



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 2008

No. 97

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 12, 2008.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ELLEN O. TAUSCHER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

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

It would seem, Lord, that peace can come to both sides of any wall that divides people. Only four conditions are required of the human spirit for peace to be achieved: Truth, justice, love and freedom. So Lord, we pray:

That truth will build peace as every individual sincerely acknowledges not only his or her own rights but also one's duty to protect the rights of others; justice will build peace, Lord, if everyone respects the rights of others and actually fulfills one's duties toward all others; love will build peace if people feel the needs of others as their own and share what they have with others, especially the values of mind and spirit which they possess; freedom will build peace, Lord, if in their choices people act according to sound reason and are willing to accept the consequences of their own actions.

Therefore, Lord, we pray that Your people will speak the truth, act justly, love faithfully, and live freely, and so find peace not just here and now but 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 Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PALLONE 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.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### RECOGNIZING ARVERN MOORE ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. CHILDERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Arvern Moore for his 41 years of outstanding service as executive director of the Institute of Community Services Head Start Program in Mississippi's First District.

Arvern Moore began his work in 1967 with the ICS Head Start Program and had the vision to build a successful program to prepare children and families for the future. He served terms as president of the National Head Start Association and is known to many as "Mr. Head Start."

Arvern has established vital Head Start partnerships with businesses and

stakeholders but has always remained focused on the families of Mississippi. Today, the ICS Head Start Program, headquartered in Holly Springs, Mississippi, serves more than 3,600 Head Start children.

It is my honor to recognize Arvern Moore for his 41 years of service to Mississippi's children and families. Please join me on the occasion of his retirement in wishing him a rewarding life in the community he has worked so hard to support. We offer heartfelt congratulations to Arvern for a life of service as we wish him and his family a joyous celebration of this milestone.

### WHAT ABOUT AMERICAN OIL?

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

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Oil prices are climbing to record highs, gasoline is over \$4 a gallon and climbing towards \$5, food prices are up and rising, and family budgets stretch their limits.

And how do we handle this? We beg OPEC to produce more oil. The Saudis say they will call a meeting. Venezuela says they want \$200-a-barrel oil. Foreign speculators say let's hope the market will fall.

Americans say, what about America? What about American energy? Why not explore for the trillions of barrels of America's oil off our coast, America's shale oil? Saying "no" to Americans is not an energy policy. Begging other nations is not an energy policy.

Americans get it. Congress needs to get it too. American oil, American jobs, American control of its own destiny and returning America to be the greatest Nation on Earth and not a nation that has its hat in its hand saying please help us.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H5331

WHY SHOULD WE OPEN LAND FOR DRILLING WHEN BIG OIL ISN'T EVEN DRILLING WHERE THEY HAVE LEASES

(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, it is no wonder that the only Republican solution to our record high gas prices is more drilling. Who would expect anything less when two former oil executives occupy the White House?

The problem is that this has been the Republican energy plan for the last 7 years. It was created in secret by Vice President CHENEY and oil executives. And it is responsible for the record high oil prices that we all face at the pump today.

Republicans claim that we could lower the price at the pump if we would only approve more and more drilling leases. That is their rhetoric. Here are the facts. Oil companies do not need new areas to drill. They need to focus on areas that are already opened to them. Of the 42 million acres of Federal land currently leased by oil and gas companies, only about 12 million acres are actually being drilled to produce oil and natural gas.

Madam Speaker, if the Republican claims about more drilling are correct, why aren't they demanding Big Oil explore drilling on the 30 million acres of Federal land that are already open to them but that they refuse to explore?

#### THE LAW OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, 2 years ago, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle told the American people they had a commonsense plan to bring down gas prices. Unfortunately, we still haven't seen this commonsense plan, so I would like to offer my own.

This is a drill bit. The drill bit goes into the ground. Oil comes out of the ground. Oil goes to a refinery. Gasoline comes out of the refinery. More gas, price comes down.

Let me repeat that for those on the other side who seem not able to understand that.

This is a drill bit. The drill goes down into the ground. Oil comes out of the ground. Oil goes to the refinery. Gasoline comes out of the refinery. More gas, price comes down.

#### THE HIGH COST OF GASOLINE

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today for the weary Americans who are working harder than they ever have but still find themselves falling behind. I rise today

for Americans all across this country and especially those in my home State of Georgia who are hurting. I rise for those whose wallets get thinner each time they go to the gas station.

I rise for those who must decide between \$4 a gallon gasoline or food for their family, those who must decide between \$4 a gallon gasoline or paying the mortgage. Americans will continue to make these choices until we decide enough is enough. Let's change our energy policy.

#### RECOGNIZING THE WAUBONSIE VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS SOCCER TEAM

(Mrs. BIGGERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to congratulate the Waubonsie Valley Warriors on winning the Illinois State Girls Soccer Championship. In the final tournament, the Lady Warriors won three consecutive games to capture the State title against an exceptionally competitive field.

Despite the loss of Illinois Gatorade Player of the Year, Bri Rodriguez, who suffered a torn ACL in the quarterfinal match, the team notched a 3-0 victory over Belleville Althoff in the championship. This is the second consecutive State championship for the Waubonsie girls soccer team, which this season recorded an undefeated record of 26 wins, zero losses, and 1 tie.

Kiki McClellan, Vanessa DiBernardo, and Megan Green each succeeded in scoring hard-earned goals during the championship game. And Claire Hanold kept her goal-keeping streak alive by blocking five shots and securing her 22nd shut-out of the season. Indeed, every member of the team stepped up to bring the trophy home through her outstanding play. And guiding them to the championship was Coach Judy Bergstrom.

Madam Speaker, the Warriors' success can be attributed to their determined spirit and strong work ethic. These talented young ladies have made their community and the entire State of Illinois proud. So once again, I congratulate the Waubonsie Valley Warriors on this historic achievement and wish them continued success in the years to come.

#### H2B VISAS

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to raise awareness of an increasing problem with H2B Visa abuse in my hometown of Houston and elsewhere.

Fraudulent recruiters are increasingly bringing in foreign workers for temporary, low skill positions by claiming there is a labor shortage for this type of work.

These recruiters frequently advertise positions with wages below what they should be paid, and when there are no responses the employers claim there is a labor shortage and bring in foreign workers to do that work.

The Immigration and Nationality Act requires that the hiring of foreign workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of U.S. workers working in the occupation in the area of intended employment.

However, these regulations are not being strictly enforced.

The Department of Labor has proposed new procedures based on its contention that its workload, and the workload of State workforce agencies, has greatly increased in recent years due to the H2B visa program and that an adequate rise in funding to meet that increased workload has not occurred.

The proposed changes would cover many aspects of the H2B visa application process, including the moving of filing of State workforce agencies to the National Processing Centers. New requirements for employers to report on the status of their H2B employees should be enforced.

I am extremely concerned about these changes, because current regulations are not being strictly enforced at the national level, or at the State workforce agency level and moving filings to the national processing center along with these other changes will not improve enforcement.

This lack of enforcement is driving down wages, and preventing individuals from gaining experience necessary to move into higher paying jobs.

Congress needs to act and should require recruiters to be certified or licensed to prevent temporary workers and their U.S. employers from being misled about the nature of their visas being defrauded or victimized by outrageous fees.

This would allow oversight of the recruiting process which is a much-needed addition to the program.

Madam Speaker, I plan to work to see that this issue is addressed, that these rules are corrected, and I urge my colleague to join me in fixing this problem.

#### ATROCITIES IN BURMA

(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, I rise today over the comments made by the brutal generals, military dictators in Burma, saying that Aung San Suu Kyi, Nobel Peace Prize winner and rightful leader elected by the people, deserves to be flogged. Come again?

These are the generals who stonewalled for weeks and refused to allow desperately needed humanitarian aid to get to the people after the cyclone, who order their military to attack ethnic groups throughout the country, who in 1988 issued a blood as-similation order to their troops to marry or rape the ethnic women in

order to “purify” the ethnic’s blood line, who forcibly conscript children to serve as child soldiers in their army, who plant land mines around the villages they attack so that returning villagers get maimed or killed, who pillage or plunder the resources of Burma so they can have huge weddings with millions of dollars of jewels around the necks of their daughters.

It is the SPDC generals, brutal dictators with their crimes against humanity and campaigns of ethnic cleansing who deserve to be stripped of power and placed under arrest for many years to come.

#### BUSH AND HOOVER PRESIDED OVER FALTERING ECONOMIES

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, for 7 years Americans have endured the failed economic policies of President Bush, policies that have favored the wealthiest few and the big corporations at the expense of the middle class and those aspiring to reach the middle class.

Last week for the fifth month in a row, we learned that the Bush economy had lost more jobs than it created. This unimpressive economic record is once again drawing comparisons to that of another Republican President, Herbert Hoover. President Bush has the worst job creation record since Herbert Hoover, who presided over the stock market crash and led our economy into the Great Depression.

And just like Herbert Hoover, President Bush refuses to take the necessary action and begin to turn this economy around and to help those who are suffering the most.

Madam Speaker, history is not going to be too kind to President Bush when it comes to his handling of our Nation’s economy. But this week, he has the opportunity to work on that record by supporting our efforts to extend unemployment benefits to millions of our Nation’s workers. And it is the right thing to do.

□ 1015

#### ANTI-DRILLING CROWD AND ETHICS

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, the anti-crude oil crowd has an ethical dilemma. You see, they don’t want to drill for crude in Alaska, they don’t want to drill offshore, especially off that sacred west coast. They don’t want any refineries to produce that crude into products. They are just against all this nonsense. After all, they say, crude is the demon of the Earth.

However, they don’t have a problem with using everything that comes from

crude, like gasoline that comes from crude off the Texas east coast, refined in American refineries. And it seems to me that the irrational non-drillers should lead by example, rather than being hypocritical by preaching damnation to crude oil, but using its by-products every day. So no more plastic water bottles, no using insecticides, no more fertilizer, medicine, candles, nylon, paint, makeup, perfume, computers or detergents. No more car rides or plane rides, and no more home heating oil come winter. After all, all of these things come from crude oil.

The radical don’t-drill folks should literally walk the walk, instead of talking the big talk about how they are going to save us all from that demon crude oil, but sanctimoniously use its products every day.

And that’s just the way it is.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5749, EMERGENCY EX- TENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COM- PENSATION ACT OF 2008

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1265 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1265

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5749) to provide for a program of emergency unemployment compensation. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 5749 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

House Resolution 1265 provides for consideration of H.R. 5749, the Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2008. The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Madam Speaker, our economy is in trouble, and hardworking Americans across the country are bearing the weight of it. Times are especially tough for middle-class families. The labor market continues to deteriorate, the price of gasoline and food continues to rise, the value of real estate continues to decline, and millions of American households are forced up to rack up more and more credit card debt just to make ends meet. And we are not talking about frivolous expenditures. Middle class families are racking up credit card debt to do things likes paying their electric bills or buying school supplies for their children.

Madam Speaker, the American people deserve better. Since the beginning of this year, when the majority first began to push for an extension of the unemployment benefits, the national unemployment rate has surged to 5.5 percent, the largest 1-month increase in 20 years. Yesterday, 144 members of the minority made it clear that they don’t think the situation is serious enough to warrant extending unemployment benefits for Americans struggling to make ends meet, so we are here again today.

To me, 8.5 million unemployed Americans is a very serious situation. To me, trying to fill up your car with gas at \$4 a gallon when you just lost your job is a very serious situation. And to me, when so-called free trade agreements are moving jobs across the border and no new quality jobs are being created, it is a very serious situation.

Madam Speaker, I believe government should lend a hand when its citizens are struggling, especially hardworking, middle-class families. But whether you agree with that or not, extending unemployment benefit is one of the most cost-effective, fast-acting ways to stimulate the economy.

Putting money directly into the pockets of struggling workers ensures that it will be spent quickly on daily necessities, boosting our economy and making it a little easier for folks to make ends meet. Every dollar spent on unemployment benefits generates \$1.64 in new economic demand. In my home State of New York, an extra 13 weeks of unemployment benefits would infuse \$600 million into the State economy.

For my constituents in upstate New York, a struggling economy and high unemployment has been a fact of life for a very long time now. My district hasn’t reaped the so-called cyclical job

growth benefits from trade agreements. Oh, we lost our jobs all right, but we haven't seen the job creation yet. In fact, employees of businesses in my district have applied for trade adjustment assistance over 200 times since the program's inception, and of those applications, the Labor Department certified over half as a result of trade agreements. Unfortunately, as factories close, hard-working families have nowhere to go but to stand in line outside the local unemployment office. The American people deserve better, and that is why we are here today.

This bill would provide up to 13 weeks of extended unemployment benefits in every State to workers exhausting their regular benefits and provide an additional 13 weeks to States with higher unemployment levels.

