has a serious responsibility to provide adequate funding for research that could not only find promising treatments, but permanent cures.

I cannot imagine a more pressing issue than ensuring the healthy future of those we are here to represent. The disparity between the amounts of funding requested for the war in Iraq and that requested to treat deadly diseases is incomprehensible. The successful findings of research programs made possible through increased funding will not only aid people in the United States, but the rest of the world, as well. It is my hope that, by taking full advantage of the scientific resources we have here at home, we can better our relationships with research teams across the globe to reach our common goals: finding a cure and establishing peace.

As always, I remain,
Most Sincerely,

STEVE COHEN,
Member of Congress.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to close out this hour by saying all those who came forward this evening we appreciate so much because you represent different areas of the country, and we hope this word can get out across the country that we're ready to move forward.

And I do hope that we can follow through on our plans to go over the media to present the case. So I'm going to request that all Members who have stories such as the ones I read, submit them to Congressman CONYER's office so we can compile these and be sure that we've referenced them as we move closer to accessible health care for all Americans.

And with that, I would like to close out this hour, reserve the balance of our time for another evening.

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker, for the time.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALBERG) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. WALBERG. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And just to make sure that my constituents know that I have not changed States, it's Michigan. It starts with an ''M,'' it's up north, it's cold, generally. I can understand that. But I'm sure proud to represent Michigan, and more importantly, the Seventh District of Michigan in this great House of Representatives.

Tonight I am committed to talking about an issue that is of extreme importance to my constituents, and in fact from what we read, constituents of all of our districts all over this great United States because we are in a time and place and setting right now that, frankly, we aren't used to.

And may I submit tonight to all who would listen that, frankly, I don't think we should ever get used to it for America is too great of a Nation and has been the ambassador of great blessing to the rest of the world in many cases. It has set the course, has charted the way toward greater economic achievement, standard of living, advances in technology, business, industry, education, medicine, and transportation.

I happen to come from the district where Henry Ford had his home, made homes and schools for his employees in a great part of my district, used the resources from that district, including during some wartimes some Sassafras trees just three miles from my house that were used to make a light but strong frame for his motor cars with the absence of steel at that point in time because of the war effort.

I come from the State that has been known as the Motor Capital of the World, Michigan. Detroit has set the standard that the rest of the world has followed, emulated, copied, and sometimes even expanded upon, and yet still America, Michigan, the Motor Capital, charts the way.

Just the other day—I tell this story for a purpose, but just the other day I had something of an experience happen to me that has never happened before, nor did I expect it to happen. I filled the tank of my Harley Davidson motorcycle, which has a 5-gallon tank, and it cost me over $20. Now, for those of you that have ridden motorcycles, it is almost unbelievable to think that a vehicle that gets great gas mileage, that has a small tank like that would ever cost double digits, let alone over $20 to fill. But that's the place we're in right now with gas today on average across the United States at $4.04 a gallon. My Harley happens to take premium. So I paid $4.27 a gallon for that 5-gallon tank fill.

□ 1930

Less than 2 years ago, very seldom, if ever, would I double-digit fill my tank, even if it were on empty. Now, I don't ride my Harley Davidson for transportation anymore.

It's primarily for recreation, but 38 years ago when I started riding my first motorcycle it was for transportation, to get to and from my work.

Over the course of successive years, I would use my motorcycle in the better seasons of the year, the warmer time, to ride to work and enjoy that experience but also as commuting. I don't do that anymore, but we're paying gas prices now that should not be part and parcel of what America is.

We talk a lot about energy independence and being willing to compete and make sure that the rest of the world has to compete with us, as opposed to the other way around. And yet, up to this very day, in the outcome of what has gone on in Congress, it has been just talk and no action.

Last week, I heard the governor of our great State of Michigan announce on a major radio talk show that she was now riding a bicycle to the Capitol from her governor's residence each day, and when the host expressed concern about her safety, she said, oh, no problem, my security detail are following me on their bicycles as well.

Now, that's a nice story. I don't give any negatives toward our governor for being efficient in her use of energy resources, but you've got to understand that, when I heard that, it shocked me. And in fact, if not angered, it frustrated me to think that the governor of the motor capital of the world was riding a bicycle to work, even though she has an energy efficient, flex-fuel vehicle that I've seen her use and seen her actually fill the gas tank with fuel.

Right now, more importantly, getting to the real world of real people, people who pay those gas prices each day, people who pay their taxes, that includes supporting this Congress in what we do, right now most Michigan families that I know of, as I go back to my district each weekend, are giving up things like nights out eating at restaurants or family vacations or traveling to family events in order to cover the rising cost of gasoline. If Congress does not take action soon, families will be giving up much more than that. They will be giving up very specific needs, necessities in their life. And in fact, what I've heard in many town hall meetings, some are already giving up even necessities of their life in order to pay for the gasoline to get to their workplace the next day in order to sometime hopefully pay for some of these necessities.

Just this past weekend, AAA announced that the nationwide average gas price finally reached over $4 per gallon. It's been much higher in Michigan for several weeks. High gas prices are affecting families, truckers, farmers, small business owners. I met a small business owner in my office today who said the cost of transporting copy machines, office equipment to and from her client is getting almost prohibitive. Emergency services, public safety, and numerous other entities in Michigan's Seventh District and all over this U.S. are being negatively affected by the high cost, and I say the unnecessarily high cost, of fuel.

Despite fuel costs at levels previously only seen in Europe, leadership in this Congress refuses to increase American energy production. Instead, Speaker PELOSI and leading House Democrats would rather increase taxes on domestic energy production and increase our reliance on OPEC or, as suggested last week, sue OPEC for what all that's worth.

On a related note, the United States Department of Commerce recently announced the U.S. trade deficit reached its highest level in 13 months in April. Our trade deficit also increased by $4.1 billion between February 2007 and February 2008.

This is why our country is facing a rising trade deficit, even though American-made exports grew by 12 percent in 2007. The issue related to energy and the cost of energy has a direct influence on this. This is why we need to provide incentives to increase America's investment in alternative energy and overall production of energy.

The United States imports around 12 million barrels of oil a day, and a barrel of oil has gone from $70 to $140 over the last year, dramatically increasing our trade deficit. Our reliance on imported oil and increased oil prices means we are sending even more money to foreign countries and some that don't like us very much at all and certainly don't share our interests.

For both economic and national security purposes, and again, I want to reiterate that, national security purposes, Congress needs to finally get serious about an energy plan that truly lowers prices at the pump, reduces our dependence on foreign oil, and makes real progress towards energy independence. Instead of increasing our dependence on OPEC, America needs to return energy production to the United States. Doing so will create American jobs and provide needed economic stability and transportation that's efficient and usable to our American taxpayer.

The answer to our current energy crisis must be multi-pronged, and I have cosponsored legislation to provide incentives along those lines for solar, wind, cellulosic ethanol, biodiesel and other green alternatives. We must increase domestic energy production through carbon-free nuclear power and clean coal technology as well. I'm also cosponsoring legislation that would encourage conservation with tax credits for green buildings and legislation that would spark a revolution in clean hydrogen technology.

There are many sources where we can move toward if we're willing to dig down deep and do what's necessary and walk away from those unnecessarily strong, critical, excessive environmental forces that don't speak to the welfare of this great country.

Today, I introduced a discharge petition, something that isn't done regularly in Congress, something that isn't successful regularly but has been. I trust that this discharge motion will be. As of this point in time, with just a few hours with that discharge motion being on the floor, 93 of my colleagues have signed on, moving toward the 218 that are necessary.

This petition, if effective with 218 signatures, will force a vote on Congressman Mac Thornberry's No More Excuses Energy Act, an Act suitably entitled, legislation to increase U.S. energy production and invest in alternative sources of energy as well.

This appropriately named legislation would impact the price at the pump and lower electric bills. It would encourage the construction of new refineries, boost alternative energy, supplemental energy development by extending the wind production tax credit for 10 years, giving some certainty that if I were to invest in wind energy production, I would have a reasonable amount of time to see a return on my investment.

It would increase American oil production by allowing environmentally sound drilling in Alaska, the Outer Continental Shelf and the Gulf of Mexico, and it would help increase our supply of electricity by encouraging the construction of new nuclear power plants. Even leaders, in fact, one of the founders of Greenpeace, have come out strongly encouraging the use of nuclear power as being clean, green energy, not given over to continuing production of greenhouse gases.

Rather than increase taxes on domestic energy production, as some in Congress have proposed, I'm working to pass sound legislation that will bring down the price of gas and reduce our dependence on Middle East oil. Legislation like the No More Excuses Energy Act of MAC THORNBERRY would increase the supply of American energy and increase the number of good paying jobs in this country and in my district, the Seventh District of Michigan.

Policies such as a 23-year moratorium on exploring and developing offshore production of clean and green natural gas need to be lifted in order to lower prices and reduce our dependence on foreign gas. Natural gas provides 23 percent of our Nation's energy. It should be more. And America is the only developed Nation that prohibits offshore production and exploration of this clean, green, clean burning resource, and Americans are paying higher electricity and heating bills as a result of this.

Like all of you, I'm tired of paying these high prices. Whether it's for my motorcycle, whether it's for my car or whether it's for my pick-up truck, I'm tired of paying this because it's unnecessary, as we've done nothing to change that except talk, and it's time to put action into place.

I know high prices are affecting all of us. This is unacceptable. It is unacceptable for America to put up with this. The good people of south central Michigan, the good people of Michigan, the good people of the rest of the States in this wonderful country who depend on gasoline or diesel to get to work, drive their kids to baseball practice and visit family members deserve better.

The volunteers who offer to drive veterans to VA hospitals in my district and other districts in other States deserve better.

The volunteers who offer to drive Meals on Wheels to needy senior citizens deserve better than this.

Our churches and synagogues, our places of worship all across this great country that will be looking at looming fuel bills that many will be unable to pay this coming heating season deserve better than this because America doesn't need to be in this situation.

So I'm delighted that tonight I'm joined by a number of my colleagues who will add to what has been stated already, probably more eloquently, with points of experience that come from all over this country. I appreciate their commitment to doing something more than talking about energy independence, doing something more than talking about resuming America's position of leading the world in all areas, including the area of energy production and usage.

We have blessed the world with our standard of living, with our technology and with our energy, and it is time to get about that project again.

So at this time, I would like to ask my good friend and colleague from Georgia, Dr. PAUL BROUN, to add to what has been said. I appreciate you taking the time to be with us this evening.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank my colleague.

According to AAA, the average American is paying over $4.04 per gallon of gasoline today. Meanwhile, Communist China and Fidel Castro's Communist Cuba are moving forward with drilling for oil and gas just 45 miles off of the coast of Florida and Key West.

We cannot even drill for oil or gas 200 miles off our own shores; yet congressional Democrats continue to refuse to allow access to American gas and oil supplies. The average price of gasoline has gone up $1.71 per gallon since Speaker PELOSI's promise, promise, to lower energy prices at the beginning of the 110th Congress, this Congress.

What have the Democrats done to try to help hardworking Americans? They're simply seeking political gain from America's pain. Democratic Presidential candidate Barack Obama said he wants to impose more taxes on U.S. oil companies. Is that really a smart solution? This will only drive up prices on Americans, not just for gasoline but for every product or service purchased. Even worse is that foreign oil companies will not be subject to this joke of a solution.

The liberals propose raising the Federal tax on gasoline and diesel by 50 cents per gallon. This is on top of the already existing Federal tax of 18.4 cents per gallon for gasoline and 24.4 cents per gallon for diesel. Under this proposal, you will be paying at today's prices $4.54 a gallon for gas.

Liberals also suggest mandating ethanol and renewable fuel production and selling it as the answer to America's energy needs. The 2007 lack of energy bill has already proven that the Democratic solution is wrong. Mandating the production of renewable fuels has only led to an increase in world food prices.

□ 1945

It is, at best, disingenuous, and at worst, an outright lie to say that renewable fuels can meet America's needs in the near future. As a good southerner, I love my corn bread and grits. It makes no sense to put corn in the tank of my truck.

The Department of the Interior estimates that there are 112 billion particles of recoverable oil beneath U.S. Federal lands and coastal waters, enough oil to fuel 60 million cars for 60 years. The United States is the only nation in the world that forbids any production on its Outer Continental Shelf. Despite a decades-long record of environmentally responsible offshore production, over 80 percent of America's oil and natural gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf are completely off limits to exploration and production.

The OCS, Outer Continental Shelf, is estimated to hold at least 419 trillion cubic feet of recoverable natural gas resources and 86 billion barrels of oil. To put it in simple terms, this is enough natural gas to heat 100 million homes for 60 years, and enough oil to drive 85 million cars for 35 years, and enough oil to completely replace current Middle Eastern oil imports for 59 years.

We've heard time and time again about how drilling off the OCS will harm the environment. This is hogwash. Hurricanes Katrina and Rita destroyed or damaged hundreds of drilling rigs without causing a single drop to be spilled, yet congressional Democrats continue to pander to far left environmentalists instead of mending the pains of hardworking Americans.

Liberals also prevent any access to billions of barrels of oil located in ANWR. The entire area of ANWR is larger than the combined areas of five States—Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Delaware—yet the proposed drilling area is equal to one-sixth the size of Dulles Airport here in Washington, D.C.

Energy prices are soaring. And the financial pain that families are feeling at the pump is forcing them to decide what they can and cannot spend. Congressional Democrats act as if they have been living under a rock by continuing to ignore the demands of the American people and refusing to do anything to lower these burdensome prices.

Skyrocketing gas prices and a risky dependence on fuel supply by volatile foreign nations highlight our need for an American energy policy that emphasizes production and decreases our reliance on Middle Eastern oil.

The United States is the only nation on Earth that forbids development of its own natural resources. Right now, America is drilling for ice on Mars, but we cannot drill for oil in America. This makes no sense. It's crazy. It's idiotic. We must drill on our own lands, and we must drill now. We must streamline the permitting process and the refinery processes to get new refineries online, and we must end our dependence on Middle Eastern oil.

Mr. WALBERG, I greatly appreciate your doing this tonight; it is absolutely critical. I'm a medical doctor, as you know. I have patients who have to decide whether they can go to the doctor or not because gasoline prices are so high. I have patients who have to decide whether they can put a tank of gas in their car or they can go buy medications. This has to end. And we can do something about it. We can do something about it now if we have a responsible energy policy.

Our conference, as you know, has put forth a plan, a reasonable plan, an economically viable plan, an environmentally sensitive plan, a plan that will end this dependence upon Middle Eastern oil. It's a plan where we can provide the energy sources, not only our oil resources, but provide electric resources by permitting nuclear energy.

We have not built a new refinery in America for 30 years. We have not built a new nuclear reactor in 25 years. This is nuts, it's absolutely crazy. And we've got to end this idiocy of this current policy.

I applaud what you're doing here tonight. I look forward to further discussion from our other colleagues. I know that we have colleagues that want to ask questions and want to engage in a colloquy, if that's agreeable with you.

Mr. WALBERG. Well, Congressman BROUN, I think we want to do that. And I think you've brought up some points that are interesting to think about. Not only do we have a governor riding a bicycle to the Capitol, we are exploring for ice on Mars, but not doing exploration for oil—that we know is there——

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. That's right, it's just nuts.

Mr. WALBERG. In Alaska, in ANWR.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Anywhere. We've got oil under South Dakota, North Dakota and Montana. Those three States evidently are just floating on a sea of oil. There is supposed to be more oil, from what I understand, than is in the Middle East.

We can end our dependence on these foreign nations that want to destroy us, that want to destroy America. They hate us. And we're fueling the insurgency in Iraq. We're fueling these people who hate us. They hate our freedom, they hate America, they hate everything that we stand for.

Mr. WALBERG. And for those nations that love America and appreciate America, we're not standing in a

strengthened position that we can afford to them the assurance that America will be there when necessary because we can take care of ourselves, we're independent. And I think those are issues you bring up.

I'm delighted that we have the Dean of the Michigan delegation here, Congressman FRED UPTON, who has been here through a lot and I'm sure has taken a lot of grief on this issue.

And Congressman UPTON, before I turn to you, let me just, for the record, state, as you and some of my longer serving Republican colleagues are chastised for not getting this done in the House, you have attempted to get it done on numerous occasions. If we look back at the last decade, by the numbers, votes on ANWR exploration: House Republicans, 91 percent support it; House Democrats, 86 percent opposed.

Coal-to-liquid: House Republicans, 97 percent support it; House Democrats, 78 percent opposed. Oil shale exploration: House Republicans, 90 percent supported every vote on that in the House; House Democrats, 86 percent opposed.

Moving to the Outer Continental Shelf exploration, where right now foreign countries like Japan, China and Mexico are within 44–50 miles of our shores, and they are drilling and taking out natural gas and oil. On these votes, House Republicans, 81 percent support it; House Democrats, 83 percent opposed.

And then finally, refinery increased capacity, and now that we're offering the ''no-more-excuses'' Energy Act, the opportunity to put them on abandoned military facilities, government lands, House Republicans, 97 percent support it; House Democrats, 96 percent opposed.

Who is willing to take action? Who has evidenced that by their votes in this great body, this House of Representatives? Republicans, 91 percent, when you put it all together, of House Republicans have historically voted to increase the production of American-made oil and gas while 86 percent of House Democrats have historically voted against increasing the production of American-made oil and gas.

And so why do we see an ''energy-less'' energy bill that you talked about that gives incentives for bicycle riding and not energy? I think we have to say it's a leadership problem. So I thank you for bringing up those points.

Congressman UPTON, from my home State of Michigan, I want to turn it over to you as well for a little perspective.

Mr. UPTON. Well, I thank my good friend from my neighboring district. And I am pleased to join you tonight and my colleagues from Georgia here and Texas now as well. I'd like to just make a couple of points.

First of all, I'm not on your list of 93 that signed that discharge petition, but that's because the line was too long. I hope that I can be there tomorrow when we're on the floor for votes, because you have to do that, of course—as any student knows of this Chamber—you have to sign the discharge petition in the well of the House. And when I was available to do that, the line was way too long. So hopefully tomorrow I will put you over 100 and get closer to the 218.

I want to say just a couple of things that perhaps haven't been said yet and enter into a dialogue with my good friend, Dr. GINGREY.

First of all, when we talk about Alaska, I did support drilling in Alaska multiple times over the last couple of years. It was adopted, actually, in the House and in the Senate with some bipartisan votes, and sadly, President Clinton vetoed that bill 10 years ago saying it's 10 years away. Well, here we are today.

We had a couple of very good provisions in that bill that were important; that all of the oil drilled in Alaska had to stay in the United States. It couldn't go to China, couldn't go to Korea or Japan, it had to come here. Of course that meant we would have to have the refining capability to do it as well. We also made it so that we limited it to no more than a couple thousand acres. And as the gentleman from Georgia indicated, that's about the size—for me, it's the size of Western Michigan University, not Dulles Airport—in an area that's the size of the State of South Carolina. So that's pretty small.

And of course what we know, too, is that if that oil can be drilled successfully, we can just build that tangent a little bit to the spine—you know, those of us from Michigan, you put your hand up like this. I can't quite do that with Alaska. But if this was Alaska, you only have to drill that pipeline to the spine, and then it comes down, and it's economical to do that. So that's number one.

Number two, you know, right now President Bush and other world leaders are talking to a number of the nations in Arab lands talking about what they can do to increase production. Because we all believe in supply and demand. And as the demand continues to rise, because the supply has stayed relatively stable, the price has only gone up over $4 in my district and yours, and now across the country.

Well, how can we ask the Arabs to increase their production and we won't do it ourselves? We've said no to Alaska. We've said no to the offshore drilling off our west and east coasts and even parts of the Gulf of Mexico. Eighty-five percent of our coastline is off limits, and yet we know oil is there.

Let's look at different alternatives. One of the alternatives, of course, is the development of oil shale out west, where it's anticipated that there could be as much as 1.5 trillion barrels; don't quite have the procedures down right, it's a couple years away, but you've got to begin that process, to begin the permit process. Much of it is on Federal land. No, I'm not talking about Yellowstone Park and our national parks, but in BLM land. And yet, on a vote that we had in this House last summer, by six votes we failed to allow the Department of the Interior to allow the first permits to be approved to allow the private sector to go out and explore for this oil shale—which we could develop, I would like to think, within a couple years, four to six, something along that line. But, in fact, a trillion and a half barrels are available.

We have to do more on conservation. I was one, coming from Michigan, a tough vote was increasing CAFE. You know that. We have to have the R&D, the research and development to help our auto companies develop the technologies that we, the consumers, want. And JOE KNOLLENBERG from our State has a great bill that does that that he unveiled just a couple weeks ago.

We have to do more on conservation, and a number of different steps that I know can be taken along that front.

But the bottom line is this: If we want the price to come down, we have to increase the supply. That means we have to get away from where we're drilling today. We have to look at new sites, new techniques, and in fact we can do something, I think, about that $4 plus gasoline that all of us are pained to pay.

And if I could, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Georgia to talk a little bit about an issue that I know a little something about as well, and that is Section 526 up in Canada.

Mr. GINGREY. And I appreciate my colleague from Michigan—both of my colleagues from Michigan—and my colleague from Georgia. We've got a number of other Members here as well tonight.

But this issue that Mr. UPTON is talking about is Section 526, Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. Now, this is the bill, Mr. Speaker, that the Democratic majority passed back in February of 2007 that had in it this Section 526. It basically said this, my colleagues—and I hope that you all will listen very carefully to this because it's so crucial. Section 526 will not allow, it prohibits any agency of the Federal Government, our Federal Government, including our Department of Defense and including NASA, from utilizing any fuel source other than conventional fuel if it results in one nanogram increase in carbon footprint.

□ 2000

I am not talking about tonnage of CO_2. I am talking about any increase. So what my good friend from Michigan was talking about in regard to shale, s-h-a-l-e, shale is a solid product. It is a granular product. And we have, as FRED UPTON pointed out, Mr. Speaker, an abundance of that product out in the West. There are about five States. And I think Mr. UPTON said that it is estimated that you can get something like one and a half trillion, with a T,

one and a half trillion barrels of petroleum from that source.

But this section 526 that the Democratic majority put in their ''no energy bill'' back in February of 2007 means that we can't utilize that. We can't get that source increase of supply so that the prices will go down. And the reason I am so outraged about that, Mr. Speaker, is that tomorrow, on the floor, we will be doing the rule on the NASA reauthorization bill of 2008, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Well their price of fuel in the last 5 years, my colleagues, has gone up 400 percent from something like $4.5 million to $18.3 million. That is what NASA is having to pay on an annual basis for jet fuel.

And yet they are the very agency of the Federal Government that is doing research. A lot of the research that NASA has done, we all know, we have utilized in the private sector. There are many things. I can name several. But they are doing research on shale. They are doing research on tar sands. They are doing research on coal to liquid and carbon sequestration and sharing that information with the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force, which could save us a tremendous amount of money.

So I yield back to my colleague for a colloquy on this issue because it is so important and so timely.

Mr. UPTON. Well the gentleman is exactly correct. And let me just say one quick thing. When you look at oil shale and you look at tar sands, it takes a little bit of energy to then derive that oil from those bodies, the shale, the tar or the sand. Basically you have to heat it up. And for tar sands, the Canadians are producing literally one million barrels a day up in Alberta. And they are going to make that whether we are the buyer or not. To use the analogy of the Clampetts, and maybe they still have that technique back in Oklahoma and Texas, I see some of my colleagues, and I'll be careful, but the Clampetts, they put that pipe down and the oil came up. And it didn't take any energy to get it out of the ground.

Well it is different today. That easy energy is gone for the most part. So we have to do a lot of things. We have to inject carbon to bring it up. But in essence in Canada they have to have the heat to separate the oil from the sand, and then you have to refine it. And that takes a little bit more energy than the Clampetts, just to use that analogy.

Mr. GINGREY. This is just the kind of research, and the colleague is absolutely right, we all remember the movie, most of us have seen the movie.

Mr. UPTON. I am looking at the pages. I don't know if they know about the Clampetts or not. Do you know about the Clampetts? Have you heard?

Mr. WALBERG. As long as my colleagues don't yield and sing them the theme song.

Mr. UPTON. I am glad I didn't date myself.

Mr. GINGREY. Reclaiming your time. I am sure the pages don't remember the movie ''Giant,'' but we all do, and how that oil just came bubbling up out of the ground. I believe that was in Texas. It may have been Oklahoma.

In any regard, what the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) is saying is that these tar sands and shale, shale has to be mined. And then you have to go through a process, as he is saying, and you have to extract. And it is a little bit more difficult.

Again, we're about to reauthorize NASA in the next day or two. They are doing research on that very process now where they can get that petroleum, and I said to you 1.5 trillion barrels probably from the shale in our West, western part of the United States, and Mr. UPTON pointed out that these tar sands in Canada, it is estimated that it is probably another 1.5 trillion barrels of petroleum that we can get from that. And they are producing it in Canada. And they are selling it to somebody. And yet we can't utilize it. It absolutely makes no sense. As my colleague from Georgia said earlier, I think he used the word ''idiotic,'' ''insanity'' or ''crazy.'' He is right on all three points. But I will yield back to my colleague.

Mr. UPTON. If the gentleman would yield just briefly. The Canadians have said that they are going to increase production up in Alberta. They want to go to four to five million barrels a day. And they have the buyers. Let's face it. Wouldn't we rather have that pipeline come down to the Midwest and have us refine it here and be able to sell a cheaper product to Americans than have it come from overseas some place else? And if we're not going to buy it from them, and the Canadians told me this, they are going to build a pipeline out to the Pacific. They are going to put it on one of those big freighters. They're going to spend a lot of carbon going up into the air shipping it to someplace else, China, Korea, Japan or some place else. Let's have it come here. We'll actually save energy. We will help pollution wise in terms of reducing greenhouse gases from where it otherwise would have gone. And our consumers will be a lot better off.

And with that, I yield now to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WALBERG. If my colleague could yield just a moment here on one point that ties into that. We heard yesterday from one of our Senate colleagues from a northern State, a northeastern State, say that what we ought to do is buy one million barrels a day from Saudi Arabia. That would reduce the cost at the pump by about 50 cents. Well 50 cents right now would be great. But why not take that from ANWR? We can get one million barrels per day from ANWR right now, we are told, at least that, if we are to take it from there, and not have to buy it from any other foreign country, have it shipped to us from any other foreign country, and use it exactly like you said down here to make this great country run on its own fuel as opposed to buying from someplace else.

Mr. GINGREY. If my colleague from Michigan will yield, the whole issue here is when the Democrats passed this Energy Independence and Security Act some 17 months ago, the price of regular gasoline, as all my colleagues know, was about $2.60 a gallon. Now, if Speaker PELOSI, at that particular time, or Leader HOYER felt that the price of gasoline at the pump was going to drop $1.50, then maybe I could understand their emphasis on protecting the environment from any iota increase in carbon dioxide footprint or greenhouse gases.

But what has happened with their ''no energy plan,'' unfortunately the price of gasoline has gone up about $1.55 a gallon, and here we are looking at $4, $4 and a nickel now, and so we have to ask ourselves, what is the crisis? Is the crisis global warming? Or is the crisis bankruptcy of our country because of the price of energy? And people can't afford to buy gasoline. They can't afford to buy food. We are losing jobs to other countries. I think it is time to say to our majority party, for goodness' sakes, at least make in order the Gingrey amendment which would allow the administrator of NASA to have a waiver of section 526 and utilize some of these sources that Mr. UPTON and Mr. BROUN and others are talking about, getting that shale oil product from Canada. It just flows right down the pipeline. It is an easy flow, easy obtaining it. There is not a lot of hard work. It is the same thing with tar sands. And let NASA continue to do their research. Share it with the Department of Defense.

And I will make this one point to the gentleman from Michigan who is controlling the time, and then I will yield back so that others can weigh in, but do you know that in the year 2008 the Department of Defense is going to spend an additional, a delta, of $9 billion on fuel because of price of gasoline right now? And I yield back.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank you for that and the points you make so clear.

I would like to yield back for a moment to my good friend from Georgia, since we have two Michiganders here and two Georgians now speaking, Dr. PAUL Broun, for some additional comments, I know you have a point to make, before I go on to my good friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, my friend, Mr. WALBERG. I just wanted to ask Mr. UPTON something before he left. You were mentioning that it takes some energy to produce this energy. And the people on the other side, the leadership on the other side has been promoting these alternative sources of fuel. Ethanol has been one. And you are on the Energy Committee I think, isn't that correct?

Mr. UPTON. Yes. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well tell me if it is true. I understand that to

produce ethanol today, particularly corn-based ethanol, it actually takes more energy to produce that corn-based ethanol than the ethanol itself produces. Is that correct?

Mr. UPTON. Well, there have been different studies showing different things in terms of what to count. One of the bills that I have cosponsored, it is actually a bipartisan bill, is to look at increasing ethanol from nonfood source, or noncorn, and there are a couple of bills to do that using switch grass and a number of different things. We are not quite there in the technology, but we are not too far away, within a couple of years. And I think we ought to be investing more on that type of technology so that we can take some of the pressure off these rising food prices. I represent Kellogg's as well, as does the gentleman in the well, Mr. WALBERG.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I am talking about corn-based ethanol because I am excited about switch grass and other sources of potential, and I believe we need to investigate any source of energy anywhere.

Mr. UPTON. Now that the price of oil has gotten up to $135 a barrel, there is a lot of things that 1 month ago weren't economical to do. And that is why by putting more alternative fuels in the mix, we can have some downward pressure on the overall price of gasoline. And obviously ethanol is part of that mix, whether it be corn-based or nonfood items, and we need to explore those and see what we can do to put downward pressure on the overall price of gasoline.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I agree with that totally. The other thing is propane is a byproduct of the refinery process of gasoline as well as natural gas. And we already know that propane is an environmentally protective agent. And we have had, in the past, fleets of cars fueled by propane. I know at my hunting camp down in rural southwest Georgia, I have fueled my house down there in my hunting camp with propane. And I know a lot of people heat their homes with it. And most propane, from what I understand, is produced here in America and sold here in America.

So tapping into our oil sources would give us an additional source of energy that we are not getting today if my understanding is correct, and so we can further protect the environment by having more propane utilized in our own energy, as well as stop the production of carbon in the atmosphere that the environmentalists are so bent that it is causing global warming. And I am not so certain about that. I don't really think that is so.

Mr. UPTON. The gentleman makes a very good point. And I know there are other Members waiting patiently to speak. So I am going yield whatever time I have left to the gentleman from the great State of Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Congressman BROUN, you point out the fact that we have all sorts of energy sources. And we ought to be using them and developing them.

I want to move to a good friend, colleague and leader in our conference from Oklahoma. Congressman COLE, I appreciate your joining us tonight. I know you have taken some ribbing already about Oklahoma. I know you can handle it, but certainly I know our people would like to hear what you have to say about this issue.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. I thank my good friend from Michigan for yielding. And I thank him even more for conducting what is an important and enlightening educational experience for the people of our country about the reality of high fuel prices and what is behind it. You do take a little ribbing occasionally if you're from Oklahoma. But we think that is generally jealousy, except from our friends from Texas, who have a very similar view of the world to us.

But let me talk a little if I can about what the current state of play is in energy prices. Today as you have had up on your sign, the national average price for a gallon of gasoline is $4.04. That is something I never thought I would live to see, and frankly, no American should have ever lived to see. You can now buy a barrel of light sweet crude for July delivery at $131.31, a nice round number, nice even alliterative number. Currently in my State, Oklahoma's price at the pump, and we are producers, in some ways we will we feel it even worse because we have been producing for over 100 years much more than we consume and exporting it to the rest of the country. And we are delighted to do that. But it is pretty tough when people in Oklahoma, a producing State that sacrificed, that frankly are delighted to have exploration and production, but they are paying $3.83 a gallon.

In January of 2007 when this majority, this Democrat majority took office, the price per gallon was $2.08 a gallon. That is a rise of $1.75, an increase of over 80 percent.

□ 2015

The country as a whole has experienced very much the same thing. The average price since the Democratic majority has come into power has gone up $1.67, an increase of 71 percent.

Now, that is not what our friends on the other side of the aisle expected to happen at all. As a matter of fact, let me read you a few quotes of what they told America as they came into the majority our energy future would be.

Our distinguished Speaker, Speaker PELOSI, said on April 18, 2006, ''Democrats have a commonsense plan to help bring down the skyrocketing gas prices.'' She said a few days later, ''The Democrats have a plan to lower gas prices.''

Our distinguished Majority Leader STENY HOYER said on the 4th of April, 2005, ''Democrats believe that we can do more for the American people who are struggling to deal with high gas prices.'' I would love to ''struggle'' to pay $2.08 a gallon. It would be a nice fight to have.

Our good friend and distinguished whip of the majority party, JIM CLYBURN, said, ''House Democrats have a plan to help curb rising prices.'' That is on the 26th of July, 2006. If this is the plan, we want them to go back to the drawing board and reconsider where they are at.

Four times since they have taken the majority they have voted to increase energy taxes; to increase energy taxes. Now, even people that don't like the energy industry can usually say, well, gosh, if you increase the tax, won't they pass that along to us in the price? It is an incredible record.

Now, every single energy bill the majority wants to reach the floor has reached the floor. Most of them have passed this body. Some of them have gone all the way to the President and been signed. As I recall, I don't remember anybody who actually vetoed any energy legislation that has actually reached the President's desk. So what we are seeing really is the product of the majority's legislative agenda.

What haven't they let come to the floor? What commonsense solutions that most Americans support haven't come to the floor? I am just going to list a few of them, because, as my colleague knows, there are many of them.

Our colleague from Texas, MAC THORNBERRY, has a wonderful bill, the No More Excuses Energy Act, H.R. 3089, that literally covers the gambit of things we ought to be doing. Not just oil and gas, but nuclear, solar and wind. It incentivizes production. That is the lesson that our friends on the other side have forgotten, that supply is really important to cost. They simply seem to have no conception of that.

There is a wonderful bill by Mr. PITTS of Pennsylvania, H.R. 2279, that will expedite the construction of new refining capacity on closed military installations in the United States. These are installations that have been set aside. They are safe. They are secure. Why in the world wouldn't we want to refine the product? If we have to import it, we at least ought to get the value-added portion of refining it. It is a crime that we should ever import a refined product.

Our good friend Mr. BLUNT, H.R. 2493, has legislation that removes the fuel blend requirements and government mandates that contribute to unaffordable gas prices. We shouldn't have dozens and dozens of blends of gasoline. A few is enough.

Our good friend Mrs. MYRICK has H.R. 6108, Outer Continental Shelf Exploration, which grants coastal states the authority to grant exploration up to 100 miles from their coastlines and allows States to share in that revenue. A commonsense solution.

None of this legislation, and dozens more, have been allowed to come to the floor. My friends on the other side love to blame Republicans, President Bush

and the energy industry for these kinds of problems.

I just want to conclude quickly with a story. I do represent a district that is one of the top 20 energy producers in the United States, so we are more than doing our part. I convened about a year ago, actually before this extraordinary rise in prices, a group of independent energy people that have spent a lifetime trying to provide energy to this country.

I asked them, ''Give me your suggestions. What can we do to increase the supply and stabilize and hopefully lower the price of a gallon of gasoline or heating fuel or electricity?'' They thought, and they had a lot of great solutions.

They said, ''Let's go drill in ANWR, in Alaska. That would be a wonderful thing.'' By the way, my good friend Mr. YOUNG has a superb piece of legislation on that, H.R. 6107, that would actually allow us to drill there and invest some of the severance revenue in alternative energy supplies so we could both meet an immediate need and start looking for alternatives.

But they suggested that. I said, ''Well, you know, I am for that. I voted for that. The Republican majority passed it four times in the House and couldn't get it through the Senate because of Democratic obstruction, so we probably can't get it done.''

Then they said, ''Let's do more exploration and production offshore. We have seen Katrina. That has worked well in terms of no spillage. We know we had 25 percent of our supply in the Gulf of Mexico. We could do more.'' I said, ''Well, I am for that, but we can't do that either.''

Then they asked about additional refining capacity, and they asked about expedited permitting on non-park Federal lands. They just went through a litany of things. Alternative energy. Each one I would say yes, I am for that, but we can't get that through, particularly a Democratic Congress.

Finally at the end of this in frustration, one of my good friends said, ''Well, why don't you go back and ask those other Members of Congress who are opposing these measures just how rich they want foreign countries to be? Just how much they want to pay the people overseas that we are importing this petroleum from, or this gas, when we could actually do the production here? Because they are exporting thousands of jobs, billions of dollars, and they are jeopardizing our security.''

Then the guy added in fairness, he said, ''By the way, we are all here giving you suggestions about how to lower the price of the product that we produce.''

We have had a shameful exercise, in my opinion, in the last several days, particularly on the Senate side, where people that work to solve America's energy problems are brought in and interrogated as if they are the source of the problems, and the only frankly justification for that is the high prices. But when those people respond, they say, ''If you would just do the things we have asked you to do year after year after year, we could solve this problem.''

So I am sorry I went on. You have been very generous with your time, and I appreciate that very much. But it is a frustrating problem when the solutions are sitting here waiting to be acted upon by this House and none of them are being dealt with at all.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank you for sharing that history. It is a good point to know what has been attempted and what hasn't been accomplished. But it would also give the opportunity for our constituents to voice their concerns now with factual information to say there are things you can do. Now get it done.

In the time remaining, I would like to turn a portion of that over to my good friend and colleague from Texas, bringing the southern States in now, Congressman RANDY NEUGEBAUER.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Well, I thank the gentleman from Michigan. I also want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, because he makes a very good point. And when he says we are importing thousands of dollars, actually it is billions of dollars. Every day America gets up and writes a check for $1 billion-plus to buy enough energy to run this country for 1 day.

What does that mean? That means that it takes $365 billion currently for America to buy enough energy just to run our country on an annual basis, $1 billion every day. And do you know what? Unfortunately, some of that money is going to some folks that aren't all that friendly to the American people. One of those people is Hugo Chavez.

I want to read you what Hugo Chavez thinks about America. He said, ''What we do regarding the imperialist power of the United States, we have no choice but to unite. We use oil in our war against neo-liberalism.'' He also said, ''We have invaded the United States, but with our oil.''

So every day as the American people go to the pumps all across America, what I want them to visualize is that every day we write Hugo Chavez, who calls us imperialists, a $170 million check. That is $62 billion a year. What would happen if we could invest $1 billion a day in America developing America's energy resources, creating jobs for Americans? Think about it. Instead of writing Hugo Chavez a check for $172 million, that we write America a check for $172 million?

I think of the people I know in the 19th Congressional District of Texas, which is a big district, 29,000 square miles, 27 counties, teachers having to drive 60, 70 miles a day to go and teach our young people, that now are looking at doubling the cost of making that commute across the district.

I think about the man last night that I was talking to in my district. He said, ''Congressman,'' he said, ''I have to drive three times a week 30 miles each way to get dialysis so that I can be treated for diabetes.'' He said, ''Congressman, I am down to the point now of having to choose whether I can afford dialysis, afford gasoline, or afford food.''

Madam Speaker, it is time to say yes. We have heard you say no; no to new drilling, no to building additional power plants in this country; no to new refineries. America is wanting you to say yes, because America is tired of writing checks to Hugo Chavez for $160 million every day.

I thank my friend from Michigan tonight for hosting this hour. I hope that somehow the American people realize that there is a willingness on behalf of many Members of Congress to say yes and to move forward and to do something proactive, instead of doing something that is called nothing.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank my good friend and colleague from Texas for ending it on a point that is poignant, that reminds us what this really costs. I wish we could go on and on tonight to bring out more points like this. This is critical. It is a security issue, as well as a point of life, and you made it very clear. I don't want to write a check for $170 million to Hugo Chavez. Let's get it done.

RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the impeachment resolution noticed last evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. RICHARDSON). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1258

Resolved, That President George W. Bush be impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, and that the following articles of impeachment be exhibited to the United States Senate:

Articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in the name of itself and of the people of the United States of America, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against President George W. Bush for high crimes and misdemeanors.

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, has committed the following abuses of power.

ARTICLE I.—CREATING A SECRET PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN TO MANUFACTURE A FALSE CASE FOR WAR AGAINST IRAQ

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution

of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, illegally spent public dollars on a secret propaganda program to manufacture a false cause for war against Iraq.

The Department of Defense (DOD) has engaged in a years-long secret domestic propaganda campaign to promote the invasion and occupation of Iraq. This secret program was defended by the White House Press Secretary following its exposure. This program follows the pattern of crimes detailed in Article I, II, IV and VIII.. The mission of this program placed it within the field controlled by the White House Iraq Group (WHIG), a White House task-force formed in August 2002 to market an invasion of Iraq to the American people. The group included Karl Rove, I. Lewis Libby, Condoleezza Rice, Karen Hughes, Mary Matalin, Stephen Hadley, Nicholas E. Calio, and James R. Wilkinson.

The WHIG produced white papers detailing so-called intelligence of Iraq's nuclear threat that later proved to be false. This supposed intelligence included the claim that Iraq had sought uranium from Niger as well as the claim that the high strength aluminum tubes Iraq purchased from China were to be used for the sole purpose of building centrifuges to enrich uranium. Unlike the National Intelligence Estimate of 2002, the WHIG's white papers provided ''gripping images and stories'' and used ''literary license'' with intelligence. The WHIG's white papers were written at the same time and by the same people as speeches and talking points prepared for President Bush and some of his top officials.

The WHIG also organized a media blitz in which, between September 7–8, 2002, President Bush and his top advisers appeared on numerous interviews and all provided similarly gripping images about the possibility of nuclear attack by Iraq. The timing was no coincidence, as Andrew Card explained in an interview regarding waiting until after Labor Day to try to sell the American people on military action against Iraq, ''From a marketing point of view, you don't introduce new products in August.''

September 7–8, 2002:

NBC's ''Meet the Press: Vice President Cheney accused Saddam of moving aggressively to develop nuclear weapons over the past 14 months to add to his stockpile of chemical and biological arms.

CNN: Then-National Security Adviser Rice said, regarding the likelihood of Iraq obtaining a nuclear weapon, ''We don't want the smoking gun to be a mushroom cloud.''

CBS: President Bush declared that Saddam was ''six months away from developing a weapon,'' and cited satellite photos of construction in Iraq where weapons inspectors once visited as evidence that Saddam was trying to develop nuclear arms.

The Pentagon military analyst propaganda program was revealed in an April 20, 2002, New York Times article. The program illegally involved ''covert attempts to mold opinion through the undisclosed use of third parties.'' Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld recruited 75 retired military officers and gave them talking points to deliver on Fox, CNN, ABC, NBC, CBS, and MSNBC, and according to the New York Times report, which has not been disputed by the Pentagon or the White House, ''Participants were instructed not to quote their briefers directly or otherwise describe their contacts with the Pentagon.''

According to the Pentagon's own internal documents, the military analysts were considered ''message force multipliers'' or ''surrogates'' who would deliver administration ''themes and messages'' to millions of Americans ''in the form of their own opinions.'' In fact, they did deliver the themes and the messages but did not reveal that the Pentagon had provided them with their talking points. Robert S. Bevelacqua, a retired Green Beret and Fox News military analyst described this as follows: ''It was them saying, 'We need to stick our hands up your back and move your mouth for you.'''

Congress has restricted annual appropriations bills since 1951 with this language: ''No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not heretofore authorized by the Congress.''

A March 21, 2005, report by the Congressional Research Service states that ''publicity or propaganda'' is defined by the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) to mean either (1) self-aggrandizement by public officials, (2) purely partisan activity, or (3) ''covert propaganda.''

These concerns about ''covert propaganda'' were also the basis for the GAO's standard for determining when government-funded video news releases are illegal:

''The failure of an agency to identify itself as the source of a prepackaged news story misleads the viewing public by encouraging the viewing audience to believe that the broadcasting news organization developed the information. The prepackaged news stories are purposefully designed to be indistinguishable from news segments broadcast to the public. When the television viewing public does not know that the stories they watched on television news programs about the government were in fact prepared by the government, the stories are, in this sense, no longer purely factual—the essential fact of attribution is missing.''

The White House's own Office of Legal Council stated in a memorandum written in 2005 following the controversy over the Armstrong Williams scandal:

''Over the years, GAO has interpreted 'publicity or propaganda' restrictions to preclude use of appropriated funds for, among other things, so-called 'covert propaganda.' . . . Consistent with that view, the OLC determined in 1988 that a statutory prohibition on using appropriated funds for 'publicity or propaganda' precluded undisclosed agency funding of advocacy by third-party groups. We stated that 'covert attempts to mold opinion through the undisclosed use of third parties' would run afoul of restrictions on using appropriated funds for 'propaganda.'''

Asked about the Pentagon's propaganda program at White House press briefing in April 2008, White House Press Secretary Dana Perino defended it, not by arguing that it was legal but by suggesting that it ''should'' be: ''Look, I didn't know look, I think that you guys should take a step back and look at this look, DOD has made a decision, they've decided to stop this program. But I would say that one of the things that we try to do in the administration is get information out to a variety of people so that everybody else can call them and ask their opinion about something. And I don't think that that should be against the law. And I think that it's absolutely appropriate to provide information to people who are seeking it and are going to be providing their opinions on it. It doesn't necessarily mean that all of those military analysts ever agreed with the administration. I think you can go back and look and think that a lot of their analysis was pretty tough on the administration. That doesn't mean that we shouldn't talk to people.''

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE II.—FALSELY, SYSTEMATICALLY, AND WITH CRIMINAL INTENT CONFLATING THE ATTACKS OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001 WITH MISREPRESENTATION OF IRAQ AS AN IMMINENT SECURITY THREAT AS PART OF A FRAUDULENT JUSTIFICATION FOR A WAR OF AGGRESSION.