Federal unemployment trust funds, which were created exactly for this type of situation and have more than enough reserves to cover the costs, will finance these benefits. This costs will not be deferred to our children to pay back, and the trust fund will do so in a structure very similar to the temporary extended unemployment compensation program established in response to the last recession in 2002, an emergency extension, I might add, which was passed by the previous Republican Congress in the same way we are doing today, when there were fewer long-term unemployed workers.

Madam Speaker, extending these benefits for struggling Americans is the right thing to do. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, it is an unfortunate spectacle to see the leaders of this Congress manipulate the extension of unemployment benefits into a partisan weapon and a diversion from their failure to do anything about the skyrocketing price of gasoline and diesel. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want the American people to believe that Republicans are mean, uncaring and opposed to providing help to unemployed workers as they look for a job.

I am certain, Madam Speaker, that Democrat after Democrat will come to the House floor and attempt to paint this cartoon view of the world. But nothing, Madam Speaker, is further from the truth. It is Republicans who have been trying for weeks, months and years to overcome the near monolithic Democrat opposition to producing more American-made energy, which will increase the oil supply and

lower prices at the pump to keep our economy working. The high cost of gasoline is affecting families, workers and businesses in every town in this country, and this Democrat Congress does nothing.

Let me state for the record that Republicans not only believe in the importance and value of unemployment benefits and that we support extension of benefits in times of needs, but that it was a Republican Congress and President that last enacted unemployment benefit extensions in 2003, and I supported and voted for those extensions.

Yet the liberal leaders of this Congress decided to bring an unemployment benefit extension bill to the House floor that purposely undermines the bipartisan, responsible manner in which extensions have been enacted for the past 27 years, going all the way back to 1981. Democrat leaders decided to change the rules and to do it while blocking every single Representative, Republican or Democrat, from being able to come to the floor of the House and offer their suggestions for improving unemployment insurance or better directing benefits to those Americans or those communities in our country that are most in need.

As written in this bill, Madam Speaker, Democrats have mutated the requirements for receiving benefits so that an individual could work for just 2 weeks and then get an entire year's worth of unemployment benefits. Madam Speaker, giving 365 days worth of benefit checks for having worked just 14 days violates most Americans' sense of fairness. There is a big difference between providing a leg up and giving a handout, and I think this bill crosses that line.

This bill also gives an extra 13 weeks of unemployment benefits to States where the unemployment rate is incredibly low, below 3 percent. Instead of focusing benefit extensions to where it is needed, this bill gives it to places where it is not.

As I said, Democrats have chosen to mutate the way unemployment benefit extensions have been done for the past 27 years so that they can try to score political points. But Democrats have also decided it is okay to break the promises they made to the American people in just the last election.

One of the promises that Democrat leaders spoke about the loudest and most often was their commitment to what is known as PAYGO, or pay-as-you-go. Under the promise made by Democrat leaders, a new rule was written in the House at the start of this Congress to prevent any bill from passing that wasn't budget neutral, that didn't offset new spending with spending cuts or tax increases.

Madam Speaker, Democrats are not keeping that promise on this bill. On this bill, they are waiving PAYGO rules. They are now saying that the PAYGO rule they wrote and the promise they made to the American people

can be ignored whenever it is convenient or expedient.

Madam Speaker, my purpose in raising the issue of PAYGO rules being violated is not to use it as an argument against the extension of unemployment benefits, but to point out the broken promises and hypocrisy of the liberal leaders of this Congress. They claim it is okay to ignore PAYGO because American people pay unemployment insurance tax out of every paycheck, so it is the American people's own money that is paying for the bill.

Well, when it comes to income tax increases, that is the American people's money too. Yet it was just 2 days ago that the Democrat majority leader flat out declared that Americans will face billions of dollars of tax increases this year if expiring tax rates aren't offset by PAYGO rules.

Madam Speaker, the leaders of this House are using PAYGO to hold hostage tax relief legislation that would prevent 25 million Americans from having their taxes go up by an average of \$2,000 next April to pay the AMT tax.

□ 1030

They are holding an extension of the State sales tax deduction hostage under PAYGO rules by requiring taxes to be increased so that the residents of sales tax States, like my State, can be treated as fairly and equally as residents of income tax States. For the leaders of this Congress, PAYGO is an excuse to raise taxes by billions of dollars, but PAYGO can be ignored when they mutate long-standing unemployment benefits to allow someone who works just 2 weeks, just 2 weeks, to get an entire year's worth of benefits checks.

This extension of unemployment benefits is labeled as an emergency, as an emergency, because unemployment rose from 5 to 5.5 percent last month. It's stated that this is the largest 1-month increase in two decades and so Congress must now pass legislation. This 1-month increase of 10 percent is justification for urgent, immediate action that this House and the Senate must clear all other schedules and vote to pass this legislation without delay. That's what has been said.

Where is the same level of urgency and need for immediate action on gas prices? Gas prices have gone up over 10 percent in the last month. Americans aren't just paying the highest gas prices in the past two decades, they are paying the highest prices ever, ever, recorded in the history of this country? Almost every day the price of gasoline sets a new record.

Since Democrats took control of Congress the price of gasoline has gone up over 75 percent. At the pace that prices are climbing, it may only be a matter of time until they have doubled, doubled, while this liberal Congress does nothing.

I absolutely agree that losing one's job is a painful experience and that it deserves the attention of Congress. But

the pain of filling up your gas tank is felt by every American, whether they just lost their job or not. The pain of skyrocketing gas prices is hurting all Americans, all Americans, yet this liberal Congress does nothing to help increase the supply of gasoline to lower prices at the pump.

Time after time Democrats have blocked real solutions for more American-made energy by increasing oil and gas production and refining here, right here, in America. America has billions of barrels of oil reserves and trillions of cubic feet of natural gas, but Democrats insist on keeping it off limits. We are not allowed to make our own energy, and so the prices continue to climb.

How long will Speaker PELOSI and this liberal Congress refuse to act to increase supply and lower gas prices? How high do prices have to go before they stop blockading America from tapping its own resources? There were thousands of oil-drilling rigs in the Gulf of Mexico that weathered two back-to-back Category 5 hurricanes, Rita and Katrina, and not one single rig ruptured. America has the resources and safe technology to produce oil for years, but Democrats refuse to allow it.

Eighty-six percent of congressional Democrats have opposed more American-made energy, while 91 percent of Republicans have supported producing more energy right here in our own country. If this Congress is serious about addressing economic pain, then they need to get serious about gas prices and stop blocking real solutions.

For months Republicans have tried to force this House, and for months Democrats have refused to act. Meanwhile, the price of gas and diesel just goes up and up and up.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I heard my friend from Washington twice refer to this Congress—at least twice, anyway—as a liberal Congress. I guess I would have to respond in that sense when does helping people who lost their job have anything to do with being a liberal or conservative?

I think people, the American people, hear people in Congress cite statistics and studies as if the people they are referring to are not real. These people, a person who loses job, who has to support his family, doesn't care if the statistics say that his State has the lowest unemployment in America. He doesn't care. All he wants to know is that he has unemployment benefits so that he can support his family. That is what we are here to do today.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington, the chairman of the Family Support Subcommittee of the Ways and Means, Mr. McDERMOTT.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, the Bible says, "By their deeds, you shall know them." The Republicans do not want to help unemployed workers

in this country. It is as simple as that. If you go back to the debate in 1935 and come forward, the Republicans have always resisted the idea of unemployment benefits because the argument is that people will sit at home and wait for a check and that they will then not go out and look for work.

Now, it's clear that's not true and now, today, what they are hanging their hat on is some mythical worker out there who has worked 2 weeks and is going to get full benefits. That simply is misleading in the very plainest form.

Madam Speaker, I have a letter which I ask to enter into the RECORD from the Oregon Unemployment Department, signed by Tom Byerley.

STATE OF OREGON,  
EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT,  
Salem, OR, June 11, 2008.

INDIVAR DUTTA-GUPTA,  
Professional Staff, House of Representatives,  
Committee on Ways and Means Sub-  
committee on Income Security and Family  
Support, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. DUTTA-GUPTA: In the deliberations by Congress relating to a proposal to extend unemployment insurance benefits, it has come to my attention that Oregon has been held up as an example as a state where a worker could work only three weeks during the base period upon which the claim was filed and qualify for 26 weeks of regular state benefits and an additional 13 weeks, or 26 depending on the unemployment rate, of benefits under the bill to extend claims. That is not true.

In Oregon a worker must have a minimum of \$1,000 in earnings for the entire base year. In addition, he must have total base year wages in an amount equal to or in excess of one and one half times the wages in the highest quarter. Oregon Revised Statute 657.150(2)(a)(A). With only three weeks of work, the only way this worker could qualify would be to work in two separate quarters. As an example, when an individual worked only three weeks in the base year, we'll place one week of work in one quarter and two in the subsequent quarter.

In this scenario, let's say the second quarter where the claimant worked two weeks would be the highest quarter since he worked two weeks and only one week in the prior quarter. In simplest terms, he earns \$333 for one week in the first quarter and \$667 for two weeks of work in the second quarter. That gives him the minimum required wage threshold of \$ 1,000 total earnings to qualify and gives him wages of one and one half times in the highest quarter in total base year wages.

This worker would qualify for \$108 per week for 3.08 weeks. \$108 for three weeks and the last payment would be \$9. This worker would not receive the full 26 weeks. Our law provides that if total base year wages are between \$1,000 and \$8,423.99, the maximum award will always be 1/3 of the total base year wages or in this case, \$333.

I cannot speculate how our law could be misconstrued to say that someone with the minimum wages to qualify for a claim would be able to claim the maximum award or 26 weeks. The information I have reviewed that I understand has been referenced in the "Highlights of State Unemployment Compensation Laws, January 2007" published by the National Foundation for Unemployment and Worker's Compensation (UWC) on pages 53 through 56 entitled "Qualifying Requirements" (copy attached) is accurate. In fact, we provide that data on an annual basis. To

read this to say you only have to work three weeks to qualify for a maximum claim of 26 weeks is simply reading something into our qualifying requirements that isn't there.

I hope this information is helpful. Please don't hesitate to contact me at (503) 947-1707 if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

TOM BYERLEY,  
UI Director.

This letter says, "In the deliberations by Congress relating to a proposal to extend unemployment insurance benefits, it has come to my attention that Oregon has been held up as an example as a State where a worker could work only 3 weeks during the base period and receive 26 weeks of benefits and an additional 13 weeks. That is not true."

He goes on to say, "I cannot speculate how our law could be misconstrued to say that someone with the minimum wages to qualify for a claim would be able to claim the maximum award" or benefit.

Now, what Members have to understand is the qualification for unemployment is decided by State legislatures. They make the decision. Many of them do not start the quarter that you are in. If you lost your job today, they would not count back to the 1st of April, they will not count to the first of the year, they would start counting last year in 2007.

So he gives an example, suppose somebody worked one week in September and two weeks in October, and they made \$1,000. They would be eligible in Oregon for a check of \$108 for three weeks and \$9 in the fourth week.

Now, if you want to hold up benefits for 1.5 million people in the United States for one lone Oregon duck who got \$108 for three weeks and \$9 in the fourth week, you go ahead. Your decision will be from the voters in your districts in this election.

This is a red herring. It has been.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. McDERMOTT. This was put into the law in 1981 when the workforce was entirely different. Women were not such a big part of the workforce, we did not have part-time jobs. When you have this provision in the law you are denying extended benefits to about 10 percent of the people who have exhausted their benefits. Because they did not work full time, they don't get anything, and these objections are simply a reflection of the Republicans, the fact they do not want to give unemployment benefits.

Vote for the rule. Vote for the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentledady from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I certainly appreciate the gentleman yielding. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the rule, but I strongly support the underlying bill.

We are back here again today because this House, in my estimation, must act to give those who are struggling in our challenging economy the help that they need. Too many working families in my district, in my home State of Michigan are having serious difficulties finding work and making ends meet.

Not only have too many workers lost their jobs, but other factors have stymied their efforts to find work. Gas prices of over \$4 a gallon are making it increasingly difficult to travel longer distances to find work. The housing crisis, which is particularly acute in my home State of Michigan, has made it nearly impossible for families to sell their homes, which would allow them to move closer to areas where jobs could perhaps be found.

Some have argued that this bill would alter very long-standing Federal policy as a reason to vote against it and perhaps it does, but that is no comfort to those who cannot find work. They are not interested in Federal policy changes, they are interested in keeping their homes or feeding their families or having money to buy gas so that they can go out and find a job. I understand some of the concerns about granting this extension of benefits, but I believe strongly that those concerns are far outweighed by the needs of struggling American families.