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, executed a calculated and wide-ranging strategy to deceive the citizens and Congress of the United States into believing that there was and is a connection between Iraq and Saddam Hussein on the one hand, and the attacks of September 11, 2001 and al Qaeda, on the other hand, so as to falsely justify the use of the United States Armed Forces against the nation of Iraq in a manner that is damaging to the national security interests of the United States, as well as to fraudulently obtain and maintain congressional authorization and funding for the use of such military force against Iraq, thereby interfering with and obstructing Congress's lawful functions of overseeing foreign affairs and declaring war.

The means used to implement this deception were and continue to be, first, allowing, authorizing and sanctioning the manipulation of intelligence analysis by those under his direction and control, including the Vice President and the Vice President's agents, and second, personally making, or causing, authorizing and allowing to be made through highly- placed subordinates, including the President's Chief of Staff, the White House Press Secretary and other White House spokespersons, the Secretaries of State and Defense, the National Security Advisor, and their deputies and spokespersons, false and fraudulent representations to the citizens of the United States and Congress regarding an alleged connection between Saddam Hussein and Iraq, on the one hand, and the September 11th attacks and al Qaeda, on the other hand, that were half-true, literally true but misleading, and/or made without a reasonable basis and with reckless indifference to their truth, as well as omitting to state facts necessary to present an accurate picture of the truth as follows:

(A) On or about September 12, 2001, former terrorism advisor Richard Clarke personally informed the President that neither Saddam Hussein nor Iraq was responsible for the September 11th attacks. On September 18, Clarke submitted to the President's National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice a memo he had written in response to George W. Bush's specific request that stated: (1) the case for linking Hussein to the September 11th attacks was weak; (2) only anecdotal evidence linked Hussein to al Qaeda; (3) Osama Bin Laden resented the secularism of Saddam Hussein; and (4) there was no confirmed reporting of Saddam Hussein cooperating with Bin Laden on unconventional weapons.

(B) Ten days after the September 11th attacks the President received a President's

Daily Briefing which indicated that the U.S. intelligence community had no evidence linking Saddam Hussein to the September 11th attacks and that there was ''scant credible evidence that Iraq had any significant collaborative ties with Al Qaeda.''

(C) In Defense Intelligence Terrorism Summary No. 044–02, issued in February 2002, the United States Defense Intelligence Agency cast significant doubt on the possibility of a Saddam Hussein-Al Qaeda conspiracy: ''Saddam's regime is intensely secular and is wary of Islamic revolutionary movements. Moreover, Baghdad is unlikely to provide assistance to a group it cannot control.''

(D) The October 2002 National Intelligence Estimate gave a ''Low Confidence'' rating to the notion of whether ''in desperation Saddam would share chemical or biological weapons with Al Qaeda.'' The CIA never informed the President that there was an operational relationship between Al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein; on the contrary, its most ''aggressive'' analysis contained in Iraq and al-Qaeda-Interpreting a ''Murky Relationship'' dated June 21, 2002 was that Iraq had had ''sporadic, wary contacts with al Qaeda since the mid-1990s rather than a relationship with al Qaeda that has developed over time.''

(E) Notwithstanding his knowledge that neither Saddam Hussein nor Iraq was in any way connected to the September 11th attacks, the President allowed and authorized those acting under his direction and control, including Vice President Richard B. Cheney and Lewis Libby, who reported directly to both the President and the Vice President, and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, among others, to pressure intelligence analysts to alter their assessments and to create special units outside of, and unknown to, the intelligence community in order to secretly obtain unreliable information, to manufacture intelligence or reinterpret raw data in ways that would further the Bush administration's goal of fraudulently establishing a relationship not only between Iraq and al Qaeda, but between Iraq and the attacks of September 11th.

(F) Further, despite his full awareness that Iraq and Saddam Hussein had no relationship to the September 11th attacks, the President, and those acting under his direction and control have, since at least 2002 and continuing to the present, repeatedly issued public statements deliberately worded to mislead, words calculated in their implication to bring unrelated actors and circumstances into an artificially contrived reality thereby facilitating the systematic deception of Congress and the American people. Thus the public and some members of Congress, came to believe, falsely, that there was a connection between Iraq and the attacks of 9/11. This was accomplished through well-publicized statements by the Bush Administration which contrived to continually tie Iraq and 9/11 in the same statements of grave concern without making an explicit charge:

(1) ''[If] Iraq regimes [sic] continues to defy us, and the world, we will move deliberately, yet decisively, to hold Iraq to account . . . It's a new world we're in. We used to think two oceans could separate us from an enemy. On that tragic day, September the 11th, 2001, we found out that's not the case. We found out this great land of liberty and of freedom and of justice is vulnerable. And therefore we must do everything we can—everything we can—to secure the homeland, to make us safe.'' Speech of President Bush in Iowa on September 16, 2002.

(2) ''With every step the Iraqi regime takes toward gaining and deploying the most terrible weapons, our own options to confront that regime will narrow. And if an emboldened regime were to supply these weapons to terrorist allies, then the attacks of September 11th would be a prelude to far greater horrors.'' March 6, 2003, Statement of President Bush in National Press Conference.

(3) ''The battle of Iraq is one victory in a war on terror that began on September the 11, 2001—and still goes on. That terrible morning, 19 evil men—the shock troops of a hateful ideology—gave America and the civilized world a glimpse of their ambitions. They imagined, in the words of one terrorist, that September the 11th would be the 'beginning of the end of America.' By seeking to turn our cities into killing fields, terrorists and their allies believed that they could destroy this nation's resolve, and force our retreat from the world. They have failed.'' May 1, 2003, Speech of President Bush on U.S.S. *Abraham Lincoln*.

(4) ''Now we're in a new and unprecedented war against violent Islamic extremists. This is an ideological conflict we face against murderers and killers who try to impose their will. These are the people that attacked us on September the 11th and killed nearly 3,000 people. The stakes are high, and once again, we have had to change our strategic thinking. The major battleground in this war is Iraq.'' June 28, 2007, Speech of President Bush at the Naval War College in Newport, Rhode Island.

(G) Notwithstanding his knowledge that there was no credible evidence of a working relationship between Saddam Hussein and Al Qaeda and that the intelligence community had specifically assessed that there was no such operational relationship, the President, both personally and through his subordinates and agents, has repeatedly falsely represented, both explicitly and implicitly, and through the misleading use of selectively-chosen facts, to the citizens of the United States and to the Congress that there was and is such an ongoing operational relationship, to wit:

(1) ''We know that Iraq and al Qaeda have had high-level contacts that go back a decade. Some al Qaeda leaders who fled Afghanistan went to Iraq. These include one very senior al Qaeda leader who received medical treatment in Baghdad this year, and who has been associated with planning for chemical and biological attacks. We've learned that Iraq has trained al Qaeda members in bomb-making and poisons and deadly gases.'' September 28, 2002, Weekly Radio Address of President Bush to the Nation.

(2) ''[W]e we need to think about Saddam Hussein using al Qaeda to do his dirty work, to not leave fingerprints behind.'' October 14, 2002, Remarks by President Bush in Michigan.

(3) ''We know he's got ties with al Qaeda.'' November 1, 2002, Speech of President Bush in New Hampshire.

(4) ''Evidence from intelligence sources, secret communications, and statements by people now in custody reveal that Saddam Hussein aids and protects terrorists, including members of al Qaeda. Secretly, and without fingerprints, he could provide one of his hidden weapons to terrorists, or help them develop their own.'' January 28, 2003, President Bush's State of the Union Address.

(5) ''[W]hat I want to bring to your attention today is the potentially much more sinister nexus between Iraq and the al Qaeda terrorist network, a nexus that combines classic terrorist organizations and modern methods of murder. Iraq today harbors a deadly terrorist network . . .'' February 5, 2003, Speech of Former Secretary of State Colin Powell to the United Nations.

(6) ''The battle of Iraq is one victory in a war on terror that began on September the 11, 2001—and still goes on. . . . [T]he liberation of Iraq . . . removed an ally of al Qaeda.'' May 1, 2003, Speech of President Bush on U.S.S. *Abraham Lincoln*.

(H) The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Report on Whether Public Statements Regarding Iraq By U.S. Government Officials Were Substantiated By Intelligence Information, which was released on June 5, 2008, concluded that:

(1) ''Statements and implications by the President and Secretary of State suggesting that Iraq and al-Qaeda had a partnership, or that Iraq had provided al-Qaeda with weapons training, were not substantiated by the intelligence.''

(2) ''The Intelligence Community did not confirm that Muhammad Atta met an Iraqi intelligence officer in Prague in 2001 as the Vice President repeatedly claimed.''

Through his participation and instance in the breathtaking scope of this deception, the President has used the highest office of trust to wage of campaign of deception of such sophistication as to deliberately subvert the national security interests of the United States. His dishonesty set the stage for the loss of more than 4000 United States service members; injuries to tens of thousands of soldiers, the loss of more than 1,000,000 innocent Iraqi citizens since the United States invasion; the loss of approximately $527 billion in war costs which has increased our Federal debt and the ultimate expenditure of three to five trillion dollars for all costs covering the war; the loss of military readiness within the United States Armed Services due to overextension, the lack of training and lack of equipment; the loss of United States credibility in world affairs; and the decades of likely blowback created by the invasion of Iraq.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE III.—MISLEADING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO BELIEVE IRAQ POSSESSED WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION, SO AS TO MANUFACTURE A FALSE CASE FOR WAR

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, executed instead a calculated and wide-ranging strategy to deceive the citizens and Congress of the United States into believing that the nation of Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction in order to justify the use of the United States Armed Forces against the nation of Iraq in a manner damaging to our national security interests, thereby interfering with and obstructing Congress's lawful functions of overseeing foreign affairs and declaring war.

The means used to implement this deception were and continue to be personally making, or causing, authorizing and allowing to be made through highly-placed subordinates, including the President's Chief of Staff, the White House Press Secretary and other White House spokespersons, the Secretaries of State and Defense, the National Security Advisor, and their deputies and

spokespersons, false and fraudulent representations to the citizens of the United States and Congress regarding Iraq's alleged possession of biological, chemical and nuclear weapons that were half-true, literally true but misleading, and/or made without a reasonable basis and with reckless indifference to their truth, as well as omitting to state facts necessary to present an accurate picture of the truth as follows:

(A) Long before the March 19, 2003 invasion of Iraq, a wealth of intelligence informed the President and those under his direction and control that Iraq's stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons had been destroyed well before 1998 and that there was little, if any, credible intelligence that showed otherwise. As reported in the Washington Post in March of 2003, in 1995, Saddam Hussein's son-in-law Hussein Kamel had informed U.S. and British intelligence officers that ''all weapons—biological, chemical, missile, nuclear were destroyed.'' In September 2002, the Defense Intelligence Agency issued a report that concluded: ''A substantial amount of Iraq's chemical warfare agents, precursors, munitions and production equipment were destroyed between 1991 and 1998 as a result of Operation Desert Storm and UNSCOM actions . . . [T]here is no reliable information on whether Iraq is producing and stockpiling chemical weapons or whether Iraq has—or will—establish its chemical warfare agent production facilities.'' Notwithstanding the absence of evidence proving that such stockpiles existed and in direct contradiction to substantial evidence that showed they did not exist, the President and his subordinates and agents made numerous false representations claiming with certainty that Iraq possessed chemical and biological weapons that it was developing to use to attack the United States, to wit:

(1) ''[T]he notion of a Saddam Hussein with his great oil wealth, with his inventory that he already has of biological and chemical weapons . . . is, I think, a frightening proposition for anybody who thinks about it.'' Statement of Vice President Cheney on CBS's Face the Nation, March 24, 2002.

(2) ''In defiance of the United Nations, Iraq has stockpiled biological and chemical weapons, and is rebuilding the facilities used to make more of those weapons.'' Speech of President Bush, October 5, 2002.

(3) ''All the world has now seen the footage of an Iraqi Mirage aircraft with a fuel tank modified to spray biological agents over wide areas. Iraq has developed spray devices that could be used on unmanned aerial vehicles with ranges far beyond what is permitted by the Security Council. A UAV launched from a vessel off the American coast could reach hundreds of miles inland.'' Statement by President Bush from the White House, February 6, 2003.

(B) Despite overwhelming intelligence in the form of statements and reports filed by and on behalf of the CIA, the State Department and the IAEA, among others, which indicated that the claim was untrue, the President, and those under his direction and control, made numerous representations claiming and implying through misleading language that Iraq was attempting to purchase uranium from Niger in order to falsely buttress its argument that Iraq was reconstituting its nuclear weapons program, including:

(1) ''The regime has the scientists and facilities to build nuclear weapons, and is seeking the materials needed to do so.'' Statement of President Bush from White House, October 2, 2002.

(2) ''The [Iraqi] report also failed to deal with issues which have arisen since 1998, including: . . . attempts to acquire uranium and the means to enrich it.'' Letter from President Bush to Vice President Cheney and the Senate, January 20, 2003.

(3) ''The British Government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa.'' President Bush Delivers State of the Union Address, January 28, 2003.

(C) Despite overwhelming evidence in the form of reports by nuclear weapons experts from the Energy, the Defense and State Departments, as well from outside and international agencies which assessed that aluminum tubes the Iraqis were purchasing were not suitable for nuclear centrifuge use and were, on the contrary, identical to ones used in rockets already being manufactured by the Iraqis, the President, and those under his direction and control, persisted in making numerous false and fraudulent representations implying and stating explicitly that the Iraqis were purchasing the tubes for use in a nuclear weapons program, to wit:

(1) ''We do know that there have been shipments going . . . into Iraq . . . of aluminum tubes that really are only suited to—high-quality aluminum tools [sic] that are only really suited for nuclear weapons programs, centrifuge programs.'' Statement of then National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice on CNN's Late Edition with Wolf Blitzer, September 8, 2002.

(2) ''Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production.'' President Bush's State of the Union Address, January 28, 2003.

(3) ''[H]e has made repeated covert attempts to acquire high-specification aluminum tubes from 11 different countries, even after inspections resumed. . . . By now, just about everyone has heard of these tubes and we all know that there are differences of opinion. There is controversy about what these tubes are for. Most U.S. experts think they are intended to serve as rotors in centrifuges used to enrich uranium.'' Speech of Former Secretary of State Colin Powell to the United Nations, February 5, 2003.

(D) The President, both personally and acting through those under his direction and control, suppressed material information, selectively declassified information for the improper purposes of retaliating against a whistleblower and presenting a misleading picture of the alleged threat from Iraq, facilitated the exposure of the identity of a covert CIA operative and thereafter not only failed to investigate the improper leaks of classified information from within his administration, but also failed to cooperate with an investigation into possible federal violations resulting from this activity and, finally, entirely undermined the prosecution by commuting the sentence of Lewis Libby citing false and insubstantial grounds, all in an effort to prevent Congress and the citizens of the United States from discovering the fraudulent nature of the President's claimed justifications for the invasion of Iraq.

(E) The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Report on Whether Public Statements Regarding Iraq By U.S. Government Officials Were Substantiated By Intelligence Information, which was released on June 5, 2008, concluded that:

(1) ''Statements by the President and Vice President prior to the October 2002 National Intelligence Estimate regarding Iraq's chemical weapons production capability and activities did not reflect the intelligence community's uncertainties as to whether such production was ongoing.''

(2) ''The Secretary of Defense's statement that the Iraqi government operated underground WMD facilities that were not vulnerable to conventional airstrikes because they were underground and deeply buried was not substantiated by available intelligence information.''

(3) Chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee Jay Rockefeller concluded: ''In making the case for war, the Administration repeatedly presented intelligence as fact when in reality it was unsubstantiated, contradicted, or even non-existent. As a result, the American people were led to believe that the threat from Iraq was much greater than actually existed.''

The President has subverted the national security interests of the United States by setting the stage for the loss of more than 4000 United States service members and the injury to tens of thousands of U.S. soldiers; the loss of more than 1,000,000 innocent Iraqi citizens since the United States invasion; the loss of approximately $500 billion in war costs which has increased our Federal debt with a long term financial cost of between three and five trillion dollars; the loss of military readiness within the United States Armed Services due to overextension, the lack of training and lack of equipment; the loss of United States credibility in world affairs; and the decades of likely blowback created by the invasion of Iraq.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE IV.—MISLEADING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO BELIEVE IRAQ POSED AN IMMINENT THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, executed a calculated and wide-ranging strategy to deceive the citizens and Congress of the United States into believing that the nation of Iraq posed an imminent threat to the United States in order to justify the use of the United States Armed Forces against the nation of Iraq in a manner damaging to our national security interests, thereby interfering with and obstructing Congress's lawful functions of overseeing foreign affairs and declaring war.

The means used to implement this deception were and continue to be, first, allowing, authorizing and sanctioning the manipulation of intelligence analysis by those under his direction and control, including the Vice President and the Vice President's agents, and second, personally making, or causing, authorizing and allowing to be made through highly-placed subordinates, including the President's Chief of Staff, the White House Press Secretary and other White House spokespersons, the Secretaries of State and Defense, the National Security Advisor, and their deputies and spokespersons, false and fraudulent representations to the citizens of the United States and Congress regarding an alleged urgent threat posed by Iraq, statements that were half-true, literally true but misleading, and/or made without a reasonable basis and with reckless indifference to their truth, as well as omitting to state facts necessary to present an accurate picture of the truth as follows:

(A) Notwithstanding the complete absence of intelligence analysis to support a claim that Iraq posed an imminent or urgent threat to the United States and the intelligence community's assessment that Iraq was in fact not likely to attack the United States unless it was itself attacked, President Bush, both personally and through his agents and subordinates, made, allowed and caused to be made repeated false representations to the citizens and Congress of the United States implying and explicitly stating that such a dire threat existed, including the following:

(1) ''States such as these [Iraq, Iran and North Korea] and their terrorist allies constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred. They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States. In any of these cases, the price of indifference would be catastrophic.'' President Bush's State of the Union Address, January 29, 2002.

(2) ''Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction. He is amassing them to use against our friends, our enemies and against us.'' Speech of Vice President Cheney at VFW 103rd National Convention, August 26, 2002.

(3) ''The history, the logic, and the facts lead to one conclusion: Saddam Hussein's regime is a grave and gathering danger. To suggest otherwise is to hope against the evidence. To assume this regime's good faith is to bet the lives of millions and the peace of the world in a reckless gamble. And this is a risk we must not take.'' Address of President Bush to the United Nations General Assembly, September 12, 2002.

(4) ''[N]o terrorist state poses a greater or more immediate threat to the security of our people than the regime of Saddam Hussein and Iraq.'' Statement of Former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld to Congress, September 19, 2002.

(5) ''On its present course, the Iraqi regime is a threat of unique urgency . . . it has developed weapons of mass death.'' Statement of President Bush at White House, October 2, 2002.

(6) ''But the President also believes that this problem has to be dealt with, and if the United Nations won't deal with it, then the United States, with other likeminded nations, may have to deal with it. We would prefer not to go that route, but the danger is so great, with respect to Saddam Hussein having weapons of mass destruction, and perhaps even terrorists getting hold of such weapons, that it is time for the international community to act, and if it doesn't act, the President is prepared to act with likeminded nations.'' Statement of Former Secretary of State Colin Powell in interview with Ellen Ratner of Talk Radio News, October 30, 2002.

(7) ''Today the world is also uniting to answer the unique and urgent threat posed by Iraq. A dictator who has used weapons of mass destruction on his own people must not be allowed to produce or possess those weapons. We will not permit Saddam Hussein to blackmail and/or terrorize nations which love freedom.'' Speech by President Bush to Prague Atlantic Student Summit, November 20, 2002.

(8) ''But the risk of doing nothing, the risk of the security of this country being jeopardized at the hands of a madman with weapons of mass destruction far exceeds the risk of any action we may be forced to take.'' President Bush Meets with National Economic Council at White House, February 25, 2003.

(B) In furtherance of his fraudulent effort to deceive Congress and the citizens of the United States into believing that Iraq and Saddam Hussein posed an imminent threat to the United States, the President allowed and authorized those acting under his direction and control, including Vice President Richard B. Cheney, former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, and Lewis Libby, who reported directly to both the President and the Vice President, among others, to pressure intelligence analysts to tailor their assessments and to create special units outside of, and unknown to, the intelligence community in order to secretly obtain unreliable information, to manufacture intelligence, or to reinterpret raw data in ways that would support the Bush administration's plan to invade Iraq based on a false claim of urgency despite the lack of justification for such a preemptive action.

(C) The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Report on Whether Public Statements Regarding Iraq By U.S. Government Officials Were Substantiated By Intelligence Information, which was released on June 5, 2008, concluded that:

(1) ''Statements by the President and the Vice President indicating that Saddam Hussein was prepared to give weapons of mass destruction to terrorist groups for attacks against the United States were contradicted by available intelligence information.''

Thus the President willfully and falsely misrepresented Iraq as an urgent threat requiring immediate action thereby subverting the national security interests of the United States by setting the stage for the loss of more than 4,000 United States service members; the injuries to tens of thousands of U.S. soldiers; the deaths of more than 1,000,000 Iraqi citizens since the United States invasion; the loss of approximately $527 billion in war costs which has increased our Federal debt and the ultimate costs of the war between three trillion and five trillion dollars; the loss of military readiness within the United States Armed Services due to overextension, the lack of training and lack of equipment; the loss of United States credibility in world affairs; and the decades of likely blowback created by the invasion of Iraq.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE V.—ILLEGALLY MISSPENDING FUNDS TO SECRETLY BEGIN A WAR OF AGGRESSION

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, illegally misspent funds to begin a war in secret prior to any Congressional authorization.

The president used over $2 billion in the summer of 2002 to prepare for the invasion of Iraq. First reported in Bob Woodward's book, Plan of Attack, and later confirmed by the Congressional Research Service, Bush took money appropriated by Congress for Afghanistan and other programs and—with no Congressional notification—used it to build airfields in Qatar and to make other preparations for the invasion of Iraq. This constituted a violation of Article I, Section 9 of the U.S. Constitution, as well as a violation of the War Powers Act of 1973.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE VI.—INVADING IRAQ IN VIOLATION OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF H.J. RES. 114.

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', exceeded his Constitutional authority to wage war by invading Iraq in 2003 without meeting the requirements of H.J. Res. 114, the ''Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002'' to wit:

(1) H.J. Res. 114 contains several Whereas clauses consistent with statements being made by the White House at the time regarding the threat from Iraq as evidenced by the following:

(A) H.J. Res. 114 states ''Whereas Iraq both poses a continuing threat to the national security of the United States and international peace and security in the Persian Gulf region and remains in material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations by, among other things, continuing to possess and develop a significant chemical and biological weapons capability, actively seeking a nuclear weapons capability, and supporting and harboring terrorist organizations;''; and

(B) H.J. Res. 114 states ''Whereas members of Al Qaeda, an organization bearing responsibility for attacks on the United States, its citizens, and interests, including the attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, are known to be in Iraq;''.