I urge all of my colleagues to join together and to take this important step to provide a helping hand to fellow Americans in need.

Again, I oppose this rule, but I strongly support the underlying bill.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Madam Speaker, last Friday the Labor Department in our country reported that in May the unemployment rate rose to 5.5 percent from 5 percent and reported that unemployment continued to fall in construction, manufacturing, retail trade and temporary health services, while health care continued to add jobs. The half percentage point increase is the largest single increase in the unemployment rate in 22 years, with more than 861,000 jobs lost in May.

The unemployment insurance program provides benefits to those who become unemployed through no fault of their own and meet certain conditions. Our economy has also lost jobs for five consecutive months, and it's likely that more than 1.4 million workers have exhausted their unemployment benefits in the first 6 months of this year alone. The Congressional Budget Office estimate that had this legislation would provide additional benefits to 3.8 million unemployed workers, many of whom are at extreme financial risk.

Extending these benefits is one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to stimulate our faltering economy because the money is spent quickly, according to the Congressional

Budget Office. Every \$1 spent on unemployment benefits generates \$1.64 in new economic demand.

Congress has extended unemployment benefits over several occasions over the last 50 years in response to economic weakness. This is another one of those times in which Congress must take immediate action to address this emergency on behalf of the people in our country.

I urge my colleagues to support this temporary, I repeat, temporary extension of unemployment benefits so we can provide much-needed relief to 3.8 million unemployed workers to assist them with rapidly rising food costs while they continue to struggle to find work in this rapidly slowing economy.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Republican Conference chairman, Mr. PUTNAM of Florida.

Mr. PUTNAM. I thank the gentleman for the time, and I appreciate the opportunity to debate this issue.

Madam Speaker, it is an unfortunate situation that we have to debate unemployment compensation because of the underlying economic weaknesses, particularly those that have been caused by high energy prices.

We have seen reports of plant closures because of high energy prices. High natural gas prices have put American manufacturers, American fertilizer makers, American petrochemical industries at a competitive disadvantage because it is not a global commodity, and we have failed as a Congress to put forward an energy policy that actually creates energy, which actually creates American jobs.

In addition to that, this particular rule waives PAYGO, one of the most prominently heralded reforms brought into the 110th Congress, the idea that you would pay-as-you-go. It is now a matter of sometimes paying as you go, every now and then paying when you go, when it's convenient paying as you go.

□ 1045

But be that as it may, it is important that we address not only the necessary relief for those who have lost their jobs, but to prevent people from losing their jobs in the first place. And the best way that this Congress can move forward on that is to put onto the floor of the House a comprehensive energy policy that actually produces energy, that puts American workers back to work, taking advantage of the tremendous potential in conservation and green jobs, but also in domestic production, exploring the resources that we have here and putting them to work for the American people, constructing nuclear power plants. There is a lot of talk from both sides of the aisle about the need to move into more innovative uses of mobile fuels, to move into the plug-in hybrid. Well, what are you going to plug it into?

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

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

Mr. PUTNAM. I thank the gentleman.

So we have to invest not only in the next generation of mobile fuels to eliminate our dependence on foreign oil and gas, but also to construct the type of electrical infrastructure necessary to create a thriving economy, to put people to work so they don't have to rely on unemployment compensation and the whim of the Congress and the whim of the State legislatures about whether it is 13 weeks or 26 weeks. We ought to be focused on putting them back to work. That is what these American workers want, and we have an opportunity to do that.

We have put forward that proposal with the No More Excuses Energy Act, a comprehensive approach that puts people to work and eliminates our dependence on foreign energy from people who don't like us and creates a generational leap forward for energy security for North America.

I urge Members to defeat this rule. Let's start over and do it the right way.

Mr. ARCURI. If what the gentleman from Florida says is true, I guess any pay-as-you-go is better than the no-pay-as-you-go that we had in the last Congress.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Madam Speaker, we are hearing a lot of concern about PAYGO. I have to tell you that when it comes to having credibility on this issue, as someone who is not a particularly partisan person, I always like to work on both sides of the aisle, I am a little upset that we are hearing this criticism about PAYGO from a group of folks who when they were in charge let the law expire.

It is a law that existed for 12 years. It helped move us from deficits to surpluses. It moved us on the glide path to where we wouldn't be burdening future generations with debt, and that law expired. The bottom line is that law as it was written would have allowed this unemployment compensation legislation to go through under emergency spending.

Now, the way that the law is written in this Congress, quite frankly, I think the law wasn't crafted properly because it should have allowed this to be emergency spending. That is why I, as a Blue Dog, am comfortable with this bill.

But let me assure you, actions speak louder than words. There are so many words that get thrown out on the floor of the House, but actions speak louder than words. And the actions are this: who cares about deficits, who thinks deficits matter? I am not sure that the other side of the aisle does, and their track record demonstrates that.

We've seen debt go up by \$3 trillion during the first 6 years of the Bush administration with a Republican Congress. Come on, we shouldn't be criticized about our good-faith efforts to try to encourage PAYGO and live within our means. If we have not been perfect on this side of the aisle, we have made the effort. And I have heard no response from the other side whenever we bring up a bill that is paid for to offer an alternative that is also paid for.

So if you really care about your future generations, which I do, I think of my two young sons, and I think about the debt burden that we are placing on them, I think that we have a moral obligation to do the right thing for future generations.

So please, let's tone down the rhetoric a little and let's acknowledge that if you really care about deficits, instead of just talking about it, do something about it.

This side of the aisle has attempted to do something about it in this Congress. They established a PAYGO rule. I am proud of the fact that the Democratic Caucus has done that, and we should all work together because it shouldn't be a partisan issue. If you care about deficits, whether you're Democrat or Republican, let's work together and let's secure the future for our children.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I will tell you that this debate is to me rather sad. I listened to my friend, Mr. McDERMOTT, with whom I have been very privileged to work for many years on trying to open up new markets for U.S. workers, to have access into those markets around the world. He represents the Seattle area, and we all know how important trade is. He and I have been privileged to try and pry open markets in Asia and Latin America and other parts of the world.

I just was downstairs and heard him on TV make some statement, and I would be happy to yield to him if I am incorrect in quoting him. He said Republicans don't care about those who are unemployed, those who are suffering and are victimized here. And I would be happy to yield. Is that what my friend said? I would say to my friend from Seattle, I would be happy to yield to him, that Republicans don't care about those who are unemployed?

Mr. McDERMOTT. Thank you for yielding.

If you read the history of the enactment of the 1935 Social Security Act, the last issue argued in the United States Congress was an amendment by the Republicans trying to take out un-

employment benefits because they said it weakened the will of people to search for work. It is a long, distinguished record.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me just say the 1935 Social Security Act is a debate that took place more than a couple of years ago.

Let's talk about what it is that we as Republicans have believed passionately in doing, and that is to ensure that people who are hurting the most are in fact able to benefit from unemployment benefits.

You know, we had an interesting debate in the Rules Committee last night. We just talked about the need for PAYGO compliance. Of course that was the sine qua non when we were debating the rules at the beginning of this Congress, the fact that we were going to make sure that everything was PAYGO compliant. Obviously this is not PAYGO compliant. Everyone has acknowledged that. The distinguished chair of the Rules Committee in a discussion with Mr. HASTINGS last night finally acknowledged that this is not PAYGO compliant, so completely contrary to what has been promised here time and time again.

But when it comes to actually ensuring that those who are truly in need are the beneficiaries of unemployment compensation, it seems to me we should go back not to 1935, but to 2002 because we had an extension of unemployment benefits that was put into place in 2002.

Madam Speaker, virtually every Democrat at that time supported the notion of saying there should be a minimum of 20 weeks of work, 20 weeks of work before someone could have the opportunity to see the unemployment benefits accrued to them.

What is it that this measure does? I will tell you, when I talk to my constituents about this, Madam Speaker, they are absolutely horrified. I just was downstairs 5 minutes ago talking to one of my constituents about it, and I explained what I am about to say here to our colleagues, and she could not believe it. Every member of her family with her, they were absolutely horrified when I said the following: under this plan, if someone works for only 2 weeks, they work only 2 weeks in their entire life, they are able to receive 52 weeks, one entire year of unemployment benefits. That's what it says, that's what this measure does.

In 2002 when we dealt with this issue, the Democrats decided there should be at least 20 weeks of work. And now when we have an unemployment rate, which as I acknowledged has gone up a half a percent, and it hasn't gone up to that level in 22 years, it is very unfortunate, it is still significantly lower than the unemployment rate we have seen in the past. And what are they saying, if someone has worked for only 2 weeks, they are able to see 52 weeks of benefits. That is just plain wrong.

I will tell you, whether you are a working American or an American

looking for a job, that is not right because perpetuating the welfare state is exactly what that does. It is not providing a cushion of benefits.

We also believe, Madam Speaker, that the opportunity to say, gosh, if someone is out there and they are working to find an employment opportunity and they do, we believe we should reward that by providing them a lump-sum benefit, a lump-sum benefit that has rewarded them for the fact that they have found a job. We know it is difficult. We are not saying that everyone is going to be able to, but that is the kind of thing that we want to do.

And what has happened here? Well, the new majority has said an absolute closed rule, no opportunity for us to offer that kind of amendment.

Let me get back to the issue that we have been talking about time and time again which is on the minds of the American people, Madam Speaker, and that is the issue of high gasoline prices and the energy costs that we face right now.

You think about people who are struggling and are looking to find a job and are out there, looking to improve their situation, I will tell you, one of the cruelest penalties of all on them happens to be high gasoline prices.

Last night I had one of our telephone town hall meetings, and I had the opportunity to have nearly 5,000 households from the area that I am privileged to represent from southern California on the phone, and we talked about the need to increase energy supply. I took a number of questions during the one-hour program and not one person, not one person, Democrat, Republican, Independent, we call people regardless of their political party, not one person opposed our efforts to try to increase supply, recognizing if we can increase the supply by responsibly and in an environmentally sound way, exploring in ANWR, by pursuing the cleanest, safest most cost-effective energy source known to man, that being nuclear energy, by working to increase our refinery capacity, by looking at the shale reserves in this country, and again in an environmentally sound way exploring them, deep water exploration off the coast, those are the things that we believe are necessary. And, Madam Speaker, not one of my participants on our conference call last night indicated opposition to that.

The American people get it. They know that for two decades plus we have unfortunately seen a majority of the new majority in this place stand there and prevent us from pursuing opportunities to increase the supply so that we can bring prices down.

Now I had the chance to talk with a number of experts on this issue, a number of our colleagues who represent States like Texas and Oklahoma, and one of the things that we hear time and time again is we need an immediate response.

I listened to my friend from Utah talk about action. Well, I wondered,

how are we going to be able to immediately bring gasoline prices down? Having spoken to a wide range of people, because of the fact that oil prices are based on futures, if we take any of those actions that I outlined, whether it is in an environmentally sound way pursuing ANWR, whether it is deep water exploration, whether it is looking at shale, whether it is nuclear energy, if we were to take any of those actions, we would, Madam Speaker, see an immediate reduction, an immediate reduction. Why, because there would be recognition in the marketplace that we are now vigorously pursuing an effort to increase our supply.

So those people who are unemployed, and that is what this issue is about, those people who are out there responsibly working hard to find a job, are being penalized by high gasoline prices, just as every other American is being penalized by it because of the increased cost of virtually everything.

That is why it is terribly unfair for us not to responsibly look at these creative proposals that are out there. We want to ensure that people who are hurting are able to benefit from the unemployment compensation that we provide.

So everyone on the other side can stand up and say the Republicans don't care about those who are facing difficulty economically; that is absolute baloney. We care. We want to make sure that there are opportunities there. We want to make sure that we open up new markets around the world for job creation and economic growth so that good jobs can be created right here.

Let's defeat this rule and let's come forward with a measure that can get the signature of the President, because we all know that this is going no place. The Statement of Administration Policy, which I will include for the RECORD, has made it very clear that the President wants us to put in job creation policies, and he wants to work to responsibly deal with unemployment compensation, and the attempt to embarrass us is not going to sell with the American people.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 5749—EMERGENCY EXTENDED

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2008

The Administration is deeply committed to continually fostering an environment where every American who wants a job has a job. The Administration believes the best way to help workers is to create an environment that encourages job creation and to promote effective job training. To accomplish these goals, the Administration urges Congress to create more opportunities for American exporters by passing the pending free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea, make permanent the President's tax cuts that will expire over the next two years, and reform and reauthorize the Trade Adjustment Assistance program and the Workforce Investment Act. The Administration looks forward to continuing to work with Congress to enact these important measures. However, the Administration strongly opposes H.R. 5749. If H.R. 5749 were presented to the President, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

This legislation raises several concerns. First, although the unemployment rate has recently risen, it remains below the levels historically relied on to justify a federally financed extension of unemployment benefits. The last initiation of temporary extended benefits was in 2002 amidst the unprecedented events surrounding September 11, 2001. Other than that special case, extensions have generally been granted only when the unemployment rate was notably higher than it is today, at or above 7 percent.

Second, this bill would allow the payment of up to 13 extra weeks of benefits in every State, even though some of those States have unemployment rates as low as 2.6 percent. At present, a majority of States have unemployment rates at or below 5 percent, and it is fiscally irresponsible to provide extra benefits in States with low unemployment rates. In States with higher unemployment rates, the Federal-State extended benefits program already can provide up to 13 additional weeks of benefits to workers who have exhausted their regular unemployment insurance benefits. As many economists have noted, the counterproductive result of a broad extension of benefits would be that recipients may remain unemployed for slightly longer than they would have otherwise.

Third, this bill does not contain an important provision found in previous Federal extensions and the permanent Federal-State extended benefits law that assures the benefit extension is paid only to individuals who have demonstrated a serious attachment to the labor force. Since 1981, individuals must have 20 weeks of full-time employment to qualify for extended unemployment benefits. Under this bill, individuals who have worked as little as two weeks could qualify for up to 52 weeks of total unemployment benefits. This violates the longstanding requirement that extended benefits should be for Americans with meaningful work histories.

Fourth, for purposes of determining whether a State is considered a "high unemployment" State in which an extra 13 weeks of benefits is payable (for a total of 26 weeks of additional benefits), this proposal would use a total unemployment rate of 6 percent as the trigger for State eligibility. This is, historically, a relatively low number for justifying a full year or more of unemployment benefits.

As an alternative to these ill-targeted and costly measures, the Administration could support legislation that would offer a 13-week extension of Federally financed unemployment benefits to high-unemployment States alone.

Mr. ARCURI. The gentleman from California gives examples of working for 2 weeks and being eligible for 52 weeks. The fact of the matter is there is no record to indicate that is the case.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to a gentleman who can speak firsthand to that, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Chairman RANGEL.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I think we are all proud that we are able to at least go back home and face the people who are going through this economic crisis. They are sitting around the table. They know America is not going to let them down. They know that they have hope and vision for the future. They know that they, and others, have had economic setbacks. Be-

cause as DAVID DREIER, my dear friend has said, they are in trouble now. They are not working and they are losing hope, but they are depending on everybody, Republicans and Democrats, to be there for them. At the end of the day they will look at each other and ask, What does it look like in the Congress?

□ 1100

Are they going to give us a little assistance, a little dignity, a little pride? Can we keep our kids in school? Can we pay the rent? Can we go into the supermarket and have a decent meal over the weekend? They're not going to let us down. No.

I don't know about you. I've been here 38 years. And the one thing that I always hear when I get back home is, "And how did you vote on that?"

I would suggest to you that you staple DAVID DREIER's statement to your newsletter so that they can interpret it with you and say, I didn't vote for you, but I didn't want to let you down. I didn't vote for you, but I did advocate a permanent extension of the President's tax cut. I didn't vote for you, because I really believe that if I give you some money, you're not going to get out there and try to get a job.

So you have to take this very carefully. But I hope that when you get home, you'll be able to say, you know, when they first started this, I didn't like the way the Democrats handled it. I didn't like the way they put it on the suspension calendar. I thought that perhaps we should, even though \$35 billion is there, I would have liked to have seen it handled different. And I expressed myself about it.

But at the end of the day, because I know so many people who know so many people that are not the least bit interested in the parliamentary procedure; they're going to ask the question, "How did you vote?" Be able to say I voted the right way.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 6½ minutes. The gentleman from New York has 15 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I will reserve my time so that we can equal the time out here.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. TANNER.

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

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, I think I speak for a lot of us when we say that we welcome an intellectually honest debate on the issues that we are charged with confronting on behalf of the American people. And a discussion about the pros and cons of the provisions of the bill, I think, is in order. This is the place to do that.

When one talks about, though, ancillary matters, like whether or not this

violates PAYGO, that's why I come down here today.

Let me tell you something. Neither party is always right and neither party is always wrong. But we don't need to embarrass ourselves by trying to belittle those of us who are trying to pay the bills.

The fact is, during the first six years of this decade, the people who are criticizing the Blue Dogs and the Democratic Caucus for a PAYGO rule, sat here and helped this President borrow more money from foreign sources than all 42 before him combined. You don't have to believe that. That's not an argument. You can go to the U.S. Treasury Web site and look at it and see for yourself.

So if we want to talk about the relative merits of the legislation, we welcome that, and we want to talk about that. And we won't always vote alike. We won't always vote with the Democratic Caucus, some of us that are Democrats, because neither party's always right or always wrong.

But to come here and criticize us for somehow saying we're violating PAYGO; first of all, there's an unemployment tax that employers pay for this very purpose, and it will fill up the coffers again in time.

But don't come here with that, because I think that is not only demeaning and misleading, but embarrassing to some people.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. LEVIN.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Let me say to the gentleman from California who talked about our trying to embarrass the Republicans, we're not trying to embarrass you. You're embarrassing yourselves.

You come here when we're talking about 8 million unemployed, 1½ million who have exhausted their benefits, and soon it will be an additional 3 million, and you come here and talk about energy policy? You won't provide unemployment comp benefits so people can buy the gas to look for a job?

You talk about trade policy. Look, the jobless numbers came out this morning. Jobless claims jumped to the highest level since last March. Those claims rose to 384,000, an increase of 25,000 from the previous week, a much bigger gain than analysts had been expecting.

And you quote the administration policy. Mr. HASTINGS, under the administration policy, unemployed in Yakima would not be eligible for extended benefits because Washington, as a State, has less than 6 percent. How can you come here?

Go home, if I might be personal for just a minute. Go home and explain your position to people in Yakima, and those from Ohio, those from Pennsylvania, those from other States.

I conclude. Look, I'm from Michigan. I would benefit under the administration's narrow approach. I won't vote for it.

If you're jobless, you deserve the extended benefits, the million plus and the 3 million plus.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. If I have the time.

Will you grant me a little time?

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I want to remind my friend from Michigan that the last time that we passed an unemployment benefit extension in this Congress was in 2003. It passed on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. LEVIN. I understand that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. And the opposition that the constituents in my area are concerned about is this 2-week window. That is where the issue is.

Mr. LEVIN. Taking back my time. The 2-week window, you talk about, 26 additional weeks, 52 weeks. You can't give a single example.

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

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

Mr. LEVIN. And you raise a straw man and woman when we're talking about real men and women who have been laid off, who've been looking for a job, who can't find it. And you come here with these straw arguments.

You go home to Yakima. Others of you go back to Pennsylvania and other States, and talk to the hundreds of thousands of people looking for work and say to them, I voted "no."

That's unconscionable.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont, a member of the Rules Committee, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I thank my friend and fellow member of the Rules Committee for yielding me 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, this is really a very simple question, and it is whether we're going to extend unemployment benefits to American workers who are suffering the largest 1-month surge in increased unemployment in 22 years.

And we can bring in all kinds of other arguments about what our energy policy should be, what the compensation should be, what the formulation of the benefits should be. But the bottom line is that we have Americans who have worked, and through no fault of their own, but because of economic forces completely and utterly beyond their control, they've lost their jobs.

And when we have discussions about micromanaging how these go out, in

lump sums or weekly payments, and we're talking about trying to give an incentive, it is, in my view, Madam Chairman, very patronizing.

What is worse to an American than to lose his or her job?

Most Americans find their sense of satisfaction and self-worth in taking care of their family, in being providers, and by being a good, productive worker. All of us who've had the opportunity to have a good job know that there's nothing better than that. So there is a lot of built-in incentive for any American who's without a job to get a job.

But, in the meantime, \$300 a week, that's about what the average benefit is, is barely enough to keep gas in the car, keep your home heated, to put groceries on the table. We know it's not even close to adequate. So there is plenty of incentive.

And the question for us is not behavioral psycho dynamics. The question for us, as a Congress, is whether, when there is this largest spike in unemployment in 22 years, we're going to ignore it or we're going to respond. And we have the tool that was started in 1935 to respond, where workers and others put money into a fund that is to be used at times of stress.

Mr. ARCURI. May I inquire how much time is left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ARCURI. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule on H.R. 5749 to extend unemployment benefits to millions of American workers, including over 700,000 in my home State of California. And I'd like to speak about one of those real Americans that I am accountable to.

Just yesterday I spoke with a 51-year-old woman, whose name is Karen, from San Diego. After working for the past 10 years as a Consumer Service Specialist for a large telecom company, Karen was recently laid off from her job. And she's been actively looking for work but has been unable to find one because of the poor economy.

Unable to afford health insurance, the stress of being unemployed is beginning to take a toll on Karen's health. And it's also become harder and harder for her to pay her bills. She told me just looking for a job cost money because you've got to pay for the gas to drive to the interview. She can certainly relate to this discussion this morning.

To make matters worse, her unemployment benefits have just ended. She told me that she has worked hard her whole life and that she is not looking for a hand out, just her life back.

I think we can all agree Karen is one of those hardworking Americans we came to Washington to help.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 3

minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule and to note that Republicans support an extension of unemployment benefits for those who are suffering, those who need help.

I've enjoyed the debate of my friends on the other side of the aisle who point out, they try and blame the minority party for the delay in bringing this legislation to the floor. And I would note that the majority party controls the schedule, and the majority party can pass anything they want in the House. So I would note that the House Ways and Means Committee acted on the particular bill that we have before us 8 weeks ago. Eight weeks ago.

Now, some, my good friend from Michigan refers to this debate as being embarrassing. I think it's embarrassing in this legislative process that it's taken 8 weeks, this legislation, to come to the floor of the House to be debated, particularly when people in Michigan and Illinois have exhausted their benefits. And the Republicans in the House Ways and Means Committee voted for a proposal which could become law, which would have provided extended unemployment benefits for those workers in Michigan and Illinois who have exhausted their unemployment benefits. Eight weeks it's taken for this emergency legislation to come to the floor. Eight weeks.

I would note that a major concern many of us have in this legislation that's before us is that it takes a radical approach. It eliminates a 27-year policy that was supported by both Democrats and Republicans. The bill that is before us repeals a requirement that you work 20 weeks to get a full year's benefits.

In Michigan, under this legislation, you would work 1 week and be able to get 52 weeks of benefits. In my State of Illinois, you can work 2 weeks and get 52 weeks of benefits under this legislation.

Now, do taxpayers feel that that is fair?

We, as the minority party, the Republicans, we want to extend benefits, unemployment benefits to those who need help.

□ 1115

My district, my home State, we have unemployed workers who've exhausted their benefits. We want to ensure that their benefits are extended so that they can receive an additional 13- and 26-weeks' worth of benefits.

And we had a proposal in the Ways and Means Committee which would have accomplished that goal. All of the Republicans voted for it, and the President would sign it into law. But instead, we're seeing election year politics today. That's what this is all about. It's 8 weeks. Think about that. For 8 weeks. If you're a Michigan worker and you have been unemployed, you have exhausted your benefits, you have been waiting 8 weeks.

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

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. You've been waiting 8 weeks because of election-year politics. This legislation could have been brought to the floor immediately, we could have had a bipartisan bill that had become law, but no. Our friends in the majority played election-year politics for 8 weeks.

We're finally bringing a bill to the floor that won't become law. Let's pass legislation that will become law. Let's help those who need help.

Mr. ARCURI. Just to correct the record, this was passed by the House, this bill, weeks ago and it has been blocked in the Senate. Just so it's clear that it has not waited for 8 weeks.

I would yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. To the Chair, to the gentleman from Illinois, in Michigan, you have to work two quarters to be eligible. The 1-week example is a straw man and woman example. Let's be faithful to the reality here.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, how much time again remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 3 minutes. The gentleman from New York has 6¾ minutes.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I want to remind my good friends that yesterday we were on the floor of the House and my good friends on the other side of the aisle, the Republican minority, blocked the passage of this emergency relief to so many Americans. And I rose yesterday and I asked the question, Who will be a Good Samaritan and stand with those who are in need?

Right now, soldiers on the front lines of Iraq and Afghanistan have family members who are unemployed and who have exhausted their benefits. What do we say to them? In Texas, we have a total of 160,000 Texans who have now either exhausted or will exhaust their unemployment benefits. They do so in an economy where they've lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

That's why we put this bill on the floor of the House because you could have gone to a job, worked for a week, and the business closed down because of varying economic crises created by this administration.

We've lost—324,000 jobs have disappeared over this period of time, 5 consecutive months. We've lost 300,000-

plus job. And the unemployment rose to the highest in the month of May.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. The highest number of unemployment in 20 years in the month of May, and over the last 12 months, the number of unemployed workers have grown by 1.6 million, 200,000 more long-term jobless.