(2) H.J. Res. 114 states that the President must provide a determination, the truthfulness of which is implied, that military force is necessary in order to use the authorization, as evidenced by the following:

(A) Section 3 of H.J. Res. 114 states:

''(b) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION.—In connection with the exercise of the authority granted in subsection (a) to use force the President shall, prior to such exercise or as soon thereafter as may be feasible, but no later than 48 hours after exercising such authority, make available to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate his determination that—

(1) reliance by the United States on further diplomatic or other peaceful means alone either (A) will not adequately protect the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq nor (B) likely lead to enforcement of all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq; and

(2) acting pursuant to the Constitution and Public Law 107–243 is consistent with the United States and other countries continuing to take the necessary actions against international terrorists and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations, or persons who planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001.

(4) President George Bush knew that these statements were false as evidenced by:

(A) INFORMATION PROVIDED WITH ARTICLE I, II, III, IV AND V.

(B) A statement by President George Bush in an interview with Tony Blair on January 31st 2003: [WH]

Reporter: ''One question for you both. Do you believe that there is a link between Saddam Hussein, a direct link, and the men who attacked on September the 11th?''

President Bush: ''I can't make that claim''

(C) An article on February 19th by Terrorism expert Rohan Gunaratna states ''I could find no evidence of links between Iraq and Al Qaeda. The documentation and interviews indicated that Al Qaeda regarded Saddam, a secular leader, as an infidel.'' [InternationalHeraldTribune]

(D) According to a February 2nd, 2003 article in the New York Times: [NYT]

At the Federal Bureau of Investigation, some investigators said they were baffled by the Bush administration's insistence on a solid link between Iraq and Osama bin Laden's network. ''We've been looking at this hard for more than a year and you know what, we just don't think it's there,'' a government official said.

(5) Section 3C of HJRes 114 states that ''Nothing in this joint resolution supersedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution.''

(6) The War Powers Resolution Section 9(d)(1) states:

(d) Nothing in this joint resolution—

(1) is intended to alter the constitutional authority of the Congress or of the President, or the provision of existing treaties; or

(7) The United Nations Charter was an existing treaty and, as shown in Article VIII, the invasion of Iraq violated that treaty.

(8) President George Bush knowingly failed to meet the requirements of HJRes 114 and violated the requirement of the War Powers Resolution and, thereby, invaded Iraq without the authority of Congress.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE VII.—INVADING IRAQ ABSENT A DECLARATION OF WAR

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has launched a war against Iraq absent any congressional declaration of war or equivalent action.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 (the War Powers Clause) makes clear that the United States Congress holds the exclusive power to decide whether or not to send the nation into war. ''The Congress,'' the War Powers Clause states, ''shall have power . . . To declare war . . .''

The October 2002 congressional resolution on Iraq did not constitute a declaration of war or equivalent action. The resolution stated: ''The President is authorized to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary and appropriate in order to 1) defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq; and 2) enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.'' The resolution unlawfully sought to delegate to the President the decision of whether or not to initiate a war against Iraq, based on whether he deemed it ''necessary and appropriate.'' The Constitution does not allow Congress to delegate this exclusive power to the President, nor does it allow the President to seize this power.

In March 2003, the President launched a war against Iraq without any constitutional authority.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE VIII.—INVADING IRAQ, A SOVEREIGN NATION, IN VIOLATION OF THE UN CHARTER AND INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL LAW

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', violated United States law by invading the sovereign country of Iraq in violation of the United Nations Charter to wit:

(1) International Laws ratified by Congress are part of United States Law and must be followed as evidenced by the following:

(A) Article VI of the United States Constitution, which states ''This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land;''

(2) The UN Charter, which entered into force following ratification by the United States in 1945, requires Security Council approval for the use of force except for self-defense against an armed attack as evidenced by the following:

(A) Chapter 1, Article 2 of the United Nations Charter states:

''3. All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

''4. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.''

(B) Chapter 7, Article 51 of the United Nations Charter states:

''51. Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.''

(3) There was no armed attack upon the United States by Iraq.

(4) The Security Council did not vote to approve the use of force against Iraq as evidenced by:

(A) A United Nation Press release which states that the United States had failed to convince the Security Council to approve the use of military force against Iraq. [UN]

(5) President Bush directed the United States military to invade Iraq on March 19th, 2003 in violation of the UN Charter and, therefore, in violation of United States Law as evidenced by the following:

(A) A letter from President Bush to Congress dated March 21st, 2003 stating ''I directed U.S. Armed Forces, operating with other coalition forces, to commence combat operations on March 19, 2003, against Iraq.'' [WH]

(B) On September 16, 2004 Kofi Annan, the Secretary General of the United Nations, speaking on the invasion, said, ''I have indicated it was not in conformity with the UN charter. From our point of view, from the charter point of view, it was illegal.'' [BBC]

(C) The consequence of the instant and direction of President George W. Bush, in ordering an attack upon Iraq, a sovereign nation is in direct violation of United States Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 118, Section 2441, governing the offense of war crimes.

(6) In the course of invading and occupying Iraq, the President, as Commander in Chief, has taken responsibility for the targeting of civilians, journalists, hospitals, and ambulances, use of antipersonnel weapons including cluster bombs in densely settled urban areas, the use of white phosphorous as a weapon, depleted uranium weapons, and the use of a new version of napalm found in Mark 77 firebombs. Under the direction of President George Bush the United States has engaged in collective punishment of Iraqi civilian populations, including but not limited to blocking roads, cutting electricity and water, destroying fuel stations, planting bombs in farm fields, demolishing houses, and plowing over orchards.

(A) Under the principle of ''command responsibility'', i.e., that a de jure command can be civilian as well as military, and can apply to the policy command of heads of state, said command brings President George Bush within the reach of international criminal law under the Additional Protocol I of June 8, 1977 to the Geneva Conventions of August 12, 1949, and Relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts, Article 86(2). The United States is a state signatory to Additional Protocol I, on December 12, 1977.

(B) Furthermore, Article 85(3) of said Protocol I defines as a grave breach making a civilian population or individual civilians the object of attacks. This offense, together with the principle of command responsibility, places President George Bush's conduct under the reach of the same law and principles described as the basis for war crimes prosecution at Nuremburg, under Article 6 of the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunals: including crimes against peace, violations of the laws and customs of war and crimes against humanity, similarly codified in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, Articles 5 through 8.

(C) The Lancet Report has established massive civilian casualties in Iraq as a result of the United States' invasion and occupation of that country.

(D) International laws governing wars of aggression are completely prohibited under the legal principle of jus cogens, whether or not a nation has signed or ratified a particular international agreement.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office

ARTICLE IX.—FAILING TO PROVIDE TROOPS WITH BODY ARMOR AND VEHICLE ARMOR

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United

States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed,'' has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, has been responsible for the deaths of members of the U.S. military and serious injury and trauma to other soldiers, by failing to provide available body armor and vehicle armor.

While engaging in an invasion and occupation of choice, not fought in self-defense, and not launched in accordance with any timetable other than the President's choosing, President Bush sent U.S. troops into danger without providing them with armor. This shortcoming has been known for years, during which time, the President has chosen to allow soldiers and marines to continue to face unnecessary risk to life and limb rather then providing them with armor.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE X.—FALSIFYING ACCOUNTS OF U.S. TROOP DEATHS AND INJURIES FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed,'' has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, promoted false propaganda stories about members of the United States military, including individuals both dead and injured.

The White House and the Department of Defense (DOD) in 2004 promoted a false account of the death of Specialist Pat Tillman, reporting that he had died in a hostile exchange, delaying release of the information that he had died from friendly fire, shot in the forehead three times in a manner that led investigating doctors to believe he had been shot at close range.

A 2005 report by Brig. Gen. Gary M. Jones reported that in the days immediately following Specialist Tillman's death, U.S. Army investigators were aware that Specialist Tillman was killed by friendly fire, shot three times to the head, and that senior Army commanders, including Gen. John Abizaid, knew of this fact within days of the shooting but nevertheless approved the awarding of the Silver Star, Purple Heart, and a posthumous promotion.

On April 24, 2007, Spc. Bryan O'Neal, the last soldier to see Specialist Pat Tillman alive, testified before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee that he was warned by superiors not to divulge information that a fellow soldier killed Specialist Tillman, especially to the Tillman family. The White House refused to provide requested documents to the committee, citing ''executive branch confidentiality interests.''

The White House and DOD in 2003 promoted a false account of the injury of Jessica Dawn Lynch, reporting that she had been captured in a hostile exchange and had been dramatically rescued. On April 2, 2003, the DOD released a video of the rescue and claimed that Lynch had stab and bullet wounds, and that she had been slapped about on her hospital bed and interrogated. Iraqi doctors and nurses later interviewed, including Dr. Harith Al-Houssona, a doctor in the Nasirya hospital, described Lynch's injuries as ''a broken arm, a broken thigh, and a dislocated ankle.'' According to Al-Houssona, there was no sign of gunshot or stab wounds, and Lynch's injuries were consistent with those that would be suffered in a car accident. Al-Houssona's claims were later confirmed in a U.S. Army report leaked on July 10, 2003.

Lynch denied that she fought or was wounded fighting, telling Diane Sawyer that the Pentagon ''used me to symbolize all this stuff. It's wrong. I don't know why they filmed [my rescue] or why they say these things. . . . I did not shoot, not a round, nothing. I went down praying to my knees. And that's the last I remember.'' She reported excellent treatment in Iraq, and that one person in the hospital even sang to her to help her feel at home.

On April 24, 2007 Lynch testified before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:

''[Right after my capture], tales of great heroism were being told. My parent's home in Wirt County was under siege of the media all repeating the story of the little girl Rambo from the hills who went down fighting. It was not true. . . . I am still confused as to why they chose to lie.''

The White House had heavily promoted the false story of Lynch's rescue, including in a speech by President Bush on April 28, 2003. After the fiction was exposed, the President awarded Lynch the Bronze Star.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XI.—ESTABLISHMENT OF PERMANENT U.S. MILITARY BASES IN IRAQ

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed,'' has violated an act of Congress that he himself signed into law by using public funds to construct permanent U.S. military bases in Iraq.

On January 28, 2008, President George W. Bush signed into law the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2008 (H.R. 4986). Noting that the Act ''authorizes funding for the defense of the United States and its interests abroad, for military construction, and for national security-related energy programs,'' the president added the following ''signing statement'':

''Provisions of the Act, including sections 841, 846, 1079, and 1222, purport to impose requirements that could inhibit the President's ability to carry out his constitutional obligations to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, to protect national security, to supervise the executive branch, and to execute his authority as Commander in Chief. The executive branch shall construe such provisions in a manner consistent with the constitutional authority of the President.''

Section 1222 clearly prohibits the expenditure of money for the purpose of establishing permanent U.S. military bases in Iraq. The construction of over $1 billion in U.S. military bases in Iraq, including runways for aircraft, continues despite congressional intent, as the Administration intends to force upon the Iraqi government such terms which will assure the bases remain in Iraq.

Iraqi officials have informed Members of Congress in May 2008 of the strong opposition within the Iraqi parliament and throughout Iraq to the agreement that the administration is trying to negotiate with Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki. The agreement seeks to assure a long-term U.S. presence in Iraq of which military bases are the most obvious, sufficient and necessary construct, thus clearly defying Congressional intent as to the matter and meaning of ''permanency.''

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XII.—INITIATING A WAR AGAINST IRAQ FOR CONTROL OF THAT NATION'S NATURAL RESOURCES

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed,'' has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, invaded and occupied a foreign nation for the purpose, among other purposes, of seizing control of that nation's oil.

The White House and its representatives in Iraq have, since the occupation of Baghdad began, attempted to gain control of Iraqi oil. This effort has included pressuring the new Iraqi government to pass a hydrocarbon law. Within weeks of the fall of Saddam Hussein in 2003, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAid) awarded a $240 million contract to Bearing Point, a private U.S. company. A Bearing Point employee, based in the U.S. embassy in Baghdad, was hired to advise the Iraqi Ministry of Oil on drawing up the new hydrocarbon law. The draft law places executives of foreign oil companies on a council with the task of approving their own contracts with Iraq; it denies the Iraqi National Oil Company exclusive rights for the exploration, development, production, transportation, and marketing of Iraqi oil, and allows foreign companies to control Iraqi oil fields containing 80 percent of Iraqi oil for up to 35 years through contracts that can remain secret for up to 2 months. The draft law itself contains secret appendices.

President Bush provided unrelated reasons for the invasion of Iraq to the public and Congress, but those reasons have been established to have been categorically fraudulent, as evidenced by the herein mentioned Articles of Impeachment I, II, III, IV, VI, and VII.

Parallel to the development of plans for war against Iraq, the U.S. State Department's Future of Iraq project, begun as early as April 2002, involved meetings in Washington and London of 17 working groups, each composed of 10 to 20 Iraqi exiles and international experts selected by the State

Department. The Oil and Energy working group met four times between December 2002 and April 2003. Ibrahim Bahr al-Uloum, later the Iraqi Oil Minister, was a member of the group, which concluded that Iraq ''should be opened to international oil companies as quickly as possible after the war,'' and that, ''the country should establish a conducive business environment to attract investment of oil and gas resources.'' The same group recommended production-sharing agreements with foreign oil companies, the same approach found in the draft hydrocarbon law, and control over Iraq's oil resources remains a prime objective of the Bush Administration.

Prior to his election as Vice President, Dick Cheney, then-CEO of Halliburton, in a speech at the Institute of Petroleum in 1999 demonstrated a keen awareness of the sensitive economic and geopolitical role of Middle East oil resources saying: ''By 2010, we will need on the order of an additional 50 million barrels a day. So where is the oil going to come from? Governments and national oil companies are obviously controlling about 90 percent of the assets. Oil remains fundamentally a government business. While many regions of the world offer great oil opportunities, the Middle East, with two-thirds of the world's oil and lowest cost, is still where the prize ultimately lies. Even though companies are anxious for greater access there, progress continues to be slow.''

The Vice President led the work of a secret energy task force, as described in Article XXXII below, a task force that focused on, among other things, the acquisition of Iraqi oil through developing a controlling private corporate interest in said oil.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XIII.—CREATING A SECRET TASK FORCE TO DEVELOP ENERGY AND MILITARY POLICIES WITH RESPECT TO IRAQ AND OTHER COUNTRIES

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, created a secret task force to guide our nation's energy policy and military policy, and undermined Congress' ability to legislate by thwarting attempts to investigate the nature of that policy.

A Government Accountability Office (GAO) Report on the Cheney Energy Task Force, in August 2003, described the creation of this task force as follows:

''In a January 29, 2001, memorandum, the President established NEPDG [the National Energy Policy Development Group]—comprised of the Vice President, nine cabinet-level officials, and four other senior administration officials—to gather information, deliberate, and make recommendations to the President by the end of fiscal year 2001. The President called on the Vice President to chair the group, direct its work and, as necessary, establish subordinate working groups to assist NEPDG.''

The four ''other senior administration officials were the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Assistant to the President and Deputy Chief of Staff for Policy, the Assistant to the President for Economic Policy, and the Deputy Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs.

The GAO report found that: ''In developing the National Energy Policy report, the NEPDG Principals, Support Group, and participating agency officials and staff met with, solicited input from, or received information and advice from nonfederal energy stakeholders, principally petroleum, coal, nuclear, natural gas, and electricity industry representatives and lobbyists. The extent to which submissions from any of these stakeholders were solicited, influenced policy deliberations, or were incorporated into the final report cannot be determined based on the limited information made available to GAO. NEPDG met and conducted its work in two distinct phases: the first phase culminated in a March 19, 2001, briefing to the President on challenges relating to energy supply and the resulting economic impact; the second phase ended with the May 16, 2001, presentation of the final report to the President. The Office of the Vice President's (OVP) unwillingness to provide the NEPDG records or other related information precluded GAO from fully achieving its objectives and substantially limited GAO's ability to comprehensively analyze the NEPDG process. associated with that process.

''None of the key federal entities involved in the NEPDG effort provided GAO with a complete accounting of the costs that they incurred during the development of the National Energy Policy report. The two federal entities responsible for funding the NEPDG effort—OVP and the Department of Energy (DOE)—did not provide the comprehensive cost information that GAO requested. OVP provided GAO with 77 pages of information, two-thirds of which contained no cost information while the remaining one-third contained some miscellaneous information of little to no usefulness. OVP stated that it would not provide any additional information. DOE, the Department of the Interior, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) provided GAO with estimates of certain costs and salaries associated with the NEPDG effort, but these estimates, all calculated in different ways, were not comprehensive.''

In 2003, the Commerce Department disclosed a partial collection of materials from the NEPDG, including documents, maps, and charts, dated March 2001, of Iraq's, Saudi Arabia's and the United Arab Emirates' oil fields, pipelines, refineries, tanker terminals, and development projects.

On November 16, 2005, the Washington Post reported on a White House document showing that oil company executives had met with the NEPDG, something that some of those same executives had just that week denied in Congressional testimony. The Bush Administration had not corrected the inaccurate testimony.

On July 18, 2007, the Washington Post reported the full list of names of those who had met with the NEPDG.

In 1998 Kenneth Derr, then chief executive of Chevron, told a San Francisco audience, ''Iraq possesses huge reserves of oil and gas, reserves I'd love Chevron to have access to.'' According to the GAO report, Chevron provided detailed advice to the NEPDG.

In March, 2001, the NEPDG recommended that the United States Government support initiatives by Middle Eastern countries ''to open up areas of their energy sectors to foreign investment.'' Following the invasion of Iraq, the United States has pressured the new Iraqi parliament to pass a hydrocarbon law that would do exactly that. The draft law, if passed, would take the majority of Iraq's oil out of the exclusive hands of the Iraqi Government and open it to international oil companies for a generation or more. The Bush administration hired Bearing Point, a U.S. company, to help write the law in 2004. It was submitted to the Iraqi Council of Representatives in May 2007.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XIV.—MISPRISION OF A FELONY, MISUSE AND EXPOSURE OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE IN THE MATTER OF VALERIE PLAME WILSON, CLANDESTINE AGENT OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President,

(1) suppressed material information;

(2) selectively declassified information for the improper purposes of retaliating against a whistleblower and presenting a misleading picture of the alleged threat from Iraq;

(3) facilitated the exposure of the identity of Valerie Plame Wilson who had theretofore been employed as a covert CIA operative;

(4) failed to investigate the improper leaks of classified information from within his administration;

(5) failed to cooperate with an investigation into possible federal violations resulting from this activity; and

(6) finally, entirely undermined the prosecution by commuting the sentence of Lewis Libby citing false and insubstantial grounds, all in an effort to prevent Congress and the citizens of the United States from discovering the deceitful nature of the President's claimed justifications for the invasion of Iraq.

In facilitating this exposure of classified information and the subsequent cover-up, in all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XV.—PROVIDING IMMUNITY FROM PROSECUTION FOR CRIMINAL CONTRACTORS IN IRAQ

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, established policies granting United States government contractors and their employees in Iraq immunity from Iraqi law, U.S. law, and international law.

Lewis Paul Bremer III, then-Director of Reconstruction and Humanitarian Assistance for post-war Iraq, on June 27, 2004, issued Coalition Provisional Authority Order Number 17, which granted members of the U.S. military, U.S. mercenaries, and other U.S. contractor employees immunity from Iraqi law.

The Bush Administration has chosen not to apply the Uniform Code of Military Justice or United States law to mercenaries and other contractors employed by the United States government in Iraq.

Operating free of Iraqi or U.S. law, mercenaries have killed many Iraqi civilians in a manner that observers have described as aggression and not as self-defense. Many U.S. contractors have also alleged that they have been the victims of aggression (in several cases of rape) by their fellow contract employees in Iraq. These charges have not been brought to trial, and in several cases the contracting companies and the U.S. State Department have worked together in attempting to cover them up.

Under the Fourth Geneva Convention, to which the United States is party, and which under Article VI of the U.S. Constitution is therefore the supreme law of the United States, it is the responsibility of an occupying force to ensure the protection and human rights of the civilian population. The efforts of President Bush and his subordinates to attempt to establish a lawless zone in Iraq are in violation of the law.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XVI.—RECKLESS MISSPENDING AND WASTE OF U.S. TAX DOLLARS IN CONNECTION WITH IRAQ CONTRACTORS

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, recklessly wasted public funds on contracts awarded to close associates, including companies guilty of defrauding the government in the past, contracts awarded without competitive bidding, ''cost-plus'' contracts designed to encourage cost overruns, and contracts not requiring satisfactory completion of the work. These failures have been the rule, not the exception, in the awarding of contracts for work in the United States and abroad over the past seven years. Repeated exposure of fraud and waste has not been met by the president with correction of systemic problems, but rather with retribution against whistleblowers.

The House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform reported on Iraq reconstruction contracting:

''From the beginning, the Administration adopted a flawed contracting approach in Iraq. Instead of maximizing competition, the Administration opted to award no-bid, cost-plus contracts to politically connected contractors. Halliburton's secret $7 billion contract to restore Iraq's oil infrastructure is the prime example. Under this no-bid, cost-plus contract, Halliburton was reimbursed for its costs and then received an additional fee, which was a percentage of its costs. This created an incentive for Halliburton to run up its costs in order to increase its potential profit.

''Even after the Administration claimed it was awarding Iraq contracts competitively in early 2004, real price competition was missing. Iraq was divided geographically and by economic sector into a handful of fiefdoms. Individual contractors were then awarded monopoly contracts for all of the work within given fiefdoms. Because these monopoly contracts were awarded before specific projects were identified, there was no actual price competition for more than 2,000 projects.

''In the absence of price competition, rigorous government oversight becomes essential for accountability. Yet the Administration turned much of the contract oversight work over to private companies with blatant conflicts of interest. Oversight contractors oversaw their business partners and, in some cases, were placed in a position to assist their own construction work under separate monopoly construction contracts. . . .

''Under Halliburton's two largest Iraq contracts, Pentagon auditors found $1 billion in 'questioned' costs and over $400 million in 'unsupported' costs. Former Halliburton employees testified that the company charged $45 for cases of soda, billed $100 to clean 15-pound bags of laundry, and insisted on housing its staff at the five-star Kempinski hotel in Kuwait. Halliburton truck drivers testified that the company 'torched' brand new $85,000 trucks rather than perform relatively minor repairs and regular maintenance. Halliburton procurement officials described the company's informal motto in Iraq as 'Don't worry about price. It's cost-plus.' A Halliburton manager was indicted for 'major fraud against the United States' for allegedly billing more than $5.5 billion for work that should have cost only $685,000 in exchange for a $1 million kickback from a Kuwaiti subcontractor. . . .