Who will be the Good Samaritan for the American people who have helped build this country? Who will tell the Iraqi soldiers and Afghanistan soldiers that the mother and father that is there longing for their return does not have a job and cannot pay for gasoline and rent and food? We have to stand today. Who will be the Good Samaritans?

This legislation is written the way it is to solve the problems of Americans. I will stand with them.

I ask you to support the underlying legislation and the rule.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, when you are born into poverty, you enjoy such delicacies as mayonnaise sandwiches without mayonnaise. When you're born into poverty, phrases like "but for the grace of God, there go I" have true meaning because you understand you have been there.

This bill will not fuel rockets to Mars. It will, however, put fuel in gas tanks right here on Earth. It will not put a man on the Moon, but it will put food on the table of somebody's home. But for the grace of God, there go I.

I will support the bill.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 3 minutes. The gentleman from New York has 4¼ minutes.

Mr. ARCURI. I would yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS).

(Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, it's a pleasure today to come on the floor and talk about ways that this Congress and those of us who serve here can help those who are unfortunate to have lost a job.

I have watched the opposition on the other side attempt for the last couple of years to make illegal immigration their issue. I have watched with dismay as they continue to bring to this floor and blame Democrats in this Congress for the cost of gasoline at \$4 a

gallon. Back home we have a saying: that dog ain't gonna hunt in this Congress.

In fact, when you look at what they attempted to do on immigration, their Presidential candidate introduced an amnesty bill, and now their attempts on the floor are to block this Congress from even introducing legislation or passing legislation that would have been an energy package that would even attempt, that would attempt, to tell oil companies you have to pay your fair share of taxes.

So what they're now trying to do is block legislation that gives amnesty to big oil companies. Again, that's not going to work.

And now they come to the floor saying pay-as-you-go principles are not being followed with this bill that's been introduced, and I hope it passes today.

So as we look at this legislation, let's talk about pay-as-you-go. I used to be an employer. Today in Tennessee, if you employ someone, you pay between .15 percent, less than 1 percent, up to 10 percent as an employer of what each employee earns. They're paying as they go. At Forbus General Store, my friend Joe pays every paycheck every week so much percentage of what his employees earned into a Federal trust fund. He's paying as he goes. And when someone has to be laid off because jobs are not available, the economy turned sour, those individuals apply for and receive unemployment benefits.

We're paying as we go constantly. We have close to \$40 billion in the trust fund. Currently, this bill today scored with the CBO saves roughly \$10 billion cost over 10 years. This Congress has attempted to address the issues of oil prices and unemployment.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. It seems to me that as we listen to the other side, they're constantly trying to find some way that would be a head shot on issues for an election campaign. I tell you who's getting a head shot right now, folks who work at furniture factories in Tennessee and North Carolina, folks who work at auto industries. Their jobs are being lost. That's a head shot to them.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would ask my friend from New York how many speakers he has.

Mr. ARCURI. I am prepared to close. We have no further speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I have 3 minutes left; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, the idea here is to take care of those that have lost their jobs by extending unemployment bene-

fits. The idea is to get a bill to the President that he will sign. As the gentleman from Illinois said, this bill has been waiting now for 8 weeks before it has been brought to the floor, but the bill, in its present form, will not be signed because it has changed 27 years of bipartisan support on extending unemployment benefits.

So I think that we need to go back to the drawing board, if you will, and get a bill that we know that the President will sign. But more importantly, more importantly, we need to get our economy going again. And so it's time, in my mind, for the House to debate ideas for lowering gas prices to get the economy going again.

I'm going to ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that the House can consider H.R. 3089, the No More Excuses energy bill. By defeating the previous question, the House will still be able to act on the unemployment benefit extension bill, but the House will also be able to finally act on legislation that will create more American-made energy and jobs to increase the supply of gas by producing more gas and producing more gas here in our Nation. It will increase the supply and decrease the price at the pump. Skyrocketing prices need the attention of this Congress, and we've got to act.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so this House can get serious about rising gas prices so we can start producing American-made gasoline.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, unemployment insurance can mean the difference between saving a home and failing to make a mortgage payment. It can mean the difference between purchasing needed medications and going without, and it can mean the difference between filling up the car to go out and look for another job and having to stay home. This legislation has the potential to help over 4 million unemployed Americans put food on their tables while quickly stimulating the economy.

The number of long-term unemployed Americans is higher now than when Congress last extended benefits in 2002. I am hopeful we can come together later today, Republicans and Democrats, to do the right thing and pass this rule and the underlying legislation. American workers and families can't wait any longer.

The idea is not getting the President a bill that he can sign. The idea is to do the right thing and for the President to sign that bill.

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

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1265 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

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 member 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.

Mr. ARCURI. 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. HASTINGS of Washington. 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.

#### 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 1257; adopting House Resolution 1257, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1265; adopting House Resolution 1265, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1553.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6063, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1257, 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 226, nays 183, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]  
YEAS—226

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)  
Brady (PA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Castor  
Cazayoux  
Chandler  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Lincoln  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Foster  
Frank (MA)  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez

Gordon  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Herseth Sandlin  
Hinchev  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee (TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Speier  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowe  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum (MN)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murtha  
Nadler

NAYS—183

Barton (TX)  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner

Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Childers  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Gonaway  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English (PA)  
Everett  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Sarbanes  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gingrey  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Graves  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes

Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Oliver  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Schabowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
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

Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hill  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Issa  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Keller  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Lamborn  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Murphy, Tim  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Westmoreland  
Paul  
Pearce  
Petri  
Pence  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts

NOT VOTING—24

Boyd (KS)  
Braley (IA)  
Davis (AL)  
Flake  
Frelinghuysen  
Granger  
Higgins  
Honda  
Hulshof  
Kind  
Lewis (CA)  
Loeb sack  
McCrery  
Meek (FL)  
Mollohan  
Moran (KS)

□ 1150

Messrs. DONNELLY and SHAYS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. KIRK and JONES of North Carolina and Ms. HARMAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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. Madam 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 221, nays 188, not voting 24, as follows:

Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)

[Roll No. 406]

YEAS—221

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd (FL)  
Brady (PA)  
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  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Lincoln  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Foster  
Frank (MA)  
Giffords  
Gillibrand

Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Herseht Sandlin  
Hinchee  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoolley  
Hoyer  
Inlee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
Kagen  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
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)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano

Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Wexler  
Wilson (OH)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth

NAYS—188

Aderholt  
Alexander  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Biggert  
Billray  
Billirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boustany  
Broun (GA)

Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway

Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English (PA)  
Everett  
Fallin

Feeney  
Ferguson  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Foxy  
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 (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jordan  
Keller  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Lamborn  
Latham  
LaTourette

Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Murphy, Tim  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert

Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Sali  
Saxton  
Scalise  
Schmidt  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Paul  
Tiberi  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield (KY)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman (VA)  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Akin  
Berkley  
Boyd (KS)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Flake  
Higgins  
Hulshof

Kanjorski  
Kind  
Kirk  
Loebsack  
McCrery  
Meek (FL)  
Moran (KS)  
Ortiz

Peterson (PA)  
Rangel  
Rogers (MI)  
Rush  
Simpson  
Stark  
Tancredo  
Wilson (NM)

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

□ 1159

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5749, EMERGENCY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1265, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.  
The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.  
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 186, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

YEAS—225

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Billirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd (FL)  
Brady (PA)  
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  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Lincoln  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Foster  
Frank (MA)  
Giffords

Gillibrand  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Hall (NY)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Herseht Sandlin  
Hinchee  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoolley  
Hoyer  
Inlee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCollum (MN)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
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  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reichert  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Rohrabacher  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
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—186

Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Biggert  
Billray  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boustany

Brady (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot

Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan

Ehlers	LaHood	Ramstad	Barrow	Hare	Olver	Gerlach	Lungren, Daniel	Rohrabacher
Emerson	Lamborn	Regula	Bean	Harman	Pallone	Giffords	E.	Ros-Lehtinen
Everett	Latham	Rehberg	Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell	Gilchrest	Mack	Roskam
Fallin	LaTourette	Renzi	Berkley	Hersteth Sandlin	Pastor	Gingrey	Manzullo	Royce
Feeney	Latta	Rogers (AL)	Berman	Hinchey	Payne	Gohmert	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Ferguson	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)	Berry	Hinojosa	Perlmutter	Goode	McCarthy (CA)	Sali
Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher	Bishop (GA)	Hirono	Peterson (MN)	Goodlatte	McCaul (TX)	Saxton
Fortenberry	Linder	Roskam	Bishop (NY)	Hodes	Pomeroy	Granger	McCotter	Scalise
Fossella	Lucas	Royce	Blumenauer	Holden	Price (NC)	Graves	McHenry	Schmidt
Fox	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (WI)	Boren	Holt	Rahall	Hall (TX)	McHugh	Sensenbrenner
Franks (AZ)	E.	Sali	Boswell	Honda	Rangel	Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Sessions
Frelinghuysen	Mack	Saxton	Boucher	Hooley	Reyes	Hayes	McMorris	Shadegg
Gallely	Manzullo	Scalise	Boyd (FL)	Hoyer	Richardson	Heller	Rodgers	Shimkus
Garrett (NJ)	Marchant	Schmidt	Brady (PA)	Insee	Rodriguez	Hensarling	Mica	Shuster
Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner	Brown, Corrine	Israel	Ross	Herger	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Gilchrest	McCaul (TX)	Sessions	Butterfield	Jackson (IL)	Rothman	Hill	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)
Gingrey	McCotter	Shadegg	Capps	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Roybal-Allard	Hobson	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)
Gohmert	McHenry	Shays	Capuano	Jefferson	Ruppersberger	Hoekstra	Musgrave	Smith (TX)
Goode	McHugh	Shimkus	Caroza	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)	Hunter	Myrick	Souder
Goodlatte	McKeon	Shuster	Carnahan	Johnson (E. B.)	Salazar	Inglis (SC)	Neugebauer	Stearns
Granger	McMorris	Simpson	Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda	Issa	Nunes	Stearns
Graves	Rodgers	Smith (NE)	Carson	Jones (OH)	T.	Johnson (IL)	Paul	Sullivan
Hall (TX)	Mica	Smith (TX)	Castor	Kagen	Sanchez, Loretta	Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Terry
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Souder	Cazayoux	Kanjorski	Sarbanes	Jones (NC)	Pence	Thornberry
Hayes	Miller (MI)	Stearns	Chandler	Kaptur	Schakowsky	Jordan	Peterson (PA)	Tiahrt
Heller	Miller, Gary	Sullivan	Childers	Kennedy	Schiff	Keller	Petri	Tiberi
Hensarling	Murphy, Tim	Terry	Clarke	Kildee	Schwartz	King (IA)	Pickering	Turner
Herger	Musgrave	Thornberry	Clay	Kilpatrick	Scott (GA)	King (NY)	Pitts	Upton
Hill	Myrick	Tiahrt	Cleaver	Klein (FL)	Scott (VA)	Kingston	Platts	Walberg
Hobson	Neugebauer	Tiberi	Clyburn	Kucinich	Serrano	Kirk	Poe	Walden (OR)
Hoekstra	Nunes	Turner	Cohen	Lampson	Sestak	Kline (MN)	Porter	Walsh (NY)
Hunter	Paul	Upton	Conyers	Langevin	Shays	Knollenberg	Price (GA)	Wamp
Inglis (SC)	Pearce	Walberg	Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Shea-Porter	Kuhl (NY)	Pryce (OH)	Weldon (FL)
Issa	Pence	Walden (OR)	Costa	Larson (CT)	Sherman	LaHood	Putnam	Weller
Johnson, Sam	Peterson (PA)	Walsh (NY)	Costello	Lee	Shuler	Lamborn	Radanovich	Westmoreland
Jones (NC)	Petri	Wamp	Courtney	Levin	Sires	Latham	Ramstad	Whitfield (KY)
Jordan	Pickering	Weldon (FL)	Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Skelton	LaTourette	Regula	Wilson (NM)
Keller	Pitts	Weller	Crowley	Lipinski	Slaughter	Latta	Rehberg	Wilson (SC)
King (IA)	Platts	Westmoreland	Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)	Lewis (CA)	Reichert	Wittman (VA)
King (NY)	Poe	Whitfield (KY)	Cummings	Lowey	Snyder	Lewis (KY)	Renzi	Wolf
Kingston	Porter	Wilson (NM)	Davis (AL)	Lynch	Solis	Linder	Reynolds	Young (AK)
Kirk	Price (GA)	Wilson (SC)	Davis (CA)	Mahoney (FL)	Space	LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)	Young (FL)
Kline (MN)	Pryce (OH)	Wolf	Davis (IL)	Maloney (NY)	Speier	Lucas	Rogers (KY)	
Knollenberg	Putnam	Young (AK)	Davis, Lincoln	Markey	Spratt			
Kuhl (NY)	Radanovich	Young (FL)	DeFazio	Marshall	Stupak			
			DeGette	Matheson	Sutton			
			Delahunt	Matsui	Tanner			
			DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Tauscher			
			Dicks	McCollum (MN)	Taylor			
			Dingell	McDermott	Thompson (CA)			
			Doggett	McGovern	Thompson (MS)			
			Donnelly	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)			
			Doyle	McNerney	Tierney			
			Edwards	McNulty	Towns			
			Ellison	Meek (FL)	Tsongas			
			Ellsworth	Meeke (NY)	Udall (CO)			
			Emanuel	Melancon	Udall (NM)			
			Engel	Michaud	Van Hollen			
			English (PA)	Velázquez	Velázquez			
			Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Visclosky			
			Etheridge	Miller, George	Walz (MN)			
			Farr	Mitchell	Wasserman			
			Fattah	Mollohan	Schultz			
			Filner	Moore (KS)	Waters			
			Foster	Moore (WI)	Watson			
			Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Watt			
			Gillibrand	Murphy (CT)	Waxman			
			Gonzalez	Murphy, Patrick	Weiner			
			Gordon	Murphy, Tim	Welch (VT)			
			Green, Al	Murtha	Wexler			
			Green, Gene	Nadler	Wilson (OH)			
			Grijalva	Napolitano	Neal (MA)			
			Gutiérrez	Neal (MA)	Woolsey			
			Hall (NY)	Oberstar	Wu			
				Obey	Yarmuth			

## NOT VOTING—22

Boyda (KS)	McCarthy (NY)	Stark
Braley (IA)	McCrery	Tancredo
Flake	Miller, George	Towns
Gutiérrez	Moran (KS)	Velázquez
Higgins	Ortiz	Waters
Hulshof	Reynolds	Wittman (VA)
Kind	Rogers (MI)	
Loeb sack	Rush	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1205

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, earlier today I missed one vote. On rollcall No. 407 on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 1265, I would have voted "yea."

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam 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 192, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 408]

YEAS—227

Abercrombie	Altmire	Baca
Ackerman	Andrews	Baird
Allen	Arcuri	Baldwin

## NAYS—192

Aderholt	Brown-Waite,	Davis, Tom
Akin	Ginny	Deal (GA)
Alexander	Buchanan	Dent
Bachmann	Burgess	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bachus	Burton (IN)	Diaz-Balart, M.
Barrett (SC)	Buyer	Doolittle
Bartlett (MD)	Calvert	Drake
Barton (TX)	Camp (MI)	Dreier
Biggert	Campbell (CA)	Duncan
Bilbray	Cannon	Ehlers
Bilirakis	Cantor	Emerson
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Everett
Blackburn	Carter	Fallin
Blunt	Castle	Feeney
Boehner	Chabot	Ferguson
Bonner	Coble	Forbes
Bono Mack	Cole (OK)	Fortenberry
Boozman	Conaway	Fossella
Boustany	Crenshaw	Fox
Brady (TX)	Cubin	Franks (AZ)
Broun (GA)	Culberson	Frelinghuysen
Brown (SC)	Davis (KY)	Gallely
	Davis, David	Garrett (NJ)

## NOT VOTING—14

Boyda (KS)	Kind	Rogers (MI)
Braley (IA)	Loeb sack	Rush
Flake	McCrery	Stark
Higgins	Moran (KS)	Tancredo
Hulshof	Ortiz	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1214

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

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 405, 406, 407, and 408, I was at Walter Reed visiting SPC Kody Wilson who was seriously wounded in Iraq in May. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

## CAROLINE PRYCE WALKER CONQUER CHILDHOOD CANCER 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. 1553, 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 New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1553, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 409]

YEAS—416

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  
Billbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
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  
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  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Fallin  
Farr  
Fattah  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Foster  
Foxy  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herse  
Herseth Sandlin  
Hill  
Hinche  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hobson  
Hodes  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
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  
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  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
    E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
    Rodgers  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver

Pallone  
Pascarella  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar

Sali  
Sanchez, Linda  
    T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Saxton  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadeg  
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  
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)  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
    Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Wexler  
Whitfield (KY)  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman (VA)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

The text of the bill is as follows:  
H.R. 5749

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2008”.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Federal-State agreements.
- Sec. 3. Emergency unemployment compensation account.
- Sec. 4. Payments to States having agreements for the payment of emergency unemployment compensation.
- Sec. 5. Financing provisions.
- Sec. 6. Fraud and overpayments.
- Sec. 7. Definitions.
- Sec. 8. Applicability.

**SEC. 2. FEDERAL-STATE AGREEMENTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Any State which desires to do so may enter into and participate in an agreement under this Act with the Secretary of Labor (in this Act referred to as the “Secretary”). Any State which is a party to an agreement under this Act may, upon providing 30 days’ written notice to the Secretary, terminate such agreement.

(b) **PROVISIONS OF AGREEMENT.**—Any agreement under subsection (a) shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of emergency unemployment compensation to individuals who—

(1) have exhausted all rights to regular compensation under the State law or under Federal law with respect to a benefit year (excluding any benefit year that ended before May 1, 2007);

(2) have no rights to regular compensation or extended compensation with respect to a week under such law or any other State unemployment compensation law or to compensation under any other Federal law; and

(3) are not receiving compensation with respect to such week under the unemployment compensation law of Canada.

(c) **EXHAUSTION OF BENEFITS.**—For purposes of subsection (b)(1), an individual shall be deemed to have exhausted such individual’s rights to regular compensation under a State law when—

(1) no payments of regular compensation can be made under such law because such individual has received all regular compensation available to such individual based on employment or wages during such individual’s base period; or

(2) such individual’s rights to such compensation have been terminated by reason of the expiration of the benefit year with respect to which such rights existed.

(d) **WEEKLY BENEFIT AMOUNT, ETC.**—For purposes of any agreement under this Act—

(1) the amount of emergency unemployment compensation which shall be payable to any individual for any week of total unemployment shall be equal to the amount of the regular compensation (including dependents’ allowances) payable to such individual during such individual’s benefit year under the State law for a week of total unemployment;

(2) the terms and conditions of the State law which apply to claims for regular compensation and to the payment thereof shall apply to claims for emergency unemployment compensation and the payment thereof, except where otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or with the regulations or operating instructions of the Secretary promulgated to carry out this Act; and

**NOT VOTING—17**

Bralley (IA)  
Broun (GA)  
Doggett  
Flake  
Higgins  
Hulshof  
Kind  
Loebsack  
McCrery  
Meeks (NY)  
Moran (KS)  
Ortiz  
Paul  
Rogers (MI)  
Rush  
Stark  
Tancredo

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

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

□ 1224

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to advance medical research and treatments into pediatric cancers, ensure patients and families have access to information regarding pediatric cancers and current treatments for such cancers, establish a national childhood cancer registry, and promote public awareness of pediatric cancer.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**EMERGENCY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2008**

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1265, I call up the bill (H.R. 5749) to provide for a program of emergency unemployment compensation, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

(3) the maximum amount of emergency unemployment compensation payable to any individual for whom an emergency unemployment compensation account is established under section 3 shall not exceed the amount established in such account for such individual.

(e) ELECTION BY STATES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law (and if State law permits), the Governor of a State that is in an extended benefit period may provide for the payment of emergency unemployment compensation prior to extended compensation to individuals who otherwise meet the requirements of this section.

**SEC. 3. EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACCOUNT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any agreement under this Act shall provide that the State will establish, for each eligible individual who files an application for emergency unemployment compensation, an emergency unemployment compensation account with respect to such individual's benefit year.

(b) AMOUNT IN ACCOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount established in an account under subsection (a) shall be equal to the lesser of—

(A) 50 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law, or

(B) 13 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year.

(2) WEEKLY BENEFIT AMOUNT.—For purposes of this subsection, an individual's weekly benefit amount for any week is the amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) under the State law payable to such individual for such week for total unemployment.

(c) SPECIAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if, at the time that the individual's account is exhausted, such individual's State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under paragraph (2)), then, such account shall be augmented by an amount equal to the amount originally established in such account (as determined under subsection (b)(1)).

(2) EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a State shall be considered to be in an extended benefit period if, at the time of exhaustion (as described in paragraph (1))—

(A) such a period is then in effect for such State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970;

(B) such a period would then be in effect for such State under such Act if section 203(d) of such Act—

(i) were applied by substituting "4" for "5" each place it appears; and

(ii) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A); or

(C) such a period would then be in effect for such State under such Act if—

(i) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

(ii) such section 203(f)—

(I) were applied by substituting "6.0" for "6.5" in paragraph (1)(A)(i); and

(II) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii).

**SEC. 4. PAYMENTS TO STATES HAVING AGREEMENTS FOR THE PAYMENT OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.**

(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be paid to each State that has entered into an agreement under this Act an amount equal to 100 percent of the emergency unemployment compensation paid to individuals by the State pursuant to such agreement.

(b) TREATMENT OF REIMBURSABLE COMPENSATION.—No payment shall be made to any State under this section in respect of any compensation to the extent the State is entitled to reimbursement in respect of such compensation under the provisions of any Federal law other than this Act or chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code. A State shall not be entitled to any reimbursement under such chapter 85 in respect of any compensation to the extent the State is entitled to reimbursement under this Act in respect of such compensation.

(c) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—Sums payable to any State by reason of such State having an agreement under this Act shall be payable, either in advance or by way of reimbursement (as may be determined by the Secretary), in such amounts as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this Act for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any amount by which the Secretary finds that the Secretary's estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made on the basis of such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency of the State involved.

**SEC. 5. FINANCING PROVISIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds in the extended unemployment compensation account (as established by section 905(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1105(a)) of the Unemployment Trust Fund (as established by section 904(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1104(a))) shall be used for the making of payments to States having agreements entered into under this Act.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to such State under this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the Government Accountability Office, shall make payments to the State in accordance with such certification, by transfers from the extended unemployment compensation account (as so established) to the account of such State in the Unemployment Trust Fund (as so established).

(c) ASSISTANCE TO STATES.—There are appropriated out of the employment security administration account (as established by section 901(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1101(a)) of the Unemployment Trust Fund, without fiscal year limitation, such funds as may be necessary for purposes of assisting States (as provided in title III of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 501 et seq.)) in meeting the costs of administration of agreements under this Act.

(d) APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN PAYMENTS.—There are appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury, without fiscal year limitation, to the extended unemployment compensation account (as so established) of the Unemployment Trust Fund (as so established) such sums as the Secretary estimates to be necessary to make the payments under this section in respect of—

(1) compensation payable under chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) compensation payable on the basis of services to which section 3309(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 applies.

Amounts appropriated pursuant to the preceding sentence shall not be required to be repaid.

**SEC. 6. FRAUD AND OVERPAYMENTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—If an individual knowingly has made, or caused to be made by another, a false statement or representation of a material fact, or knowingly has failed, or

caused another to fail, to disclose a material fact, and as a result of such false statement or representation or of such nondisclosure such individual has received an amount of emergency unemployment compensation under this Act to which he was not entitled, such individual—

(1) shall be ineligible for further emergency unemployment compensation under this Act in accordance with the provisions of the applicable State unemployment compensation law relating to fraud in connection with a claim for unemployment compensation; and

(2) shall be subject to prosecution under section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

(b) REPAYMENT.—In the case of individuals who have received amounts of emergency unemployment compensation under this Act to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such emergency unemployment compensation to the State agency, except that the State agency may waive such repayment if it determines that—

(1) the payment of such emergency unemployment compensation was without fault on the part of any such individual; and

(2) such repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience.

(c) RECOVERY BY STATE AGENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The State agency may recover the amount to be repaid, or any part thereof, by deductions from any emergency unemployment compensation payable to such individual under this Act or from any unemployment compensation payable to such individual under any State or Federal unemployment compensation law administered by the State agency or under any other Federal law administered by the State agency which provides for the payment of any assistance or allowance with respect to any week of unemployment, during the 3-year period after the date such individuals received the payment of the emergency unemployment compensation to which they were not entitled, except that no single deduction may exceed 50 percent of the weekly benefit amount from which such deduction is made.

(2) OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING.—No repayment shall be required, and no deduction shall be made, until a determination has been made, notice thereof and an opportunity for a fair hearing has been given to the individual, and the determination has become final.

(d) REVIEW.—Any determination by a State agency under this section shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in that manner and to that extent.

**SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act, the terms "compensation", "regular compensation", "extended compensation", "additional compensation", "benefit year", "base period", "State", "State agency", "State law", and "week" have the respective meanings given such terms under section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note).

**SEC. 8. APPLICABILITY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), an agreement entered into under this Act shall apply to weeks of unemployment—

(1) beginning after the date on which such agreement is entered into; and

(2) ending on or before February 1, 2009.

(b) TRANSITION FOR AMOUNT REMAINING IN ACCOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), in the case of an individual who has amounts remaining in an account established under section 3 as of the last day of

the last week (as determined in accordance with the applicable State law) ending on or before February 1, 2009, emergency unemployment compensation shall continue to be payable to such individual from such amounts for any week beginning after such last day for which the individual meets the eligibility requirements of this Act.

(2) LIMIT ON AUGMENTATION.—If the account of an individual is exhausted after the last day of such last week (as so determined), then section 3(c) shall not apply and such account shall not be augmented under such section, regardless of whether such individual's State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under paragraph (2) of such section).

(3) LIMIT ON COMPENSATION.—No compensation shall be payable by reason of paragraph (1) for any week beginning after April 30, 2009.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order against consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order against consideration of this bill because the bill violates clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives which provides in pertinent part that "it shall not be in order to consider any bill if the provisions of such measure affecting direct spending and revenues have the net effect of increasing the deficit" over the 5- or 10-year budget scoring window.

This rule is commonly referred to as the pay-as-you-go rule or PAYGO and was enacted by the majority with great fanfare at the beginning of this Congress.

In reviewing the estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, I note that they have scored this bill as increasing the deficit by \$14 billion over the next 5 years, and nearly \$10 billion over the coming decade.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the table prepared by the Congressional Budget Office appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, given this overwhelming evidence that this bill does have the net effect of increasing the deficit over both scoring windows, I must respectfully insist on my point of order that the bill violates the PAYGO rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard?

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's motion receive the consideration it deserves.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order against consideration of H.R. 5749 on the ground that the bill includes provisions affecting direct spending or revenues that would have the net effect of increasing the Federal budget deficit. That point of order sounds in clause 10 of rule XXI.

The special order of business prescribed by the adoption of House Reso-

lution 1265 waives any such point of order. The Chair will read the operative sentence of House Resolution 1265: "All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI."

The Chair finds that the point of order raised by the gentleman from Illinois has been waived.

The Chair therefore holds that the point of order is overruled.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, on that I respectfully appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

Mr. RANGEL. I move to table the appeal.

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

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 185, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

YEAS—217

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyda (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Castor  
Cazayoux  
Chandler  
Childers  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Lincoln

DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Foster  
Frank (MA)  
Gillibrand  
Gordon  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Hall (NY)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Herseth Sandlin  
Hill  
Hinchoy  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Insee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy

Kildee  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum (MN)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)

Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano

Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
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  
Billbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English (PA)  
Everett  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Forbes  
Fortenberry

Fossella  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Granger  
Graves  
Hall (TX)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Issa  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jordan  
Keller  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Lamborn  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCauley (TX)  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Mica  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary

Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Paul  
Pearce  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Putnam  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Sali  
Saxton  
Scalise  
Schmidt  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield (KY)  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman (VA)  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—31

Baca  
Braley (IA)  
Davis (IL)  
Dicks  
Flake  
Gonzalez  
Gutierrez  
Higgins  
Hinojosa

Hulshof  
Kagen  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Loeb sack  
Maloney (NY)  
McCrery  
Miller (FL)  
Moran (KS)

Murphy, Tim  
Ortiz  
Pence  
Pryce (OH)  
Radanovich  
Reyes  
Rogers (MI)

Rush Stark Walsh (NY)  
Smith (NJ) Tancredo Wolf

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1245

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR). The Chair would clarify that the insertion by the gentleman from Illinois will appear separately from the point of order in the RECORD.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1265, in lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 110-710 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the ‘‘Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2008’’.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Federal-State agreements.
- Sec. 3. Emergency unemployment compensation account.
- Sec. 4. Payments to States having agreements for the payment of emergency unemployment compensation.
- Sec. 5. Financing provisions.
- Sec. 6. Fraud and overpayments.
- Sec. 7. Definitions.
- Sec. 8. Applicability.

**SEC. 2. FEDERAL-STATE AGREEMENTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Any State which desires to do so may enter into and participate in an agreement under this Act with the Secretary of Labor (in this Act referred to as the ‘‘Secretary’’). Any State which is a party to an agreement under this Act may, upon providing 30 days’ written notice to the Secretary, terminate such agreement.

(b) **PROVISIONS OF AGREEMENT.**—Any agreement under subsection (a) shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of emergency unemployment compensation to individuals who—

(1) have exhausted all rights to regular compensation under the State law or under Federal law with respect to a benefit year (excluding any benefit year that ended before May 1, 2007);

(2) have no rights to regular compensation or extended compensation with respect to a week under such law or any other State unemployment compensation law or to compensation under any other Federal law (except as provided under subsection (e)); and

(3) are not receiving compensation with respect to such week under the unemployment compensation law of Canada.

(c) **EXHAUSTION OF BENEFITS.**—For purposes of subsection (b)(1), an individual shall be deemed to have exhausted such individual’s rights to regular compensation under a State law when—

(1) no payments of regular compensation can be made under such law because such in-

dividual has received all regular compensation available to such individual based on employment or wages during such individual’s base period; or

(2) such individual’s rights to such compensation have been terminated by reason of the expiration of the benefit year with respect to which such rights existed.

(d) **WEEKLY BENEFIT AMOUNT, ETC.**—For purposes of any agreement under this Act—

(1) the amount of emergency unemployment compensation which shall be payable to any individual for any week of total unemployment shall be equal to the amount of the regular compensation (including dependents’ allowances) payable to such individual during such individual’s benefit year under the State law for a week of total unemployment;

(2) the terms and conditions of the State law which apply to claims for regular compensation and to the payment thereof shall apply to claims for emergency unemployment compensation and the payment thereof, except where otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or with the regulations or operating instructions of the Secretary promulgated to carry out this Act; and

(3) the maximum amount of emergency unemployment compensation payable to any individual for whom an emergency unemployment compensation account is established under section 3 shall not exceed the amount established in such account for such individual.

(e) **ELECTION BY STATES.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law (and if State law permits), the Governor of a State that is in an extended benefit period may provide for the payment of emergency unemployment compensation prior to extended compensation to individuals who otherwise meet the requirements of this section.

(f) **UNAUTHORIZED ALIENS INELIGIBLE.**—A State shall require as a condition of eligibility for emergency unemployment compensation under this Act that each alien who receives such compensation must be legally authorized to work in the United States, as defined for purposes of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (26 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.). In determining whether an alien meets the requirements of this subsection, a State must follow the procedures provided in section 1137(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-7(d)).

**SEC. 3. EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACCOUNT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Any agreement under this Act shall provide that the State will establish, for each eligible individual who files an application for emergency unemployment compensation, an emergency unemployment compensation account with respect to such individual’s benefit year.

(b) **AMOUNT IN ACCOUNT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amount established in an account under subsection (a) shall be equal to the lesser of—

(A) 50 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents’ allowances) payable to the individual during the individual’s benefit year under such law, or

(B) 13 times the individual’s average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year.

(2) **WEEKLY BENEFIT AMOUNT.**—For purposes of this subsection, an individual’s weekly benefit amount for any week is the amount of regular compensation (including dependents’ allowances) under the State law payable to such individual for such week for total unemployment.

(c) **SPECIAL RULE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if, at the time that the individual’s account is ex-

hausted or at any time thereafter, such individual’s State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under paragraph (2)), then, such account shall be augmented by an amount equal to the amount originally established in such account (as determined under subsection (b)(1)).

(2) **EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), a State shall be considered to be in an extended benefit period, as of any given time, if—

(A) such a period is then in effect for such State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970;

(B) such a period would then be in effect for such State under such Act if section 203(d) of such Act—

(i) were applied by substituting ‘‘4’’ for ‘‘5’’ each place it appears; and

(ii) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A); or

(C) such a period would then be in effect for such State under such Act if—

(i) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

(ii) such section 203(f)—

(I) were applied by substituting ‘‘6.0’’ for ‘‘6.5’’ in paragraph (1)(A)(i); and

(II) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii).

**SEC. 4. PAYMENTS TO STATES HAVING AGREEMENTS FOR THE PAYMENT OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.**

(a) **GENERAL RULE.**—There shall be paid to each State that has entered into an agreement under this Act an amount equal to 100 percent of the emergency unemployment compensation paid to individuals by the State pursuant to such agreement.

(b) **TREATMENT OF REIMBURSABLE COMPENSATION.**—No payment shall be made to any State under this section in respect of any compensation to the extent the State is entitled to reimbursement in respect of such compensation under the provisions of any Federal law other than this Act or chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code. A State shall not be entitled to any reimbursement under such chapter 85 in respect of any compensation to the extent the State is entitled to reimbursement under this Act in respect of such compensation.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.**—Sums payable to any State by reason of such State having an agreement under this Act shall be payable, either in advance or by way of reimbursement (as may be determined by the Secretary), in such amounts as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this Act for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any amount by which the Secretary finds that the Secretary’s estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made on the basis of such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency of the State involved.

**SEC. 5. FINANCING PROVISIONS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Funds in the extended unemployment compensation account (as established by section 905(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1105(a))) of the Unemployment Trust Fund (as established by section 904(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1104(a))) shall be used for the making of payments to States having agreements entered into under this Act.

(b) **CERTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to such State under this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit

or settlement by the Government Accountability Office, shall make payments to the State in accordance with such certification, by transfers from the extended unemployment compensation account (as so established) to the account of such State in the Unemployment Trust Fund (as so established).

(c) ASSISTANCE TO STATES.—There are appropriated out of the employment security administration account (as established by section 901(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1101(a))) of the Unemployment Trust Fund, without fiscal year limitation, such funds as may be necessary for purposes of assisting States (as provided in title III of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 501 et seq.)) in meeting the costs of administration of agreements under this Act.

(d) APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN PAYMENTS.—There are appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury, without fiscal year limitation, to the extended unemployment compensation account (as so established) of the Unemployment Trust Fund (as so established) such sums as the Secretary estimates to be necessary to make the payments under this section in respect of—

(1) compensation payable under chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) compensation payable on the basis of services to which section 3309(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 applies.

Amounts appropriated pursuant to the preceding sentence shall not be required to be repaid.

#### SEC. 6. FRAUD AND OVERPAYMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If an individual knowingly has made, or caused to be made by another, a false statement or representation of a material fact, or knowingly has failed, or caused another to fail, to disclose a material fact, and as a result of such false statement or representation or of such nondisclosure such individual has received an amount of emergency unemployment compensation under this Act to which he was not entitled, such individual—

(1) shall be ineligible for further emergency unemployment compensation under this Act in accordance with the provisions of the applicable State unemployment compensation law relating to fraud in connection with a claim for unemployment compensation; and

(2) shall be subject to prosecution under section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

(b) REPAYMENT.—In the case of individuals who have received amounts of emergency unemployment compensation under this Act to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such emergency unemployment compensation to the State agency, except that the State agency may waive such repayment if it determines that—

(1) the payment of such emergency unemployment compensation was without fault on the part of any such individual; and

(2) such repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience.

#### (c) RECOVERY BY STATE AGENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The State agency may recover the amount to be repaid, or any part thereof, by deductions from any emergency unemployment compensation payable to such individual under this Act or from any unemployment compensation payable to such individual under any State or Federal unemployment compensation law administered by the State agency or under any other Federal law administered by the State agency which provides for the payment of any assistance or allowance with respect to any week of unemployment, during the 3-year period after the date such individuals received the payment of the emergency unemploy-

ment compensation to which they were not entitled, except that no single deduction may exceed 50 percent of the weekly benefit amount from which such deduction is made.

(2) OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING.—No repayment shall be required, and no deduction shall be made, until a determination has been made, notice thereof and an opportunity for a fair hearing has been given to the individual, and the determination has become final.

(d) REVIEW.—Any determination by a State agency under this section shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in that manner and to that extent.

#### SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the terms “compensation”, “regular compensation”, “extended compensation”, “benefit year”, “base period”, “State”, “State agency”, “State law”, and “week” have the respective meanings given such terms under section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note).

#### SEC. 8. APPLICABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), an agreement entered into under this Act shall apply to weeks of unemployment—

(1) beginning after the date on which such agreement is entered into; and

(2) ending on or before March 31, 2009.

(b) TRANSITION FOR AMOUNT REMAINING IN ACCOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), in the case of an individual who has amounts remaining in an account established under section 3 as of the last day of the last week (as determined in accordance with the applicable State law) ending on or before March 31, 2009, emergency unemployment compensation shall continue to be payable to such individual from such amounts for any week beginning after such last day for which the individual meets the eligibility requirements of this Act.