''The Air Force found that another U.S. government contractor, Custer Battles, set up shell subcontractors to inflate prices. Those overcharges were passed along to the U.S. government under the company's cost-plus contract to provide security for Baghdad International Airport. In one case, the company allegedly took Iraqi-owned forklifts, re-painted them, and leased them to the U.S. government.

''Despite the spending of billions of taxpayer dollars, U.S. reconstruction efforts in keys sectors of the Iraqi economy are failing. Over two years after the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq, oil and electricity production has fallen below pre-war levels. The Administration has failed to even measure how many Iraqis lack access to drinkable water.''

''Constitution in Crisis,'' a book by Congressman John Conyers, details the Bush Administration's response when contract abuse is made public:

''Bunnatine Greenhouse was the chief contracting officer at the Army Corps of Engineers, the agency that has managed much of the reconstruction work in Iraq. In October 2004, Ms. Greenhouse came forward and revealed that top Pentagon officials showed improper favoritism to Halliburton when awarding military contracts to Halliburton subsidiary Kellogg Brown & Root (KBR). Greenhouse stated that when the Pentagon awarded Halliburton a five-year $7 billion contract, it pressured her to withdraw her objections, actions which she claimed were unprecedented in her experience.

''On June 27, 2005, Ms. Greenhouse testified before Congress, detailing that the contract award process was compromised by improper influence by political appointees, participation by Halliburton officials in meetings where bidding requirements were discussed, and a lack of competition. She stated that the Halliburton contracts represented ''the most blatant and improper contract abuse I have witnessed during the course of my professional career.'' Days before the hearing, the acting general counsel of the Army Corps of Engineers paid Ms. Greenhouse a visit and reportedly let it be known that it would not be in her best interest to appear voluntarily.

''On August 27, 2005, the Army demoted Ms. Greenhouse, removing her from the elite Senior Executive Service and transferring her to a lesser job in the corps' civil works division. As Frank Rich of The New York Times described the situation, '[H]er crime was not obstructing justice but pursuing it by vehemently questioning irregularities in the awarding of some $7 billion worth of no-bid contracts in Iraq to the Halliburton subsidiary Kellogg Brown Root.' The demotion was in apparent retaliation for her speaking out against the abuses, even though she previously had stellar reviews and over 20 years of experience in military procurement.''

The House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform reports on domestic contracting:

''The Administration's domestic contracting record is no better than its record on Iraq. Waste, fraud, and abuse appear to be the rule rather than the exception. . . .

''A Transportation Security Administration (TSA) cost-plus contract with NCS Pearson, Inc., to hire federal airport screeners was plagued by poor management and egregious waste. Pentagon auditors challenged $303 million (over 40%) of the $741 million spent by Pearson under the contract. The auditors detailed numerous concerns with the charges of Pearson and its subcontractors, such as '$20-an-hour temporary workers billed to the government at $48 per hour, subcontractors who signed out $5,000 in cash at a time with no supporting documents, $377,273.75 in unsubstantiated long distance phone calls, $514,201 to rent tents that flooded in a rainstorm, [and] $4.4 million in ''no show'' fees for job candidates who did not appear for tests.' A Pearson employee who supervised Pearson's hiring efforts at 43 sites in the U.S. described the contract as 'a waste a taxpayer's money.' The CEO of one Pearson subcontractor paid herself $5.4 million for nine months work and provided herself with a $270,000 pension. . . .

''The Administration is spending $239 million on the Integrated Surveillance and Intelligence System, a no-bid contract to provide thousands of cameras and sensors to monitor activity on the Mexican and Canadian borders. Auditors found that the contractor, International Microwave Corp., billed for work it never did and charged for equipment it never provided, 'creat[ing] a potential for overpayments of almost $13 million.' Moreover, the border monitoring system reportedly does not work. . . .

''After spending more than $4.5 billion on screening equipment for the nation's entry points, the Department of Homeland Security is now 'moving to replace or alter much of' it because 'it is ineffective, unreliable or too expensive to operate.' For example, radiation monitors at ports and borders reportedly could not 'differentiate between radiation emitted by a nuclear bomb and naturally occurring radiation from everyday material like cat litter or ceramic tile.' . . .

''The TSA awarded Boeing a cost-plus contract to install over 1,000 explosive detection systems for airline passenger luggage. After installation, the machines 'began to register false alarms' and '[s]creeners were forced to open and hand-check bags.' To reduce the number of false alarms, the sensitivity of the machines was lowered, which reduced the effectiveness of the detectors. Despite these

serious problems, Boeing received an $82 million profit that the Inspector General determined to be 'excessive.' . . .

''The FBI spent $170 million on a 'Virtual Case File' system that does not operate as required. After three years of work under a cost-plus contract failed to produce a functional system, the FBI scrapped the program and began work on the new 'Sentinel' Case File System. . . .

''The Department of Homeland Security Inspector General found that taxpayer dollars were being lavished on perks for agency officials. One IG report found that TSA spent over $400,000 on its first leader's executive office suite. Another found that TSA spent $350,000 on a gold-plated gym. . . .

''According to news reports, Pentagon auditors . . . examined a contract between the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and Unisys, a technology and consulting company, for the upgrade of airport computer networks. Among other irregularities, government auditors found that Unisys may have overbilled for as much as 171,000 hours of labor and overtime by charging for employees at up to twice their actual rate of compensation. While the cost ceiling for the contract was set at $1 billion, Unisys has reportedly billed the government $940 million with more than half of the seven-year contract remaining and more than half of the TSA-monitored airports still lacking upgraded networks.''

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XVII.—ILLEGAL DETENTION: DETAINING INDEFINITELY AND WITHOUT CHARGE PERSONS BOTH U.S. CITIZENS AND FOREIGN CAPTIVES

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, violated United States and International Law and the U.S. Constitution by illegally detaining indefinitely and without charge persons both U.S. citizens and foreign captives.

In a statement on Feb. 7, 2002, President Bush declared that in the U.S. fight against Al Qaeda, ''none of the provisions of Geneva apply,'' thus rejecting the Geneva Conventions that protect captives in wars and other conflicts. By that time, the administration was already transporting captives from the war in Afghanistan, both alleged Al Qaeda members and supporters, and also Afghans accused of being fighters in the army of the Taliban government, to U.S.-run prisons in Afghanistan and to the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The round-up and detention without charge of Muslim noncitizens inside the U.S. began almost immediately after the September 11, 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, with some being held as long as nine months. The U.S., on orders of the president, began capturing and detaining without charge alleged terror suspects in other countries and detaining them abroad and at the U.S. Naval base in Guantanamo.

Many of these detainees have been subjected to systematic abuse, including beatings, which have been subsequently documented by news reports, photographic evidence, testimony in Congress, lawsuits, and in the case of detainees in the U.S., by an investigation conducted by the Justice Department's Office of the Inspector General.

In violation of U.S. law and the Geneva Conventions, the Bush Administration instructed the Department of Justice and the U.S. Department of Defense to refuse to provide the identities or locations of these detainees, despite requests from Congress and from attorneys for the detainees. The president even declared the right to detain U.S. citizens indefinitely, without charge and without providing them access to counsel or the courts, thus depriving them of their constitutional and basic human rights. Several of those U.S. citizens were held in military brigs in solitary confinement for as long as three years before being either released or transferred to civilian detention.

Detainees in U.S. custody in Iraq and Guantanamo have, in violation of the Geneva Conventions, been hidden from and denied visits by the International Red Cross organization, while thousands of others in Iraq, Guantanamo, Afghanistan, ships in foreign off-shore sites, and an unknown number of so-called ''black sites'' around the world have been denied any opportunity to challenge their detentions. The president, acting on his own claimed authority, has declared the hundreds of detainees at Guantanamo Bay to be ''enemy combatants'' not subject to U.S. law and not even subject to military law, but nonetheless potentially liable to the death penalty.

The detention of individuals without due process violates the 5th Amendment. While the Bush administration has been rebuked in several court cases, most recently that of Ali al-Marri, it continues to attempt to exceed constitutional limits.

In all of these actions violating U.S. and International law, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XVIII.—TORTURE: SECRETLY AUTHORIZING, AND ENCOURAGING THE USE OF TORTURE AGAINST CAPTIVES IN AFGHANISTAN, IRAQ, AND OTHER PLACES, AS A MATTER OF OFFICIAL POLICY

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, violated United States and International Law and the U.S. Constitution by secretly authorizing and encouraging the use of torture against captives in Afghanistan, Iraq in connection with the so-called ''war'' on terror.

In violation of the Constitution, U.S. law, the Geneva Conventions (to which the U.S. is a signatory), and in violation of basic human rights, torture has been authorized by the President and his administration as official policy. Water-boarding, beatings, faked executions, confinement in extreme cold or extreme heat, prolonged enforcement of painful stress positions, sleep deprivation, sexual humiliation, and the defiling of religious articles have been practiced and exposed as routine at Guantanamo, at Abu Ghraib Prison and other U.S. detention sites in Iraq, and at Bagram Air Base in Afghanistan. The president, besides bearing responsibility for authorizing the use of torture, also as Commander in Chief, bears ultimate responsibility for the failure to halt these practices and to punish those responsible once they were exposed.

The administration has sought to claim the abuse of captives is not torture, by redefining torture. An August 1, 2002 memorandum from the Administration's Office of Legal Counsel Jay S. Bybee addressed to White House Counsel Alberto R. Gonzales concluded that to constitute torture, any pain inflicted must be akin to that accompanying ''serious physical injury, such as organ failure, impairment of bodily function, or even death.'' The memorandum went on to state that even should an act constitute torture under that minimal definition, it might still be permissible if applied to ''interrogations undertaken pursuant to the President's Commander-in-Chief powers.'' The memorandum further asserted that ''necessity or self-defense could provide justifications that would eliminate any criminal liability.''

This effort to redefine torture by calling certain practices simply ''enhanced interrogation techniques'' flies in the face of the Third Geneva Convention Relating to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, which states that ''No physical or mental torture, nor any other form of coercion, may be inflicted on prisoners of war to secure from them information of any kind whatever. Prisoners of war who refuse to answer may not be threatened, insulted, or exposed to any unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind.''

Torture is further prohibited by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the paramount international human rights statement adopted unanimously by the United Nations General Assembly, including the United States, in 1948. Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment is also prohibited by international treaties ratified by the United States: the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT).

When the Congress, in the Defense Authorization Act of 2006, overwhelmingly passed a measure banning torture and sent it to the President's desk for signature, the President, who together with his vice president, had fought hard to block passage of the amendment, signed it, but then quietly appended a signing statement in which he pointedly asserted that as Commander-in-Chief, he was not bound to obey its strictures.

The administration's encouragement of and failure to prevent torture of American captives in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and in the battle against terrorism, has undermined the rule of law in the U.S. and in the US military, and has seriously damaged both the effort to combat global terrorism, and more broadly, America's image abroad. In his effort to hide torture by U.S. military forces and the CIA, the president has defied Congress and has lied to the American people, repeatedly claiming that the U.S. ''does not torture.''

In all of these actions and decisions in violation of U.S. and International law, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the

cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XIX.—RENDITION: KIDNAPPING PEOPLE AND TAKING THEM AGAINST THEIR WILL TO ''BLACK SITES'' LOCATED IN OTHER NATIONS, INCLUDING NATIONS KNOWN TO PRACTICE TORTURE

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, violated United States and International Law and the U.S. Constitution by kidnapping people and renditioning them to ''black sites'' located in other nations, including nations known to practice torture.

The president has publicly admitted that since the 9–11 attacks in 2001, the U.S. has been kidnapping and transporting against the will of the subject (renditioning) in its so-called ''war'' on terror—even people captured by U.S. personnel in friendly nations like Sweden, Germany, Macedonia and Italy—and ferrying them to places like Bagram Airbase in Afghanistan, and to prisons operated in Eastern European countries, African Countries and Middle Eastern countries where security forces are known to practice torture.

These people are captured and held indefinitely, without any charges being filed, and are held without being identified to the Red Cross, or to their families. Many are clearly innocent, and several cases, including one in Canada and one in Germany, have demonstrably been shown subsequently to have been in error, because of a similarity of names or because of misinformation provided to U.S. authorities.

Such a policy is in clear violation of U.S. and International Law, and has placed the United States in the position of a pariah state. The CIA has no law enforcement authority, and cannot legally arrest or detain anyone. The program of ''extraordinary rendition'' authorized by the president is the substantial equivalent of the policies of ''disappearing'' people, practices widely practiced and universally condemned in the military dictatorships of Latin America during the late 20th Century.

The administration has claimed that prior administrations have practiced extraordinary rendition, but, while this is technically true, earlier renditions were used only to capture people with outstanding arrest warrants or convictions who were outside in order to deliver them to stand trial or serve their sentences in the U.S. The president has refused to divulge how many people have been subject to extraordinary rendition since September, 2001. It is possible that some have died in captivity. As one U.S. official has stated off the record, regarding the program, Some of those who were renditioned were later delivered to Guantanamo, while others were sent there directly. An example of this is the case of six Algerian Bosnians who, immediately after being cleared by the Supreme Court of Bosnia Herzegovina in January 2002 of allegedly plotting to attack the U.S. and UK embassies, were captured, bound and gagged by U.S. special forces and renditioned to Guantanamo.

In perhaps the most egregious proven case of rendition, Maher Arar, a Canadian citizen born in Syria, was picked up in September 2002 while transiting through New York's JFK airport on his way home to Canada. Immigration and FBI officials detained and interrogated him for nearly two weeks, illegally denying him his rights to access counsel, the Canadian consulate, and the courts. Executive branch officials asked him if he would volunteer to go to Syria, where he hadn't been in 15 years, and Maher refused

Maher was put on a private jet plane operated by the CIA and sent to Jordan, where he was beaten for 8 hours, and then delivered to Syria, where he was beaten and interrogated for 18 hours a day for a couple of weeks. He was whipped on his back and hands with a 2 inch thick electric cable and asked questions similar to those he had been asked in the United States. For over ten months Maher was held in an underground grave-like cell—3 × 6 × 7 feet—which was damp and cold, and in which the only light came in through a hole in the ceiling. After a year of this, Maher was released without any charges. He is now back home in Canada with his family. Upon his release, the Syrian Government announced he had no links to Al Qaeda, and the Canadian Government has also said they've found no links to Al Qaeda. The Canadian Government launched a Commission of Inquiry into the Actions of Canadian Officials in Relation to Maher Arar, to investigate the role of Canadian officials, but the Bush Administration has refused to cooperate with the Inquiry.

Hundreds of flights of CIA-chartered planes have been documented as having passed through European countries on extraordinary rendition missions like that involving Maher Arar, but the administration refuses to state how many people have been subjects of this illegal program.

The same U.S. laws prohibiting aiding and abetting torture also prohibit sending someone to a country where there is a substantial likelihood they may be tortured. Article 3 of CAT prohibits forced return where there is a ''substantial likelihood'' that an individual ''may be in danger of'' torture, and has been implemented by federal statute. Article 7 of the ICCPR prohibits return to country of origin where individuals may be ''at risk'' of either torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment.

Under international Human Rights law, transferring a POW to any nation where he or she is likely to be tortured or inhumanely treated violates Article 12 of the Third Geneva Convention, and transferring any civilian who is a protected person under the Fourth Geneva Convention is a grave breach and a criminal act.

In situations of armed conflict, both international human rights law and humanitarian law apply. A person captured in the zone of military hostilities ''must have some status under international law; he is either a prisoner of war and, as such, covered by the Third Convention, [or] a civilian covered by the Fourth Convention. . . . There is no intermediate status; nobody in enemy hands can be outside the law.'' Although the state is obligated to repatriate Prisoners of War as soon as hostilities cease, the ICRC's commentary on the 1949 Conventions states that prisoners should not be repatriated where there are serious reasons for fearing that repatriating the individual would be contrary to general principles of established international law for the protection of human beings Thus, all of the Guantanamo detainees as well as renditioned captives are protected by international human rights protections and humanitarian law.

By his actions as outlined above, the President has abused his power, broken the law, deceived the American people, and placed American military personnel, and indeed all Americans—especially those who may travel or live abroad—at risk of similar treatment. Furthermore, in the eyes of the rest of the world, the President has made the U.S., once a model of respect for Human Rights and respect for the rule of law, into a state where international law is neither respected nor upheld.

In all of these actions and decisions in violation of United States and International law, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XX.—IMPRISONING CHILDREN

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, authorized or permitted the arrest and detention of at least 2500 children under the age of 18 as ''enemy combatants'' in Iraq, Afghanistan, and at Guantanamo Bay Naval Station in violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention relating to the treatment of ''protected persons'' and the Optional Protocol to the Geneva Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict, signed by the U.S. in 2002. To wit:

In May 2008, the U.S. government reported to the United Nations that it has been holding upwards of 2,500 children under the age of 18 as ''enemy combatants'' at detention centers in Iraq, Afghanistan and at Guantanamo Bay (where there was a special center, Camp Iguana, established just for holding children). The length of these detentions has frequently exceeded a year, and in some cases has stretched to five years. Some of these detainees have reached adulthood in detention and are now not being reported as child detainees because they are no longer children.

In addition to detaining children as ''enemy combatants,'' it has been widely reported in media reports that the U.S. military in Iraq has, based upon Pentagon rules of engagement, been treating boys as young as 14 years of age as ''potential combatants,'' subject to arrest and even to being killed. In Fallujah, in the days ahead of the November 2004 all-out assault, Marines ringing the city were reported to be turning back into the city men and boys ''of combat age'' who were trying to flee the impending scene of battle—an act which in itself is a violation of the Geneva Conventions, which require combatants to permit anyone, combatants as well as civilians, to surrender, and to leave the scene of battle.

Under the Fourth Geneva Convention, to which the United States has been a signatory since 1949, children under the age of 15 captured in conflicts, even if they have been fighting, are to be considered victims, not prisoners. In 2002, the United States signed the Optional Protocol to the Geneva Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of children in Armed Conflict, which raised this age for this category of ''protected person'' to under 18.

The continued detention of such children, some as young as 10, by the U.S. military is a violation of both convention and protocol,

and as such constitutes a war crime for which the president, as commander in chief, bears full responsibility.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XXI.—MISLEADING CONGRESS AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ABOUT THREATS FROM IRAN, AND SUPPORTING TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS WITHIN IRAN, WITH THE GOAL OF OVERTHROWING THE IRANIAN GOVERNMENT

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates misled the Congress and the citizens of the United States about a threat of nuclear attack from the nation of Iran.

The National Intelligence Estimate released to Congress and the public on December 4, 2007, which confirmed that the government of the nation of Iran had ceased any efforts to develop nuclear weapons, was completed in 2006. Yet, the president and his aides continued to suggest during 2007 that such a nuclear threat was developing and might already exist. National Security Adviser Stephen Hadley stated at the time the National Intelligence Estimate regarding Iran was released that the president had been briefed on its findings ''in the last few months.'' Hadley's statement establishes a timeline that shows the president knowingly sought to deceive Congress and the American people about a nuclear threat that did not exist.

Hadley has stated that the president ''was basically told: stand down'' and, yet, the president and his aides continued to make false claims about the prospect that Iran was trying to ''build a nuclear weapon'' that could lead to ''World War III.''

This evidence establishes that the president actively engaged in and had full knowledge of a campaign by his administration to make a false ''case'' for an attack on Iran, thus warping the national security debate at a critical juncture and creating the prospect of an illegal and unnecessary attack on a sovereign nation.

Even after the National Intelligence Estimate was released to Congress and the American people, the president stated that he did not believe anything had changed and suggested that he and members of his administration would continue to argue that Iran should be seen as posing a threat to the United States. He did this despite the fact that United States intelligence agencies had clearly and officially stated that this was not the case.

Evidence suggests that the Bush Administration's attempts to portray Iran as a threat are part of a broader U.S. policy toward Iran. On September 30, 2001, then-Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld established an official military objective of overturning the regime in Iran, as well as those in Iraq, Syria, and four other countries in the Middle East, according to a document quoted in then- Undersecretary of Defense for Policy Douglas Feith's book, ''War and Decision.''

General Wesley Clark, reports in his book ''Winning Modern Wars'' being told by a friend in the Pentagon in November 2001 that the list of governments that Rumsfeld and Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz planned to overthrow included Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya, Sudan, and Somalia. Clark writes that the list also included Lebanon.

Journalist Gareth Porter reported in May 2008 asking Feith at a public event which of the six regimes on the Clark list were included in the Rumsfeld paper, to which Feith replied ''All of them.''

Rumsfeld's aides also drafted a second version of the paper, as instructions to all military commanders in the development of ''campaign plans against terrorism''. The paper called for military commanders to assist other government agencies ''as directed'' to ''encourage populations dominated by terrorist organizations or their supporters to overthrow that domination.''

In January 2005, Seymour Hersh reported in the New Yorker Magazine that the Bush Administration had been conducting secret reconnaissance missions inside Iran at least since the summer of 2004.

In June 2005 former United Nations weapons inspector Scott Ritter reported that United States security forces had been sending members of the Mujahedeen-e Khalq (MEK) into Iranian territory. The MEK has been designated a terrorist organization by the United States, the European Union, Canada, Iraq, and Iran. Ritter reported that the United States Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) had used the MEK to carry out remote bombings in Iran.

In April 2006, Hersh reported in the New Yorker Magazine that U.S. combat troops had entered and were operating in Iran, where they were working with minority groups including the Azeris, Baluchis, and Kurds.

Also in April 2006, Larisa Alexandrovna reported on Raw Story that the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) was working with and training the MEK, or former members of the MEK, sending them to commit acts of violence in southern Iran in areas where recent attacks had left many dead. Raw Story reported that the Pentagon had adopted the policy of supporting MEK shortly after the 2003 invasion of Iraq, and in response to the influence of Vice President Richard B. Cheney's office. Raw Story subsequently reported that no Presidential finding, and no Congressional oversight, existed on MEK operations.

In March 2007, Hersh reported in the New Yorker Magazine that the Bush administration was attempting to stem the growth of Shiite influence in the Middle East (specifically the Iranian government and Hezbollah in Lebanon) by funding violent Sunni organizations, without any Congressional authorization or oversight. Hersh said funds had been given to ''three Sunni jihadist groups . . . connected to al Qaeda'' that ''want to take on Hezbollah.''

In April 2008, the Los Angeles Times reported that conflicts with insurgent groups along Iran's borders were understood by the Iranian government as a proxy war with the United States and were leading Iran to support its allies against the United States' occupation force in Iraq. Among the groups the U.S. DOD is supporting, according to this report, is the Party for Free Life in Kurdistan, known by its Kurdish acronym, PEJAK. The United States has provided ''foodstuffs, economic assistance, medical supplies and Russian military equipment, some of it funneled through nonprofit groups.''

In May 2008, Andrew Cockburn reported on Counter Punch that President Bush, six weeks earlier had signed a secret finding authorizing a covert offensive against the Iranian regime. President Bush's secret directive covers actions across an area stretching from Lebanon to Afghanistan, and purports to sanction actions up to and including the funding of organizations like the MEK and the assassination of public officials.

All of these actions by the President and his agents and subordinates exhibit a disregard for the truth and a recklessness with regard to national security, nuclear proliferation and the global role of the United States military that is not merely unacceptable but dangerous in a commander-in- chief.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XXII—CREATING SECRET LAWS

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, established a body of secret laws through the issuance of legal opinions by the Department of Justice's Office of Legal Counsel (OLC).

The OLC's March 14, 2003, interrogation memorandum (''Yoo Memorandum'') was declassified years after it served as law for the executive branch. On April 29, 2008, House Judiciary Committee Chairman John Conyers and Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Chairman Jerrold Nadler wrote in a letter to Attorney General Michael Mukasey:

''It appears to us that there was never any legitimate basis for the purely legal analysis contained in this document to be classified in the first place. The Yoo Memorandum does not describe sources and methods of intelligence gathering, or any specific facts regarding any interrogation activities. Instead, it consists almost entirely of the Department's legal views, which are not properly kept secret from Congress and the American people. J. William Leonard, the Director of the National Archive's Office of Information Security Oversight Office, and a top expert in this field concurs, commenting that '[t]he document in question is purely a legal analysis' that contains 'nothing which would justify classification.' In addition, the Yoo Memorandum suggests an extraordinary breadth and aggressiveness of OLC's secret legal opinion-making. Much attention has rightly been given to the statement in footnote 10 in the March 14, 2003, memorandum that, in an October 23, 2001, opinion, OLC concluded 'that the Fourth Amendment had no application to domestic military operations.' As you know, we have requested a copy of that memorandum on no less than four prior occasions and we continue to demand access to this important document.

''In addition to this opinion, however, the Yoo Memorandum references at least 10 other OLC opinions on weighty matters of great interest to the American people that also do not appear to have been released. These appear to cover matters such as the power of Congress to regulate the conduct of military commissions, legal constraints on the 'military detention of United States citizens,' legal rules applicable to the boarding and searching foreign ships, the President's

authority to render U.S. detainees to the custody of foreign governments, and the President's authority to breach or suspend U.S. treaty obligations. Furthermore, it has been more than five years since the Yoo Memorandum was authored, raising the question how many other such memoranda and letters have been secretly authored and utilized by the Administration.

''Indeed, a recent court filing by the Department in FOIA litigation involving the Central Intelligence Agency identifies 8 additional secret OLC opinions, dating from August 6, 2004, to February 18, 2007. Given that these reflect only OLC memoranda identified in the files of the CIA, and based on the sampling procedures under which that listing was generated, it appears that these represent only a small portion of the secret OLC memoranda generated during this time, with the true number almost certainly much higher.''

Senator Russ Feingold, in a statement during an April 30, 2008, senate hearing stated:

''It is a basic tenet of democracy that the people have a right to know the law. In keeping with this principle, the laws passed by Congress and the case law of our courts have historically been matters of public record. And when it became apparent in the middle of the 20th century that federal agencies were increasingly creating a body of nonpublic administrative law, Congress passed several statutes requiring this law to be made public, for the express purpose of preventing a regime of 'secret law.' That purpose today is being thwarted. Congressional enactments and agency regulations are for the most part still public. But the law that applies in this country is determined not only by statutes and regulations, but also by the controlling interpretations of courts and, in some cases, the executive branch. More and more, this body of executive and judicial law is being kept secret from the public, and too often from Congress as well. . . .

''A legal interpretation by the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel . . . binds the entire executive branch, just like a regulation or the ruling of a court. In the words of former OLC head Jack Goldsmith, 'These executive branch precedents are ''law'' for the executive branch.' The Yoo memorandum was, for a nine-month period in 2003 until it was withdrawn by Mr. Goldsmith, the law that this Administration followed when it came to matters of torture. And of course, that law was essentially a declaration that few if any laws applied . . .

''Another body of secret law is the controlling interpretations of the Fo reign Intelligence Surveillance Act that are issued by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. FISA, of course, is the law that governs the government's ability in intelligence investigations to conduct wiretaps and search the homes of people in the United States. Under that statute, the FISA Court is directed to evaluate wiretap and search warrant applications and decide whether the standard for issuing a warrant has been met—a largely factual evaluation that is properly done behind closed doors. But with the evolution of technology and with this Administration's efforts to get the Court's blessing for its illegal wiretapping activities, we now know that the Court's role is broader, and that it is very much engaged in substantive interpretations of the governing statute. These interpretations are as much a part of this country's surveillance law as the statute itself. Without access to them, it is impossible for Congress or the public to have an informed debate on matters that deeply affect the privacy and civil liberties of all Americans . . .

''The Administration's shroud of secrecy extends to agency rules and executive pronouncements, such as Executive Orders, that carry the force of law. Through the diligent efforts of my colleague Senator Whitehouse, we have learned that OLC has taken the position that a President can 'waive' or 'modify' a published Executive Order without any notice to the public or Congress simply by not following it.''

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XXIII—VIOLATION OF THE POSSE COMITATUS ACT

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, repeatedly and illegally established programs to appropriate the power of the military for use in law enforcement. Specifically, he has contravened U.S.C. Title 18, Section 1385, originally enacted in 1878, subsequently amended as ''Use of Army and Air Force as Posse Comitatus'' and commonly known as the Posse Comitatus Act.

The Act states:

''Whoever, except in cases and under circumstances expressly authorized by the Constitution or Act of Congress, willfully uses any part of the Army or the Air Force as a posse comitatus or otherwise to execute the laws shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.''

The Posse Comitatus Act is designed to prevent the military from becoming a national police force.

The Declaration of Independence states as a specific grievance against the British that the King had ''kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the consent of our legislatures,'' had ''affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the civil power,'' and had ''quarter[ed] large bodies of armed troops among us . . . protecting them, by a mock trial, from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these States''

Despite the Posse Comitatus Act's intent, and in contravention of the law, President Bush:

(a) has used military forces for law enforcement purposes on U.S. border patrol;

(b) has established a program to use military personnel for surveillance and information on criminal activities;

(c) is using military espionage equipment to collect intelligence information for law enforcement use on civilians within the United States; and

(d) employs active duty military personnel in surveillance agencies, including the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).

In June 2006, President Bush ordered National Guard troops deployed to the border shared by Mexico with Arizona, Texas, and California. This deployment, which by 2007 reached a maximum of 6,000 troops, had orders to ''conduct surveillance and operate detection equipment, work with border entry identification teams, analyze information, assist with communications and give administrative support to the Border Patrol'' and concerned ''. . . providing intelligence, inspecting cargo, and conducting surveillance.''

The Air Force's ''Eagle Eyes'' program encourages Air Force military staff to gather evidence on American citizens. Eagle Eyes instructs Air Force personnel to engage in surveillance and then advises them to ''alert local authorities,'' asking military staff to surveil and gather evidence on public citizens. This contravenes DoD Directive 5525.5 ''SUBJECT: DoD Cooperation with Civilian Law Enforcement'' which limits such activities.

President Bush has implemented a program to use imagery from military satellites for domestic law enforcement through the National Applications Office.

President Bush has assigned numerous active duty military personnel to civilian institutions such as the CIA and the Department of Homeland Security, both of which have responsibilities for law enforcement and intelligence.

In addition, on May 9, 2007, President Bush released ''National Security Presidential Directive/NSPD 51,'' which effectively gives the president unchecked power to control the entire government and to define that government in time of an emergency, as well as the power to determine whether there is an emergency. The document also contains ''classified Continuity Annexes.'' In July 2007 and again in August 2007 Rep. Peter DeFazio, a senior member of the House Homeland Security Committee, sought access to the classified annexes. DeFazio and other leaders of the Homeland Security Committee, including Chairman Bennie Thompson, have been denied a review of the Continuity of Government classified annexes.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XXIV.—SPYING ON AMERICAN CITIZENS, WITHOUT A COURT-ORDERED WARRANT, IN VIOLATION OF THE LAW AND THE FOURTH AMENDMENT

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed,'' has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, knowingly violated the fourth Amendment to the Constitution and the Foreign Intelligence Service Act of 1978 (FISA) by authorizing warrantless electronic surveillance of American citizens to wit:

(1) The President was aware of the FISA Law requiring a court order for any wiretap as evidenced by the following:

(A) ''Now, by the way, any time you hear the United States government talking about wiretap, it requires—a wiretap requires a court order. Nothing has changed, by the way. When we're talking about chasing down

terrorists, we're talking about getting a court order before we do so.'' White House Press conference on April 20, 2004. [White House Transcript]

(B) ''Law enforcement officers need a federal judge's permission to wiretap a foreign terrorist's phone, or to track his calls, or to search his property. Officers must meet strict standards to use any of the tools we're talking about.'' President Bush's speech in Baltimore Maryland on July 20th 2005. [White House Transcript]

(2) The President repeatedly ordered the NSA to place wiretaps on American citizens without requesting a warrant from FISA as evidenced by the following:

(A) ''Months after the Sept. 11 attacks, President Bush secretly authorized the National Security Agency to eavesdrop on Americans and others inside the United States to search for evidence of terrorist activity without the court-approved warrants ordinarily required for domestic spying, according to government officials.'' New York Times article by James Risen and Eric Lichtblau on December 12, 2005. [NYTimes]

(B) The President admits to authorizing the program by stating ''I have reauthorized this program more than 30 times since the September the 11th attacks, and I intend to do so for as long as our nation faces a continuing threat from al Qaeda and related groups. The NSA's activities under this authorization are thoroughly reviewed by the Justice Department and NSA's top legal officials, including NSA's general counsel and inspector general. Leaders in Congress have been briefed more than a dozen times on this authorization and the activities conducted under it.'' Radio Address from the White House on December 17, 2005. [White House Transcript]

(C) In a December 19th 2005 press conference the President publicly admitted to using a combination of surveillance techniques including some with permission from the FISA courts and some without permission from FISA.

Reporter: It was, why did you skip the basic safeguards of asking courts for permission for the intercepts?

The President: . . . We use FISA still—you're referring to the FISA court in your question—of course, we use FISAs. But FISA is for long-term monitoring. What is needed in order to protect the American people is the ability to move quickly to detect. Now, having suggested this idea, I then, obviously, went to the question, is it legal to do so? I am—I swore to uphold the laws. Do I have the legal authority to do this? And the answer is, absolutely. As I mentioned in my remarks, the legal authority is derived from the Constitution, as well as the authorization of force by the United States Congress.'' [White House Transcript]

(D) Mike McConnel, the Director of National Intelligence, in a letter to to Senator Arlen Specter, acknowledged that Bush's Executive Order in 2001 authorized a series of secret surveillance activities and included undisclosed activities beyond the warrantless surveillance of e-mails and phone calls that Bush confirmed in December 2005. ''NSA Spying Part of Broader Effort'' by Dan Eggen, Washington Post, 8/1/07.

(3) The President ordered the surveillance to be conducted in a way that would spy upon private communications between American citizens located within the United States borders as evidenced by the following:

(A) Mark Klein, a retired AT&T communications technician, submitted an affidavit in support of the Electronic Frontier Foundation's FF's lawsuit against AT&T. He testified that in 2003 he connected a ''splitter'' that sent a copy of Internet traffic and phone calls to a secure room that was operated by the NSA in the San Francisco office of AT&T. He heard from a co-worker that similar rooms were being constructed in other cities, including Seattle, San Jose, Los Angeles and San Diego. From ''Whistle-Blower Outs NSA Spy Room,'' Wired News, 4/7/06 [Wired] [EFF Case]

(4) The President asserted an inherent authority to conduct electronic surveillance based on the Constitution and the ''Authorization to use Military Force in Iraq'' (AUMF) that was not legally valid as evidenced by the following:

(A) In a December 19th, 2005 Press Briefing General Alberto Gonzales admitted that the surveillance authorized by the President was not only done without FISA warrants, but that the nature of the surveillance was so far removed from what FISA can approve that FISA could not even be amended to allow it. Gonzales stated ''We have had discussions with Congress in the past—certain members of Congress—as to whether or not FISA could be amended to allow us to adequately deal with this kind of threat, and we were advised that that would be difficult, if not impossible.''.

(B) The fourth amendment to the United States Constitution states ''The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.''

(C) ''The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 unambiguously limits warrantless domestic electronic surveillance, even in a congressionally declared war, to the first 15 days of that war; criminalizes any such electronic surveillance not authorized by statute; and expressly establishes FISA and two chapters of the federal criminal code, governing wiretaps for intelligence purposes and for criminal investigation, respectively, as the ''exclusive means by which electronic surveillance . . . and the interception of domestic wire, oral, and electronic communications may be conducted.'' 50 U.S.C. 1811, 1809, 18 U.S.C. 2511(2)(f).'' Letter from Harvard Law Professor Lawrence Tribe to John Conyers on 1/6/06.

(D) In a December 19th, 2005 Press Briefing Attorney General Alberto Gonzales stated ''Our position is, is that the authorization to use force, which was passed by the Congress in the days following September 11th, constitutes that other authorization, that other statute by Congress, to engage in this kind of signals intelligence.''

(E) The ''Authorization to use Military Force in Iraq'' does not give any explicit authorization related to electronic surveillance. [HJRes114]

(F) ''From the foregoing analysis, it appears unlikely that a court would hold that Congress has expressly or impliedly authorized the NSA electronic surveillance operations here under discussion, and it would likewise appear that, to the extent that those surveillances fall within the definition of ''electronic surveillance'' within the meaning of FISA or any activity regulated under Title III, Congress intended to cover the entire field with these statutes.'' From the ''Presidential Authority to Conduct Warrantless Electronic Surveillance to Gather Foreign Intelligence Information'' by the Congressional Research Service on January 5, 2006.

(G) ''The inescapable conclusion is that the AUMF did not implicitly authorize what the FISA expressly prohibited. It follows that the presidential program of surveillance at issue here is a violation of the separation of powers—as grave an abuse of executive authority as I can recall ever having studied.'' Letter from Harvard Law Professor Lawrence Tribe to John Conyers on 1/6/06.

(H) On August 17, 2006 Judge Anna Diggs Taylor of the United States District Court in Detroit, in ACLU v. NSA, ruled that the ''NSA program to wiretap the international communications of some Americans without a court warrant violated the Constitution. . . . Judge Taylor ruled that the program violated both the Fourth Amendment and a 1978 law that requires warrants from a secret court for intelligence wiretaps involving people in the United States. She rejected the administration's repeated assertions that a 2001 Congressional authorization and the president's constitutional authority allowed the program.'' From a New York Times article ''Judge Finds Wiretap Actions Violate the Law'' 8/18/06 and the Memorandum Opinion.

(I) In July 2007, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals dismissed the case, ruling the plaintiffs had no standing to sue because, given the secretive nature of the surveillance, they could not state with certainty that they have been wiretapped by the NSA. This ruling did not address the legality of the surveillance so Judge Taylor's decision is the only ruling on that issue. [ACLU Legal Documents]

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XXV.—DIRECTING TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPANIES TO CREATE AN ILLEGAL AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL DATABASE OF THE PRIVATE TELEPHONE NUMBERS AND EMAILS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed,'' has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, violated the Stored Communications Act of 1986 and the Telecommunications Act of 1996 by creating of a very large database containing information related to the private telephone calls and emails of American citizens, to wit:

The President requested that telecommunication companies release customer phone records to the government illegally as evidenced by the following:

''The Stored Communications Act of 1986 (SCA) prohibits the knowing disclosure of customer telephone records to the government unless pursuant to subpoena, warrant or a National Security Letter (or other Administrative subpoena); with the customers lawful consent; or there is a business necessity; or an emergency involving the danger of death or serious physical injury. None of these exceptions apply to the circumstance described in the USA Today story.'' From page 169, ''George W Bush versus the US Constitution.'' Compiled at the direction of Representative John Conyers.

According to a May 11, 2006 article in USA Today by Lesley Cauley ''The National Security Agency has been secretly collecting the phone call records of tens of millions of Americans, using data provided by AT&T, Verizon and BellSouth.'' An unidentified

source said 'The agency's goal is to create a database of every call ever made within the nation's borders.''

In early 2001, Qwest CEO Joseph Nacchio rejected a request from the NSA to turn over customers records of phone calls, emails and other Internet activity. Nacchio believed that complying with the request would violate the Telecommunications Act of 1996. From National Journal, November 2, 2007.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XXVI.—ANNOUNCING THE INTENT TO VIOLATE LAWS WITH SIGNING STATEMENTS, AND VIOLATING THOSE LAWS

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed,'' has used signing statements to claim the right to violate acts of Congress even as he signs them into law.

In June 2007, the Government Accountability Office reported that in a sample of Bush signing statements the office had studied, for 30 percent of them the Bush administration had already proceeded to violate the laws the statements claimed the right to violate.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XXVII.—FAILING TO COMPLY WITH CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENAS AND INSTRUCTING FORMER EMPLOYEES NOT TO COMPLY

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed,'' has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, refused to comply with Congressional subpoenas, and instructed former employees not to comply with subpoenas.

Subpoenas not complied with include:

A House Judiciary Committee subpoena for Justice Department papers and Emails, issued April 10, 2007;

A House Oversight and Government Reform Committee subpoena for the testimony of the Secretary of State, issued April 25, 2007;

A House Judiciary Committee subpoena for the testimony of former White House Counsel Harriet Miers and documents, issued June 13, 2007;

A Senate Judiciary Committee subpoena for documents and testimony of White House Chief of Staff Joshua Bolten, issued June 13, 2007;

A Senate Judiciary Committee subpoena for documents and testimony of White House Political Director Sara Taylor, issued June 13, 2007 (Taylor appeared but refused to answer questions);

A Senate Judiciary Committee subpoena for documents and testimony of White House Deputy Chief of Staff Karl Rove, issued June 26, 2007;

A Senate Judiciary Committee subpoena for documents and testimony of White House Deputy Political Director J. Scott Jennings, issued June 26, 2007 (Jennings appeared but refused to answer questions);

A Senate Judiciary Committee subpoena for legal analysis and other documents concerning the NSA warrantless wiretapping program from the White House, Vice President Richard Cheney, The Department of Justice, and the National Security Council. If the documents are not produced, the subpoena requires the testimony of White House chief of staff Josh Bolten, Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, Cheney chief of staff David Addington, National Security Council executive director V. Philip Lago, issued June 27, 2007;

A House Oversight and Government Reform Committee subpoena for Lt. General Kensinger.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XXVIII.—TAMPERING WITH FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS, CORRUPTION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed,'' has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, conspired to undermine and tamper with the conduct of free and fair elections, and to corrupt the administration of justice by United States Attorneys and other employees of the Department of Justice, through abuse of the appointment power.

Toward this end, the President and Vice President, both personally and through their agents, did:

Engage in a program of manufacturing false allegations of voting fraud in targeted jurisdictions where the Democratic Party enjoyed an advantage in electoral performance or otherwise was problematic for the President's Republican Party, in order that public confidence in election results favorable to the Democratic Party be undermined;

Direct United States Attorneys to launch and announce investigations of certain leaders, candidates and elected officials affiliated with the Democratic Party at times calculated to cause the most political damage and confusion, most often in the weeks immediately preceding an election, in order that public confidence in the suitability for office of Democratic Party leaders, candidates and elected officials be undermined;

Direct United States Attorneys to terminate or scale back existing investigations of certain Republican Party leaders, candidates and elected officials allied with the George W. Bush administration, and to refuse to pursue new or proposed investigations of certain Republican Party leaders, candidates and elected officials allied with the George W. Bush administration, in order that public confidence in the suitability of such Republican Party leaders, candidates and elected officials be bolstered or restored;

Threaten to terminate the employment of the following United States Attorneys who refused to comply with such directives and purposes;

David C. Iglesias as U.S. Attorney for the District of New Mexico;

Kevin V. Ryan as U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of California;

John L. McKay as U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Washington;

Paul K. Charlton as U.S. Attorney for the District of Arizona;

Carol C. Lam as U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of California;

Daniel G. Bogden as U.S. Attorney for the District of Nevada;

Margaret M. Chiara as U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Michigan;

Todd Graves as U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Missouri;

Harry E. ''Bud'' Cummins, III as U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas;

Thomas M. DiBiagio as U.S. Attorney for the District of Maryland, and;

Kasey Warner as U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of West Virginia.

Further, George W. Bush has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President conspired to obstruct the lawful Congressional investigation of these dismissals of United States Attorneys and the related scheme to undermine and tamper with the conduct of free and fair elections, and to corrupt the administration of justice.

Contrary to his oath faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, George W. Bush has without lawful cause or excuse directed not to appear before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives certain witnesses summoned by duly authorized subpoenas issued by that Committee on June 13, 2007.

In refusing to permit the testimony of these witnesses George W. Bush, substituting his judgment as to what testimony was necessary for the inquiry, interposed the powers of the Presidency against the lawful subpoenas of the House of Representatives, thereby assuming to himself functions and judgments necessary to the exercise of the checking and balancing power of oversight vested in the House of Representatives.

Further, the President has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President directed the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia to decline to prosecute for contempt of Congress the aforementioned witnesses, Joshua B. Bolten and Harriet E. Miers, despite the obligation to do so as established by statute (2 U.S.C. §194) and pursuant to the direction of the United States House of Representatives as embodied in its resolution (H. Res. 982) of February 14, 2008.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XXIX.—CONSPIRACY TO VIOLATE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation

of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed,'' has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, has willfully corrupted and manipulated the electoral process of the United States for his personal gain and the personal gain of his co-conspirators and allies; has violated the United States Constitution and law by failing to protect the civil rights of African-American voters and others in the 2004 Election, and has impeded the right of the people to vote and have their vote properly and accurately counted, in that:

A. On November 5, 2002, and prior thereto, James Tobin, while serving as the regional director of the National Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee and as the New England Chairman of Bush-Cheney '04 Inc., did, at the direction of the White House under the administration of George W. Bush, along with other agents both known and unknown, commit unlawful acts by aiding and abetting a scheme to use computerized hang-up calls to jam phone lines set up by the New Hampshire Democratic Party and the Manchester firefighters' union on Election Day;

B. An investigation by the Democratic staff of the House Judiciary Committee into the voting procedures in Ohio during the 2004 election found ''widespread instances of intimidation and misinformation in violation of the Voting Rights Act, the Civil Rights Act of 1968, Equal Protection, Due Process and the Ohio right to vote;''

C. The 14th Amendment Equal Protection Clause guarantees that no minority group will suffer disparate treatment in a federal, state, or local election in stating that: ''No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.'' However, during and at various times of the year 2004, John Kenneth Blackwell, then serving as the Secretary of State for the State of Ohio and also serving simultaneously as Co-Chairman of the Committee to Re-Elect George W. Bush in the State of Ohio, did, at the direction of the White House under the administration of George W. Bush, along with other agents both known and unknown, commit unlawful acts in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution by failing to protect the voting rights of African-American citizens in Ohio and further, John Kenneth Blackwell did disenfranchise African-American voters under color of law, by

(i) Willfully denying certain neighborhoods in the cities of Cleveland, Ohio and Columbus, Ohio, along with other urban areas in the State of Ohio, an adequate number of electronic voting machines and provisional paper ballots, thereby unlawfully impeding duly registered voters from the act of voting and thus violating the civil rights of an unknown number of United States citizens.

a. In Franklin County, George W. Bush and his agent, Ohio Secretary of State John Kenneth Blackwell, Co-Chair of the Bush-Cheney Re-election Campaign, failed to protect the rights of African-American voters by not properly investigating the withholding of 125 electronic voting machines assigned to the city of Columbus.

b. Forty-two African-American precincts in Columbus were each missing one voting machine that had been present in the 2004 primary.

c. African-American voters in the city of Columbus were forced to wait three to seven hours to vote in the 2004 presidential election.

(ii) Willfully issuing unclear and conflicting rules regarding the methods and manner of becoming a legally registered voter in the State of Ohio, and willfully issuing unclear and unnecessary edicts regarding the weight of paper registration forms legally acceptable to the State of Ohio, thereby creating confusion for both voters and voting officials and thus impeding the right of an unknown number of United States citizens to register and vote.

a. Ohio Secretary of State John Kenneth Blackwell directed through Advisory 2004–31 that voter registration forms, which were greatest in urban minority areas, should not be accepted and should be returned unless submitted on 80 bond paper weight. Blackwell's own office was found to be using 60 bond paper weight.

(iii) Willfully permitted and encouraged election officials in Cleveland, Cincinnati and Toledo to conduct a massive partisan purge of registered voter rolls, eventually expunging more than 300,000 voters, many of whom were duly registered voters, and who were thus deprived of their constitutional right to vote;

a. Between the 2000 and 2004 Ohio presidential elections, 24.93% of the voters in the city of Cleveland, a city with a majority of African American citizens, were purged from the voting rolls.

b. In that same period, the Ohio county of Miami, with census data indicating a 98% Caucasian population, refused to purge any voters from its rolls. Miami County ''merged'' voters from other surrounding counties into its voting rolls and even allowed voters from other states to vote.

c. In Toledo, Ohio, an urban city with a high African-American concentration, 28,000 voters were purged from the voting rolls in August of 2004, just prior to the presidential election. This purge was conducted under the control and direction of George W. Bush's agent, Ohio Secretary of State John Kenneth Blackwell outside of the regularly established cycle of purging voters in odd-numbered years.

(iv) Willfully allowing Ohio Secretary of State John Kenneth Blackwell, acting under color of law and as an agent of George W. Bush, to issue a directive that no votes would be counted unless cast in the right precinct, reversing Ohio's long-standing practice of counting votes for president if cast in the right county.

(v) Willfully allowing his agent, Ohio Secretary of State John Kenneth Blackwell, the Co-Chair of the Bush-Cheney Re- election Campaign, to do nothing to assure the voting rights of 10,000 people in the city of Cleveland when a computer error by the private vendor Diebold Election Systems, Inc. incorrectly disenfranchised 10,000 voters

(vi) Willfully allowing his agent, Ohio Secretary of State John Kenneth Blackwell, the Co-Chair of the Bush- Cheney Re-election Campaign, to ensure that uncounted and provisional ballots in Ohio's 2004 presidential election would be disproportionately concentrated in urban African-American districts.

a. In Ohio's Lucas County, which includes Toledo, 3,122 or 41.13% of the provisional ballots went uncounted under the direction of George W. Bush's agent, the Secretary of State of Ohio, John Kenneth Blackwell, Co-Chair of the Committee to Re-Elect Bush/Cheney in Ohio.

b. In Ohio's Cuyahoga County, which includes Cleveland, 8,559 or 32.82% of the provisional ballots went uncounted.

c. In Ohio's Hamilton County, which includes Cincinnati, 3,529 or 24.23% of the provisional ballots went uncounted.

d. Statewide, the provisional ballot rejection rate was 9% as compared to the greater figures in the urban areas.

D. The Department of Justice, charged with enforcing the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the 14th Amendment's Equal Protection Clause, and other voting rights laws in the United States of America, under the direction and Administration of George W. Bush did willfully and purposely obstruct and stonewall legitimate criminal investigations into myriad cases of reported electoral fraud and suppression in the state of Ohio. Such activities, carried out by the department on behalf of George W. Bush in counties such as Franklin and Knox by persons such as John K. Tanner and others, were meant to confound and whitewash legitimate legal criminal investigations into the suppression of massive numbers of legally registered voters and the removal of their right to cast a ballot fairly and freely in the state of Ohio, which was crucial to the certified electoral victory of George W. Bush in 2004.

E. On or about November 1, 2006, members of the United States Department of Justice, under the control and direction of the Administration of George W. Bush, brought indictments for voter registration fraud within days of an election, in order to directly effect the outcome of that election for partisan purposes, and in doing so, thereby violated the Justice Department's own rules against filing election-related indictments close to an election;

F. Emails have been obtained showing that the Republican National Committee and members of Bush-Cheney '04 Inc., did, at the direction of the White House under the administration of George W. Bush, engage in voter suppression in five states by a method know as ''vote caging,'' an illegal voter suppression technique;

G. Agents of George W. Bush, including Mark F. ''Thor'' Hearne, the national general counsel of Bush/Cheney '04, Inc., did, at the behest of George W. Bush, as members of a criminal front group, distribute known false information and propaganda in the hopes of forwarding legislation and other actions that would result in the disenfranchisement of Democratic voters for partisan purposes. The scheme, run under the auspices of an organization known as ''The American Center for Voting Rights'' (ACVR), was funded by agents of George W. Bush in violation of laws governing tax exempt 501(c)3 organizations and in violation of federal laws forbidding the distribution of such propaganda by the federal government and agents working on its behalf.

H. Members of the United States Department of Justice, under the control and direction of the Administration of George W. Bush, did, for partisan reasons, illegally and with malice aforethought block career attorneys and other officials in the Department of Justice from filing three lawsuits charging local and county governments with violating the voting rights of African-Americans and other minorities, according to seven former senior United States Justice Department employees.

I. Members of the United States Department of Justice, under the control and direction of the Administration of George W. Bush, did illegally and with malice aforethought derail at least two investigations into possible voter discrimination, according to a letter sent to the Senate Rules and Administration Committee and written by former employees of the United States Department of Justice, Voting Rights Section.

J. Members of the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC), under the control and direction of the Administration of George W. Bush, have purposefully and

willfully misled the public, in violation of several laws, by;

(i) Withholding from the public and then altering a legally mandated report on the true measure and threat of Voter Fraud, as commissioned by the EAC and completed in June 2006, prior to the 2006 mid-term election, but withheld from release prior to that election when its information would have been useful in the administration of elections across the country, because the results of the statutorily required and tax-payer funded report did not conform with the illegal, partisan propaganda efforts and politicized agenda of the Bush Administration;

(ii) Withholding from the public a legally mandated report on the disenfranchising effect of Photo Identification laws at the polling place, shown to disproportionately disenfranchise voters not of George W. Bush's political party. The report was commissioned by the EAC and completed in June 2006, prior to the 2006 mid-term election, but withheld from release prior to that election when its information would have been useful in the administration of elections across the country

(iii) Withholding from the public a legally mandated report on the effectiveness of Provisional Voting as commissioned by the EAC and completed in June 2006, prior to the 2006 mid-term election, but withheld from release prior to that election when its information would have been useful in the administration of elections across the country, and keeping that report unreleased for more than a year until it was revealed by independent media outlets.

For directly harming the rights and manner of suffrage, for suffering to make them secret and unknowable, for overseeing and participating in the disenfranchisement of legal voters, for instituting debates and doubts about the true nature of elections, all against the will and consent of local voters affected, and forced through threats of litigation by agents and agencies overseen by George W. Bush, the actions of Mr. Bush to do the opposite of securing and guaranteeing the right of the people to alter or abolish their government via the electoral process, being a violation of an inalienable right, and an immediate threat to Liberty.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XXX.—MISLEADING CONGRESS AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE IN AN ATTEMPT TO DESTROY MEDICARE

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, pursued policies which deliberately drained the fiscal resources of Medicare by forcing it to compete with subsidized private insurance plans which are allowed to arbitrarily select or not select those they will cover; failing to provide reasonable levels of reimbursements to Medicare providers, thereby discouraging providers from participating in the program, and designing a Medicare Part D benefit without cost controls which allowed pharmaceutical companies to gouge the American taxpayers for the price of prescription drugs.

The President created, manipulated, and disseminated information given to the citizens and Congress of the United States in support of his prescription drug plan for Medicare that enriched drug companies while failing to save beneficiaries sufficient money on their prescription drugs. He misled Congress and the American people into thinking the cost of the benefit was $400 billion. It was widely understood that if the cost exceeded that amount, the bill would not pass due to concerns about fiscal irresponsibility.

A Medicare Actuary who possessed information regarding the true cost of the plan, $539 billion, was instructed by the Medicare Administrator to deny Congressional requests for it. The Actuary was threatened with sanctions if the information was disclosed to Congress, which, unaware of the information, approved the bill. Despite the fact that official cost estimates far exceeded $400 billion, President Bush offered assurances to Congress that the cost was $400 billion, when his office had information to the contrary. In the House of Representatives, the bill passed by a single vote and the Conference Report passed by only 5 votes. The White House knew the actual cost of the drug benefit was high enough to prevent its passage. Yet the White House concealed the truth and impeded an investigation into its culpability.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XXXI.—KATRINA: FAILURE TO PLAN FOR THE PREDICTED DISASTER OF HURRICANE KATRINA, FAILURE TO RESPOND TO A CIVIL EMERGENCY

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, failed to take sufficient action to protect life and property prior to and in the face of Hurricane Katrina in 2005, given decades of foreknowledge of the dangers of storms to New Orleans and specific forewarning in the days prior to the storm. The President failed to prepare for predictable and predicted disasters, failed to respond to an immediate need of which he was informed, and has subsequently failed to rebuild the section of our nation that was destroyed.

Hurricane Katrina killed at least 1,282 people, with 2 million more displaced. 302,000 housing units were destroyed or damaged by the hurricane, 71% of these were low-income units. More than 500 sewage plants were destroyed, more than 170 point-source leakages of gasoline, oil, or natural gas, more than 2000 gas stations submerged, several chemical plants, 8 oil refineries, and a superfund site was submerged. 8 million gallons of oil were spilled. Toxic materials seeped into floodwaters and spread through much of the city and surrounding areas.

The predictable increased strength of hurricanes such as Katrina has been identified by scientists for years, and yet the Bush Administration has denied this science and restricted such information from official reports, publications, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency's website. Donald Kennedy, editor-in-chief of Science, wrote in 2006 that ''hurricane intensity has increased with oceanic surface temperatures over the past 30 years. The physics of hurricane intensity growth . . . has clarified and explained the thermodynamic basis for these observations. [Kerry] Emanuel has tested this relationship and presented convincing evidence.''

FEMA's 2001 list of the top three most likely and most devastating disasters were a San Francisco earthquake, a terrorist attack on New York, and a Category 4 hurricane hitting New Orleans, with New Orleans being the number one item on that list. FEMA conducted a five-day hurricane simulation exercise in 2004, ''Hurricane Pam,'' mimicking a Katrina-like event. This exercise combined the National Weather Service, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the LSU Hurricane Center and other state and federal agencies, resulting in the development of emergency response plans. The exercise demonstrated, among other things, that thousands of mainly indigent New Orleans residents would be unable to evacuate on their own. They would need substantial government assistance. These plans, however, were not implemented in part due to the President's slashing of funds for protection. In the year before Hurricane Katrina hit, the President continued to cut budgets and deny grants to the Gulf Coast. In June of 2004 the Army Corps of Engineers levee budget for New Orleans was cut, and it was cut again in June of 2005, this time by $71.2 million or a whopping 44% of the budget. As a result, ACE was forced to suspend any repair work on the levees. In 2004 FEMA denied a Louisiana disaster mitigation grant request.

The President was given multiple warnings that Hurricane Katrina had a high likelihood of causing serious damage to New Orleans and the Gulf Coast. At 10 AM on Sunday 28 August 2005, the day before the storm hit, the National Weather Service published an alert titled ''DEVASTATING DAMAGE EXPECTED.'' Printed in all capital letters, the alert stated that ''MOST OF THE AREA WILL BE UNINHABITABLE FOR WEEKS . . . PERHAPS LONGER. AT LEAST ONE HALF OF WELL CONSTRUCTED HOMES WILL HAVE ROOF AND WALL FAILURE. . . . POWER OUTAGES WILL LAST FOR WEEKS. . . . WATER SHORTAGES WILL MAKE HUMAN SUFFERING INCREDIBLE BY MODERN STANDARDS.''

The Homeland Security Department also briefed the President on the scenario, warning of levee breaches and severe flooding. According to the New York Times, ''a Homeland Security Department report submitted to the White House at 1:47 a.m. on Aug. 29, hours before the storm hit, said, 'Any storm rated Category 4 or greater will likely lead to severe flooding and/or levee breaching.' '' These warnings clearly contradict the statements made by President Bush immediately after the storm that such devastation could not have been predicted. On 1 September 2005 the President said ''I don't think anyone anticipated the breach of the levees.''

The President's response to Katrina via FEMA and DHS was criminally delayed, indifferent, and inept. The only FEMA employee posted in New Orleans in the immediate aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, Marty Bahamonde, emailed head of FEMA Michael Brown from his Blackberry device on August 31, 2005 regarding the conditions. The email was urgent and detailed and indicated that ''The situation is past critical . . . Estimates are many will die within hours.'' Brown's reply was emblematic of the administration's entire response to the catastrophe:

''Thanks for the update. Anything specific I need to do or tweak?'' The Secretary of Homeland Security, Michael Chertoff, did not declare an emergency, did not mobilize the federal resources, and seemed to not even know what was happening on the ground until reporters told him.

On Friday August 26, 2005, Governor Kathleen Blanco declared a State of Emergency in Louisiana and Governor Haley Barbour of Mississippi followed suit the next day. Also on that Saturday, Governor Blanco asked the President to declare a Federal State of Emergency, and on 28 August 2005, the Sunday before the storm hit, Mayor Nagin declared a State of Emergency in New Orleans. This shows that the local authorities, responding to federal warnings, knew how bad the destruction was going to be and anticipated being overwhelmed. Failure to act under these circumstances demonstrates gross negligence.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XXXII.—MISLEADING CONGRESS AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, SYSTEMATICALLY UNDERMINING EFFORTS TO ADDRESS GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, ignored the peril to life and property posed by global climate change, manipulated scientific information and mishandled protective policy, constituting nonfeasance and malfeasance in office, abuse of power, dereliction of duty, and deception of Congress and the American people.

President Bush knew the expected effects of climate change and the role of human activities in driving climate change. This knowledge preceded his first Presidential term.

1. During his 2000 Presidential campaign, he promised to regulate carbon dioxide emissions.

2. In 2001, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a global body of hundreds of the world's foremost experts on climate change, concluded that ''most of observed warming over last 50 years (is) likely due to increases in greenhouse gas concentrations due to human activities.'' The Third Assessment Report projected several effects of climate change such as continued ''widespread retreat'' of glaciers, an ''increase threats to human health, particularly in lower income populations, predominantly within tropical/subtropical countries,'' and ''water shortages.''

3. The grave danger to national security posed by global climate change was recognized by the Pentagon's Defense Advanced Planning Research Projects Agency in October of 2003. An agency-commissioned report ''explores how such an abrupt climate change scenario could potentially de-stabilize the geo-political environment, leading to skirmishes, battles, and even war due to resource constraints such as: 1) Food shortages due to decreases in net global agricultural production 2) Decreased availability and quality of fresh water in key regions due to shifted precipitation patters, causing more frequent floods and droughts 3) Disrupted access to energy supplies due to extensive sea ice and storminess.''

4. A December 2004 paper in Science reviewed 928 studies published in peer reviewed journals to determine the number providing evidence against the existence of a link between anthropogenic emissions of carbon dioxide and climate change. ''Remarkably, none of the papers disagreed with the consensus position.''

5. The November 2007 Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Fourth Assessment Report showed that global anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gasses have increased 70% between 1970 and 2004, and anthropogenic emissions are very likely the cause of global climate change. The report concluded that global climate change could cause the extinction of 20 to 30 percent of species in unique ecosystems such as the polar areas and biodiversity hotspots, increase extreme weather events especially in the developing world, and have adverse effects on food production and fresh water availability.

The President has done little to address this most serious of problems, thus constituting an abuse of power and criminal neglect. He has also actively endeavored to undermine efforts by the federal government, states, and other nations to take action on their own.

1. In March 2001, President Bush announced the U.S. would not be pursuing ratification of the Kyoto Protocol, an international effort to reduce greenhouse gasses. The United States is the only industrialized nation that has failed to ratify the accord.

2. In March of 2008, Representative Henry Waxman wrote to EPA Administrator Stephen Johnson: ''In August 2003, the Bush Administration denied a petition to regulate CO_2 emissions from motor vehicles by deciding that CO_2 was not a pollutant under the Clean Air Act. In April 2007, the U.S. Supreme Court overruled that determination in Massachusetts v. EPA. The Supreme Court wrote that 'If EPA makes a finding of endangerment, the Clean Air Act requires the agency to regulate emissions of the deleterious pollutant from new motor vehicles.' The EPA then conducted an extensive investigation involving 60–70 staff who concluded that 'CO_2 emissions endanger both human health and welfare.' These findings were submitted to the White House, after which work on the findings and the required regulations was halted.''

3. A Memo to Members of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on May 19, 2008 stated ''The record before the Committee shows: (1) the career staff at EPA unanimously supported granting California's petition (to be allowed to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from cars and trucks, consistent with California state law); (2) Stephen Johnson, the Administrator of EPA, also supported granting California's petition at least in part; and (3) Administrator Johnson reversed his position after communications with officials in the White House.''

The President has suppressed the release of scientific information related to global climate change, an action which undermines Congress' ability to legislate and provide oversight, and which has thwarted efforts to prevent global climate change despite the serious threat that it poses.

1. In February, 2001, ExxonMobil wrote a memo to the White House outlining ways to influence the outcome of the Third Assessment report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The memo opposed the reelection of Dr. Robert Watson as the IPCC Chair. The White House then supported an opposition candidate, who was subsequently elected to replace Dr. Watson.

2. The New York Times on January 29, 2006, reported that James Hansen, NASA's senior climate scientist was warned of ''dire consequences'' if he continued to speak out about global climate change and the need for reducing emissions of associated gasses. The Times also reported that: ''At climate laboratories of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, for example, many scientists who routinely took calls from reporters five years ago can now do so only if the interview is approved by administration officials in Washington, and then only if a public affairs officer is present or on the phone.''

3. In December of 2007, the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform issued a report based on 16 months of investigation and 27,000 pages of documentation. According to the summary: ''The evidence before the Committee leads to one inescapable conclusion: the Bush Administration has engaged in a systematic effort to manipulate climate change science and mislead policy makers and the public about the dangers of global warming.'' The report described how the White House appointed former petroleum industry lobbyist Phil Cooney as head of the Council on Environmental Quality. The report states ''There was a systematic White House effort to minimize the significance of climate change by editing climate change reports. CEQ Chief of Staff Phil Cooney and other CEQ officials made at least 294 edits to the Administration's Strategic Plan of the Climate Change Science Program to exaggerate or emphasize scientific uncertainties or to de-emphasize or diminish the importance of the human role in global warming.''

4. On April 23, 2008, Representative Henry Waxman wrote a letter to EPA Administrator Stephen L Johnson. In it he reported: ''Almost 1,600 EPA scientists completed the Union of Concerned Scientists survey questionnaire. Over 22 percent of these scientists reported that 'selective or incomplete use of data to justify a specific regulatory outcome' occurred 'frequently' or 'occasionally' at EPA. Ninety-four EPA scientists reported being frequently or occasionally directed to inappropriately exclude or alter technical information from an EPA scientific document. Nearly 200 EPA scientists said that they have frequently or occasionally been in situations in which scientists have actively objected to, resigned from or removed themselves from a project because of pressure to change scientific findings.''

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XXXIII.—REPEATEDLY IGNORED AND FAILED TO RESPOND TO HIGH LEVEL INTELLIGENCE WARNINGS OF PLANNED TERRORIST ATTACKS IN THE US, PRIOR TO 911

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and

subordinates, together with the Vice President, failed in his Constitutional duties to take proper steps to protect the nation prior to September 11, 2001.

The White House's top counter-terrorism adviser, Richard A. Clarke, has testified that from the beginning of George W. Bush's presidency until September 11, 2001, Clarke attempted unsuccessfully to persuade President Bush to take steps to protect the nation against terrorism. Clarke sent a memorandum to then-National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice on January 24, 2001, ''urgently'' but unsuccessfully requesting ''a Cabinet-level meeting to deal with the impending al Qaeda attack.''

In April 2001, Clarke was finally granted a meeting, but only with second-in-command department representatives, including Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, who made light of Clarke's concerns.

Clarke confirms that in June, July, and August 2001, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) warned the president in daily briefings of unprecedented indications that a major al Qaeda attack was going to happen against the United States somewhere in the world in the weeks and months ahead. Yet, Clarke was still unable to convene a cabinet-level meeting to address the issue.

Condoleezza Rice has testified that George Tenet met with the president 40 times to warn him that a major al-Qaeda attack was going to take place, and that in response the president did not convene any meetings of top officials. At such meetings, the FBI could have shared information on possible terrorists enrolled at flight schools. Among the many preventive steps that could have been taken, the Federal Aviation Administration, airlines, and airports might have been put on full alert.

According to Condoleezza Rice, the first and only cabinet-level meeting prior to 9/11 to discuss the threat of terrorist attacks took place on September 4, 2001, one week before the attacks in New York and Washington.

On August 6, 2001, President Bush was presented a President's Daily Brief (PDB) article titled ''Bin Laden Determined to Strike in U.S.'' The lead sentence of that PDB article indicated that Bin Laden and his followers wanted to ''follow the example of World Trade Center bomber Ramzi Yousef and 'bring the fighting to America.' '' The article warned: ''Al-Qa'ida members—including some who are U.S. citizens—have resided in or traveled to the US for years, and the group apparently maintains a support structure that could aid attacks.''

The article cited a ''more sensational threat reporting that Bin Laden wanted to hijack a US aircraft,'' but indicated that the CIA had not been able to corroborate such reporting. The PDB item included information from the FBI indicating ''patterns of suspicious activity in this country consistent with preparations for hijackings or other types of attacks, including recent surveillance of federal buildings in New York.'' The article also noted that the CIA and FBI were investigating ''a call to our embassy in the UAE in May saying that a group of Bin Laden supporters was in the US planning attacks with explosives.''

The president spent the rest of August 6, and almost all the rest of August 2001 on vacation. There is no evidence that he called any meetings of his advisers to discuss this alarming report. When the title and substance of this PDB article were later reported in the press, then-National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice began a sustained campaign to play down its significance, until the actual text was eventually released by the White House.

New York Times writer Douglas Jehl, put it this way: ''In a single 17-sentence document, the intelligence briefing delivered to President Bush in August 2001 spells out the who, hints at the what and points towards the where of the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington that followed 36 days later.''

Eleanor Hill, Executive Director of the joint congressional committee investigating the performance of the U.S. intelligence community before September 11, 2001, reported in mid-September 2002 that intelligence reports a year earlier ''reiterated a consistent and constant theme: Osama bin Laden's intent to launch terrorist attacks inside the United States.''

That joint inquiry revealed that just two months before September 11, an intelligence briefing for ''senior government officials'' predicted a terrorist attack with these words: ''The attack will be spectacular and designed to inflict mass casualties against U.S. facilities or interests. Attack preparations have been made. Attack will occur with little or no warning.''

Given the White House's insistence on secrecy with regard to what intelligence was given to President Bush, the joint-inquiry report does not divulge whether he took part in that briefing. Even if he did not, it strains credulity to suppose that those ''senior government officials'' would have kept its alarming substance from the president.

Again, there is no evidence that the president held any meetings or took any action to deal with the threats of such attacks.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XXXIV.—OBSTRUCTION OF INVESTIGATION INTO THE ATTACKS OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, obstructed investigations into the attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon on September 11, 2001.

Following September 11, 2001, President Bush and Vice President Cheney took strong steps to thwart any and all proposals that the circumstances of the attack be addressed. Then-Secretary of State Colin Powell was forced to renege on his public promise on September 23 that a ''White Paper'' would be issued to explain the circumstances. Less than two weeks after that promise, Powell apologized for his ''unfortunate choice of words,'' and explained that Americans would have to rely on ''information coming out in the press and in other ways.''

On Sept. 26, 2001, President Bush drove to Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) headquarters in Langley, Virginia, stood with Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet and said: ''My report to the nation is, we've got the best intelligence we can possibly have thanks to the men and women of the C.I.A.'' George Tenet subsequently and falsely claimed not to have visited the president personally between the start of Bush's long Crawford vacation and September 11, 2001.

Testifying before the 9/11 Commission on April 14, 2004, Tenet answered a question from Commission member Timothy Roemer by referring to the president's vacation (July 29–August 30) in Crawford and insisting that he did not see the president at all in August 2001. ''You never talked with him?'' Roemer asked. ''No,'' Tenet replied, explaining that for much of August he too was ''on leave.'' An Agency spokesman called reporters that same evening to say Tenet had misspoken, and that Tenet had briefed Bush on August 17 and 31. The spokesman explained that the second briefing took place after the president had returned to Washington, and played down the first one, in Crawford, as uneventful.

In his book, At the Center of the Storm, (2007) Tenet refers to what is almost certainly his August 17 visit to Crawford as a follow-up to the ''Bin Laden Determined to Strike in the U.S.'' article in the CIA-prepared President's Daily Brief of August 6. That briefing was immortalized in a Time Magazine photo capturing Harriet Myers holding the PDB open for the president, as two CIA officers sit by. It is the same briefing to which the president reportedly reacted by telling the CIA briefer, ''All right, you've covered your ass now.'' (Ron Suskind, The One-Percent Doctrine, p. 2, 2006). In At the Center of the Storm, Tenet writes: ''A few weeks after the August 6 PDB was delivered, I followed it to Crawford to make sure that the president stayed current on events.''

A White House press release suggests Tenet was also there a week later, on August 24. According to the August 25, 2001, release, President Bush, addressing a group of visitors to Crawford on August 25, told them: ''George Tenet and I, yesterday, we piled in the new nominees for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the Vice Chairman and their wives and went right up the canyon.''

In early February 2002, Vice President Dick Cheney warned then-Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle that if Congress went ahead with an investigation, administration officials might not show up to testify. As pressure grew for an investigation, the president and vice president agreed to the establishment of a congressional joint committee to conduct a ''Joint Inquiry.'' Eleanor Hill, Executive Director of the Inquiry, opened the Joint Inquiry's final public hearing in mid-September 2002 with the following disclaimer: ''I need to report that, according to the White House and the Director of Central Intelligence, the president's knowledge of intelligence information relevant to this inquiry remains classified, even when the substance of the intelligence information has been declassified.''

The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks, also known as the 9/11 Commission, was created on November 27, 2002, following the passage of congressional legislation signed into law by President Bush. The President was asked to testify before the Commission. He refused to testify except for one hour in private with only two Commission members, with no oath administered, with no recording or note taking, and with the Vice President at his side. Commission Co-Chair Lee Hamilton has written that he believes the commission was set up to fail, was underfunded, was rushed, and did not receive proper cooperation and access to information.

A December 2007 review of classified documents by former members of the Commission found that the commission had made repeated and detailed requests to the CIA in 2003 and 2004 for documents and other information about the interrogation of operatives of Al Qaeda, and had been told falsely by a top C.I.A. official that the agency had ''produced or made available for review'' everything that had been requested.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ARTICLE XXXV.—ENDANGERING THE HEALTH OF 9/11 FIRST RESPONDERS

In his conduct while President of the United States, George W. Bush, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution ''to take care that the laws be faithfully executed'', has both personally and acting through his agents and subordinates, together with the Vice President, recklessly endangered the health of first responders, residents, and workers at and near the former location of the World Trade Center in New York City.

The Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) August 21, 2003, report numbered 2003–P–00012 and entitled ''EPA's Response to the World Trade Center Collapse: Challenges, Successes, and Areas for Improvement,'' includes the following findings:

''[W] hen EPA made a September 18 announcement that the air was 'safe' to breathe, it did not have sufficient data and analyses to make such a blanket statement. At that time, air monitoring data was lacking for several pollutants of concern, including particulate matter and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). Furthermore, The White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) influenced, through the collaboration process, the information that EPA communicated to the public through its early press releases when it convinced EPA to add reassuring statements and delete cautionary ones.

''As a result of the White House CEQ's influence, guidance for cleaning indoor spaces and information about the potential health effects from WTC debris were not included in EPA-issued press releases. In addition, based on CEQ's influence, reassuring information was added to at least one press release and cautionary information was deleted from EPA's draft version of that press release . . . The White House's role in EPA's public communications about WTC environmental conditions was described in a September 12, 2001, e-mail from the EPA Deputy Administrator's Chief of Staff to senior EPA officials:

''''All statements to the media should be cleared through the NSC [National Security Council] before they are released.'

''According to the EPA Chief of Staff, one particular CEQ official was designated to work with EPA to ensure that clearance was obtained through NSC. The Associate Administrator for the EPA Office of Communications, Education, and Media Relations (OCEMR) said that no press release could be issued for a 3- to 4-week period after September 11 without approval from the CEQ contact.''

Acting EPA Administrator Marianne Horinko, who sat in on EPA meetings with the White House, has said in an interview that the White House played a coordinating role. The National Security Council played the key role, filtering incoming data on ground zero air and water, Horinko said: ''I think that the thinking was, these are experts in WMD (weapons of mass destruction), so they should have the coordinating role.''

In the cleanup of the Pentagon following September 11, 2001, Occupational Safety and Health Administration laws were enforced, and no workers became ill. At the World Trade Center site, the same laws were not enforced.

In the years since the release of the EPA Inspector General's above-cited report, the Bush Administration has still not effected a clean-up of the indoor air in apartments and workspaces near the site.

Screenings conducted at the Mount Sinai Medical Center and released in the September 10, 2004, Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR) of the federal Centers For Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), produced the following results:

''Both upper and lower respiratory problems and mental health difficulties are widespread among rescue and recovery workers who dug through the ruins of the World Trade Center in the days following its destruction in the attack of September 11, 2001.

''An analysis of the screenings of 1,138 workers and volunteers who responded to the World Trade Center disaster found that nearly three-quarters of them experienced new or worsened upper respiratory problems at some point while working at Ground Zero. And half of those examined had upper and/or lower respiratory symptoms that persisted up to the time of their examinations, an average of eight months after their WTC efforts ended.''

A larger study released in 2006 found that roughly 70 percent of nearly 10,000 workers tested at Mount Sinai from 2002 to 2004 reported that they had new or substantially worsened respiratory problems while or after working at ground zero. This study showed that many of the respiratory ailments, including sinusitis and asthma, and gastrointestinal problems related to them, initially reported by ground zero workers persisted or grew worse over time. Most of the ground zero workers in the study who reported trouble breathing while working there were still having those problems two and a half years later, an indication of chronic illness unlikely to improve over time.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SUTTON). The resolution qualifies.

Under the previous order of the House of June 10, the previous question is ordered without intervening motion except one motion to refer.

MOTION TO REFER OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I move that the House refer the impeachment resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House of June 10, further proceedings on this question will be postponed as though under clause 8(a)(1)(A) of rule XX.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 2 p.m. on account of flooding in district.

Mr. CUMMINGS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today until 2 p.m.

Mr. MEEK of Florida (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WEINER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORAN of Kansas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, June 17.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 17.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, June 11 and 12.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today and June 11.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, June 11.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today, June 11 and 12.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, June 11, 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:

7042. A letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Eligibility and

Scope of Financing; Processing and Marketing (RIN: 3052-AC33) received June 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7043. A letter from the OSD Federal Liaison Officer, DoD, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — TRICARE; Certain Survivors of Deceased Active Duty Members; and Adoption Intermediaries [DOD-2006-HA-0194] (RIN: 0720-AB07) received June 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7044. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, DoD, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — User Fees [DoD-2006-OS-0005] (RIN: 0790-AH93) received June 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7045. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations — received June 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7046. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Project Design and Cost Standards for the Section 202 and Section 811 Programs [Docket No. FR-5097-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AI48) received June 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7047. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Luxembourg pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7048. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Brazil pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7049. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7050. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7051. A letter from the President, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, transmitting the Bank's 2007 Annual Report; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7052. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Demands for Testimony or Records in Legal Proceedings [Docket ID ED-2007-OS-0138] received June 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7053. A letter from the Deputy Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received June 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7054. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Annual Update of Filing Fees [Docket No. RM08-9-000] received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7055. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Definition of Eligible Portfolio Company under the Investment Company Act of 1940 [Release No. IC-28266; File No. S7-37-04] (RIN: 3235-AJ31) received May 20, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7056. A letter from the Associate Director, PP&I, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rough Diamonds Control Regulations — received May 20, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7057. A letter from the Acting Chief Acquisition Officer & Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2005-040, Electronic Subcontracting Reporting System (eSRS) [FAC 2005-25; FAR Case 2005-040; Item II; Docket 2008-0001, Sequence 01] (RIN: 9000-AK95) received June 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7058. A letter from the Acting Chief Acquisition Officer and Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2005-040, Electronic Subcontracting Reporting System (eSRS) [FAC 2005-25; FAR Case 2005-040; Item II; Docket 2008-0001, Sequence 01] (RIN: 9000-AK95) received June 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7059. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — REPRESENTATIVE RATE; ORDER OF RELEASE FROM COMPETITIVE LEVEL; ASSIGNMENT RIGHTS (RIN: 3206-AL19) received May 20, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7060. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Endangered Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Special Rule for the Polar Bear [[FWS-R7-ES-2008-0027] [1111 FY07 MO-B2] (RIN: 1018-AV79) received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7061. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional & Legal Affairs — Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Gaming on Trust Lands Acquired After October 17, 1988 (RIN: 1076-AE81) received May 20, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7062. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, ''Duck Stamp Improvement Act of 2008''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7063. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act Provisions; Weakfish Fishery [Docket No. 070717344-8150-01; I.D. 041907A] (RIN: 0648-AV44) received June 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7064. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator For Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Allocating Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Fishery Resources; American Fisheries Act Sideboards [Docket No. 0612242903-7445-03 and 0612242886-7464-03] (RINs 0648-AU48 and 0648-AU68) received June 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7065. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch for Vessels in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Trawl Limited Access Fishery in the Central Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 071106673-8011-02] (RIN: 0648-XH84) received June 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7066. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 ft (18.3 m) LOA Using Pot or Hook-and-Line Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 071106673-8011-02] (RIN: 0648-XH78) received June 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7067. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures [Docket No. 080408542-8615-01] (RIN: 0648-AW63) received June 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7068. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of a class of workers from the Nuclear Materials and Equipment Corporation (NUMEC) facility in Parks Township, Pennsylvania, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7069. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of a class of workers from the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Richland, Washington, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7070. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of a class of workers from the Horizons, Inc. facility in Cleveland, Ohio, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7071. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of a class of workers from the SAM Laboratories to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7072. A letter from the Acting Chief, Regulatory Management Division, Office of the

Executive Secretariat, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of a Genealogy Program [CIS No. 2074-00; DHS Docket No. USCIS-2005-0013] (RIN: 1615-AB19) received May 20, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7073. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's comments on H.R. 4080, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a separate nonimmigrant classification for fashion models; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7074. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of a class of workers from the Kellex/Pierpont facility in Jersey City, New Jersey, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7075. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's comments on S. 2829, a bill to make technical corrections to Section 1244 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (NDAA 2008); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7076. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the report of the Director of the Executive Office for United States Trustees on the evaluation of instructional classes in personal financial management for consumer bankruptcy debtors, pursuant to Public Law 109-8, section 105; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7077. A letter from the Director, National Legislative Commission, American Legion, transmitting a copy of the Legion's financial statements as of December 31, 2007, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(4) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7078. A letter from the Director, Office of Science and Technology Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the Office's Revised Research Plan for the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Scientific Assessment of the Effects of Global Change on the United States; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

7079. A letter from the Associate Administrator for Aeronautics, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Development Work for Industry in NASA Wind Tunnels [Notice: (08-045)] (RIN: 2700-AC81) received June 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

7080. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) Implementation in the Maritime Sector; Hazardous Materials Endorsement for a Commercial Driver's License [Docket Nos. TSA-2006-24191; USCG-2006-24196] (RIN: 1652-AA41) received May 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

7081. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of legislative proposals as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2009; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Oversight and Government Reform.

7082. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, ''the George Washington Memorial Parkway Boundary Revision Act''; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Transportation and Infrastructure.

7083. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of legislative proposals as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2009; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, and the Budget.

7084. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's requested legislative proposals as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2009; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, Veterans' Affairs, Ways and Means, Small Business, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Foreign Affairs, and Financial Services.

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. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5541. A bill to provide a supplemental funding source for catastrophic emergency wildland fire suppression activities on Department of the Interior and National Forest System lands, to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a cohesive wildland fire management strategy, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–704 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3754. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to accept, as part of a settlement, diesel emission reduction Supplemental Environmental Projects, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–705). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1553. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to advance medical research and treatments into pediatric cancers, ensure patients and families have access to the current treatments and information regarding pediatric cancers, establish a population-based national childhood cancer database, and promote public awareness of pediatric cancers; with an amendment (Rept. 110–706). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1257. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6063) to authorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–707). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 5541. Referred to the Committees on Agriculture and the Budget extended for a period ending not later than June 27, 2008.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MACK, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GINGREY, Ms. FALLIN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 6219. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of Commerce and to prohibit Federal economic development funds to States that carry out public takings for private purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KLINE of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. PENCE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOODE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. SHADEGG):

H.R. 6220. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to make non-union training programs eligible for Federal funding under the ''Green Jobs'' program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN):

H.R. 6221. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to include in each contract the Secretary enters for the acquisition of goods and services a provision that requires the contractee to comply with the contracting goals and preferences for small business concerns owned or controlled by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 6222. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a nonrefundable credit against income tax liability for gasoline and diesel fuel used in highway vehicles for nonbusiness purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELLER:

H.R. 6223. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Bureau of Land Management land in the State of Nevada to the Las Vegas Motor Speedway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN:

H.R. 6224. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a five-year pilot project to test the feasibility and advisability of expanding the scope of certain qualifying work-study activities under title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN:

H.R. 6225. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, relating to equitable relief with

respect to a State or private employer; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. HALL of New York, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. WEINER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WOLF, Mr. STARK, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 6226. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 300 East 3rd Street in Jamestown, New York, as the ''Stan Lundine Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 6227. A bill to exempt longstanding nonfunctionally-integrated supporting organizations from certain provisions of the Pension Protection Act of 2006; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 6228. A bill to ban the use of bisphenol A in food and beverage containers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota (for herself, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota):

H.R. 6229. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2523 7th Avenue East in North Saint Paul, Minnesota, as the ''Mayor William 'Bill' Sandberg Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 6230. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require nationally registered statistical rating organizations to provide additional disclosures with respect to the rating of certain structured securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H.R. 6231. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require that any automobile manufactured by a manufacturer after model year 2018 be an alternative fueled automobile; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SOUDER (for himself and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER):

H. Con. Res. 369. Concurrent resolution honoring the men and women of the Drug Enforcement Administration on the occasion of its 35th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WATT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BERRY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H. Con. Res. 370. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of September 2008 as ''Gospel Music Heritage Month'' and honoring gospel music for its valuable and longstanding contributions to the culture of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COLE of Oklahoma:

H. Res. 1255. A resolution honoring Toby Keith's commitment to members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EMANUEL:

H. Res. 1256. A resolution electing certain Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ARCURI (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SPACE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. CARDOZA):

H. Res. 1259. A resolution congratulating the Hamilton College Continentals on winning the NCAA Division III women's lacrosse championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. BEAN (for herself, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BARROW, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ROSS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SPACE, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Res. 1260. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''National Internet Safety Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H. Res. 1261. A resolution congratulating East High School in Denver, Colorado, on winning the 2008 ''We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution'' national competition; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

291. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 85 approving and authorizing the establishment of a state-province affiliation between the State of Hawaii of the United States of America and the Province of Negros Oriental of the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

292. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 53 urging the President of the United States to agree to an economy-wide reduction in its greenhouse gas emissions and to commit the United States to a binding international treaty that would result in a significant and rapid global reduction in atmospheric greenhouse gas concentration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

293. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 16 requesting that the Congress of the United States ratify the United Nations Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

294. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 230 urging the prevention of the sale of oil and gas leases and of drilling in the Chukchi and Beaufort Sea Regions of Alaska; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

295. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 71 urging the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to confer priority status to children born to Department of Defense personnel and foreign women during and up to to nine months after deployment in order to facilitate and expediate the immigration of these children and women to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

296. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 86 urging the President of the United States, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security to include the Republic of Korea in the Visa Waiver Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

297. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 154 urging the Congress of the United States to amend the definition of ''Amerasians'' in the Amerasians

Immigration Act of 1982; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

298. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 19 urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to exempt children of Filipino World War II Veterans from immigrant visa limits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

299. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 91 requesting that the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States enact the Filipino American Veterans Equity Act of 2007; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

300. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 110 supporting assistance for persons present in the United States under the Compacts of Free Association; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mrs. MALONEY of New York introduced a bill (H.R. 6232) for the relief of Richard M. Barlow of Bozeman, Montana; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 17: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 154: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. REGULA.
H.R. 367: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 503: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 670: Mr. KIRK.
H.R. 769: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 780: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 821: Mr. WEXLER, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 897: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 898: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 971: Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 997: Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 1014: Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 1190: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1280: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1283: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1420: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1532: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1645: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1691: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1732: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1738: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1820: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1841: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1845: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 1846: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1869: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1932: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1952: Mr. KUHL of New York.
H.R. 2032: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2045: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 2122: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2205: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 2275: Mr. MANZULLO and Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 2279: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BONNER, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan.
H.R. 2289: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2343: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. RENZI, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 2353: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 2357: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 2493: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan.
H.R. 2832: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 2833: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2914: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 2923: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 2926: Mr. STARK, Mr. CARSON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2991: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 3089: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 3112: Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 3144: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 3157: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 3232: Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 3234: Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 3267: Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 3289: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 3334: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 3404: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3423: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 3457: Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky.
H.R. 3544: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 3642: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 3652: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 3797: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 4007: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4014: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 4015: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 4016: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 4026: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4065: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 4091: Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 4093: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 4113: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 4116: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 4141: Ms. FALLIN and Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
H.R. 4229: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 4231: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 4264: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 4544: Mr. AKIN, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 4775: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 4934: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 4935: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 4987: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina and Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 5057: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 5229: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 5466: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 5496: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 5575: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 5580: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 5590: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 5606: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 5646: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 5705: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 5723: Mr. HODES.
H.R. 5733: Mr. WALSH of New York.
H.R. 5734: Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 5748: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 5774: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 5782: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 5793: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 5797: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
H.R. 5814: Mr. SHADEGG.
H.R. 5821: Ms. FALLIN.
H.R. 5835: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 5873: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 5881: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 5882: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 5886: Mr. SHADEGG.
H.R. 5892: Mr. GORDON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 5914: Mr. HODES.
H.R. 5921: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 5932: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. CAZAYOUX, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. MCCRERY.
H.R. 5933: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. CAZAYOUX, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. MCCRERY.
H.R. 5935: Mr. MURTHA.
H.R. 5954: Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 5971: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia and Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 5976: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 5984: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 6020: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 6039: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 6045: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 6053: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 6057: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 6076: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 6088: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 6101: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.
H.R. 6104: Mr. WU, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BACA, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 6107: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BONNER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 6108: Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan.
H.R. 6120: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 6126: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 6136: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 6140: Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 6146: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 6189: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 6207: Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 6208: Mr. HULSHOF.
H.R. 6214: Mr. WALSH of New York and Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.J. Res. 39: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.J. Res. 89: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
H. Con. Res. 244: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H. Con. Res. 267: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H. Con. Res. 332: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Con. Res. 336: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
H. Con. Res. 360: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Con. Res. 361: Ms. LEE, Mr. KIRK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FORTUÑO, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H. Con. Res. 362: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CANNON, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. BOREN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr.

WESTMORELAND, Mr. BONNER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. MATHESON.

H. Con. Res. 364: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. SESTAK.

H. Con. Res. 365: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. HOOLEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. ARCURI, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H. Con. Res. 367: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GORDON, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. DICKS.

H. Res. 333: Mr. WEXLER.

H. Res. 758: Mr. SHADEGG.

H. Res. 881: Mr. COHEN, Mr. GOODE, Ms. FALLIN, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H. Res. 937: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 1008: Mr. SHAYS and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 1078: Mrs. Davis of California.

H. Res. 1080: Mr. BACHUS.

H. Res. 1159: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BARROW, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H. Res. 1191: Mr. KENNEDY.

H. Res. 1202: Mr. WU.

H. Res. 1204: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 1230: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. ALLEN.

H. Res. 1231: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. DONNELLY.

H. Res. 1232: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. SHAYS.

H. Res. 1235: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H. Res. 1239: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H. Res. 1242: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LEE, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 1245: Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 1246: Mr. FARR, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 1248: Mr. HERGER.

H. Res. 1249: Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. FARR, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARSON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative BART GORDON or a designee to H.R. 6063, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2008, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.