(2) LIMIT ON AUGMENTATION.—If the account of an individual is exhausted after the last day of such last week (as so determined), then section 3(c) shall not apply and such account shall not be augmented under such section, regardless of whether such individual's State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under paragraph (2) of such section).

(3) LIMIT ON COMPENSATION.—No compensation shall be payable by reason of paragraph (1) for any week beginning after June 30, 2009.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I ask unanimous consent that I yield to myself such time as I may consume and at that conclusion the balance of the time allotted be given to Dr. MCDERMOTT, a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee, who was the major drafter of the bill that is before the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, here we are again, once again fighting for the dignity of millions of Americans who

worked every day of their adult lives, paid into a trust fund, believing if there ever was a need, that their Congress, their Members would respond to it.

The compensation that we are offering in this legislation is so meager that it is almost embarrassing to have to fight to get it, and the whole concept that maybe the President believes that if they are given assistance, they would rather not look for a job but rather have these checks. But I think I want America to know that as long as good people want to work, as long as they don't have money to pay their bills, as long as oil prices are up, education, health care, as long as these good people cannot survive and begin to lose their dignity and their pride, as long as these great Americans, middle Americans find themselves in this position, that we on our side will continue to fight no matter what you do.

So you can attack us on parliamentary grounds, you can talk about PAYGO, you can talk about suspension, you can go get a veto, but the American people should know that we are not going to give up. We are not going to give in, and that we will prevail. So whatever tactics, language, rhetoric you come up with, at the end of the day when the family says I know I can depend on our Congress, they will be asking: And how do your congressmen vote on this issue? And I hope that you will be guided by your conscience and not your party.

So I would like to yield the balance of my time to Dr. MCDERMOTT to get into the specifics, but I hope that we will be able, with our vote today, to get into the heart of the American people and let them know that this Congress and this country will not let them down.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as Yogi Berra once said, this is like déjà vu all over again. Yesterday after an 8-week delay, the House considered and failed to pass the legislation once again before us today. I continue to support providing extended unemployment benefits to workers who need it most. In fact, every Republican on the Ways and Means Committee supported extending unemployment benefits when this legislation was considered in committee 2 months ago; again, 8 weeks ago.

Again, Republicans want to extend unemployment benefits. And we want to help those who are hurting the most. We also recognize that it is time that we pass legislation that can become law.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is why I rise in strong opposition to the legislation before us today which does not satisfy the simple standard of helping those who need it most and who have worked a modest number of weeks to earn these benefits.

Yesterday, the Democratic leadership brought identical legislation to the

floor under a process normally reserved for naming post offices and honoring sports teams. This resulted in a take-it-or-leave-it approach to this very important issue of extending unemployment benefits, and the bill failed to gain enough votes, forcing us to return to the floor again today.

Now have our Democratic colleagues budged an inch? Absolutely not. Today we are considering the same legislation which once again fails to include a long-standing and reasonable policy requiring at least 20 weeks of work to qualify for extended unemployment benefits.

As several of us on this side of the aisle have noted, without this sensible requirement under H.R. 5749, workers could qualify for as many as 52 weeks of unemployment benefits, a full year, after having worked as little as one or two weeks. But whether someone worked two or 10 weeks or even 19 weeks, the simple fact is that current Federal law includes a straightforward rule that requires a modest minimum amount of work before someone can qualify for months, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 months of unemployment benefits courtesy of our taxpayers.

This 20-weeks rule is not too much to ask. It is fair, and it is inexcusable for the other side not to include such a reasonable, long-standing rule. In fact, to not include it, as the bill before us would do, is a radical, and I say that again, radical change, radical departure from current law.

My friends in the majority have called this issue a straw man. If it is just a straw man, why did they make the change? Why did they make this radical policy change that breaks 27 years of bipartisan policy which requires 20 weeks of work to qualify for a full year of unemployment benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I have a United States Department of Labor document that shows examples of States that would allow 1 year's benefits for only 1 or 2 weeks' work, including a State like Michigan where you would only have to work one week to be able to obtain,

under this legislation, 52 weeks worth of benefits.

I would like to insert this Department of Labor document into the RECORD.

STATES IN WHICH INDIVIDUALS COULD QUALIFY FOR UI WITH ONLY 2 WEEKS OF WORK

State	Minimum wages needed to qualify:	
	Wages in 1 week	Total wages in 2 weeks
AL	>\$1,157	>\$2,214
AK		\$1,000
AZ	\$1,500	\$2,250
AR		\$1,971
CA	\$900	\$1,125
CO	<sup>1</sup> \$1,084	\$2,500
CT		<sup>1</sup> \$780
DE		<sup>1</sup> \$920
DC	\$1,300	\$1,950
FL	\$2,267	\$3,400
GA	\$1,232	<sup>1</sup> \$1,848
HI		\$130
ID	\$1,508	\$1,885
IL		\$1,600
IN	\$1,000	\$2,750
IA	\$1,190	\$1,790
KS	\$2,377	\$3,030
KY	\$1,963	\$2,944
LA	\$800	\$1,200
ME	<sup>2</sup> \$1,276	\$3,828
MD	>\$576	\$900
MA		\$3,000
MI	\$2,757	\$4,136
MN	\$1,000	\$1,250
MS	\$780	\$1,200
MO	\$1,500	\$2,250
MT	\$1,392	<sup>3</sup> \$2,087
NE	\$800	\$2,651
NV	\$400	\$600
NH	\$1,400	\$2,800
NJ		\$2,860
NM	\$1,604	
NY	\$1,600	\$2,400
NC	\$1,066	\$4,291
ND	\$1,984	\$2,975
OK	\$1,000	\$1,500
OR	\$667	\$1,000
PR	\$77	\$280
RI	\$1,480	\$2,960
SC	\$540	\$900
SD	\$728	\$1,288
TN	>\$780	>\$1,560
TX	\$1,413	\$2,091
UT	\$1,933	\$2,900
VT	\$1,981	\$2,773
VA		<sup>1</sup> \$2,700
VI	\$858	\$1,287
WV		\$2,200
WI	\$1,325	\$1,590
WY	\$2,072	\$2,900

<sup>1</sup> In 2 HQs.

<sup>2</sup> In each of 2 Qs

<sup>3</sup> In 2 Qs.

Note: Most states require wages in 2 different calendar quarters in order to meet monetary eligibility requirements.

The source of this information is the 2008 Comparison of State Unemployment Insurance Laws, Chapter 3, Table 3-3.

Yesterday the majority called up this legislation under special rules that

barred any amendments. Today we are considering this legislation in much the same way, no amendments to be considered, no substitute to be considered, and every rule of the House except one is waived.

The majority even waived the House Democrat's so-called PAYGO rule. That admits that the cost of this legislation would simply be added to the deficit. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office confirms this much. Their estimate of the cost of this legislation shows it will increase the deficit by \$14 billion over the next 5 years, and that is probably just a start.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a copy of the Congressional Budget Office score of H.R. 5749 as approved by the Ways and Means Committee which provides a fuller discussion of this point.

H.R. 5749—Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2008

Summary: H.R. 5749 would make individuals who exhaust their regular benefits eligible for unemployment compensation for an additional period of time. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that enacting the bill would:

Increase direct spending by \$6.2 billion in 2008 and \$11.7 billion over the 2008–2018 period; and

Increase revenues by a net amount of \$3.2 billion of the 2008–2018 period.

In total, these changes would increase budget deficits (or reduce future surpluses) by \$6.2 billion in 2008 and by a net of \$8.5 billion over the 2008–2018 period.

The bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA).

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 5749 is shown in the following table. The spending effects of this legislation fall within budget function 600 (income security).

	By fiscal year, in billions of dollars—											2008–2013	2008–2018
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018		
Changes in Direct Spending (Outlays) <sup>1</sup>	6.2	6.7	0	0	0	0	0	-0.2	-0.3	-0.3	-0.4	12.8	11.7
Changes in Revenues	0	*	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.6	3.2
Net Change in Deficits or Surpluses <sup>2</sup>	6.2	6.6	-0.1	-0.2	-0.2	-0.1	-0.3	-0.6	-0.7	-1.0	-1.2	12.2	8.5

<sup>1</sup> For direct spending changes, budget authority equals outlays.

<sup>2</sup> Positive numbers indicate an increase in deficits or decrease in surpluses.

Note: \* = gain of less than \$50 million; components may not add to totals because of rounding.

Basis of estimate: For this estimate, CBO assumes that the bill will be enacted by June 1, 2008, and that spending will follow historical patterns for similar activities.

Direct Spending

Most states' regular unemployment compensation programs provide up to 26 weeks of benefits to qualified individuals. The bill would authorize a program for emergency extended unemployment compensation (EEUC), which would provide federal funding for additional benefits—up to 13 weeks in all states—to beneficiaries who exhaust their regular benefits. (Certain individuals who exhausted their regular benefits prior to the

bill's enactment also would be eligible for EEUC). An additional 13 weeks of benefits would be provided in states that meet certain thresholds or triggers with respect to unemployment. States would be eligible to provide the additional 13 weeks of benefits if unemployment levels reach an insured unemployment rate of 4 percent or higher, or a total unemployment rate of 6 percent or higher. (CBO estimates that around one quarter of beneficiaries would be in states that would qualify to provide that additional 13 weeks.) Benefits would be available from the date of enactment through April 30, 2009,

but no new beneficiaries could be added to the program after February 1, 2009.

Based on the number of people who previously exhausted regular benefits, as well as those anticipated to exhaust benefits in the coming months, CBO estimates that over the 2008–2009 period:

About 3.2 million people would collect EEUC and that benefits paid over that time period would total \$11.7 billion;

Administrative costs related to the EEUC program would total \$0.6 billion; and

Outlays for regular unemployment benefits would increase by \$0.9 billion because the availability of the EEUC benefits would affect some recipients' employment decisions.

(Most of those costs would be offset by increases in State revenues over fiscal years 2009 through 2013, as discussed below under "Revenues.")

Those costs would be slightly offset by reduced payments from other federal programs that provide extended unemployment benefits—the extended benefits program and trade adjustment assistance for workers. CBO estimates those offsets would amount to \$0.3 billion in 2008 and 2009.

Under the financing provisions of the bill, funds in the Extended Unemployment Compensation Account would be transferred to the state accounts for the benefit and administrative expenses incurred for the EEUC program. Because the state unemployment funds are included in the federal budget, those transfers would have no immediate budgetary effect. However, they would interact with provisions of the federal unemployment law known as the "Reed Act." Under those provisions, when funds in the federal accounts of the unemployment trust fund exceed certain statutory limits, excess revenues from the federal unemployment tax are transferred to the state accounts. In CBO's current baseline, we project that the federal government will transfer \$8.6 billion to the states over the 2013–2018 period. CBO's baseline includes outlays from the Reed Act transfers totaling \$1.1 billion from 2014 to 2018. Under the bill, outlays for EEUC would reduce the federal trust fund balances to levels that would preclude such Reed Act transfers. Thus, relative to CBO's baseline projections, outlays under the bill would be \$1.1 billion lower.

CBO estimates that the net effect of unemployment-related provisions on direct spending would total \$12.8 billion over the 2008–2013 period and \$11.7 billion over the 2008–2018 period.

#### Revenues

The availability of EEUC benefits may discourage recipients from searching for work and accepting less-desirable jobs as quickly as they would in the absence of this act. Thus, some recipients may remain unemployed for slightly longer than they would have otherwise, and direct spending for regular benefits would increase during 2008 and 2009. CBO expects that some states would respond to the lower balances in their unemployment trust funds by increasing their unemployment taxes, resulting in an increase of \$0.6 billion in revenues over the 2009–2013 period.

The interaction between EEUC and Reed Act transfers also would affect revenues. Under the baseline, CBO estimates that, as a result of the estimated \$8.6 billion in Reed Act transfers, states would reduce unemployment taxes by about \$2.5 billion over the 2014–2018 period, with additional revenue losses occurring after 2018. CBO estimates that transfers to the states under the EEUC program would reduce the federal trust fund balances to levels that would preclude such Reed Act transfers, resulting in revenues that would be \$2.5 billion higher than our baseline projections of revenues over the five-year period beginning in 2014.

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact: H.R. 5749 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA. CBO estimates that the changes to the unemployment compensation system would result in decreased federal transfers to states and also would lead to increased unemployment taxes in some states. These effects, however, would result from states' participation in the federal unemployment insurance program, which is voluntary, and would not result from intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA.

Previous CBO estimate: On February 6, 2008, CBO transmitted an estimate of the

budgetary effects of the Economic Stimulus Act of 2008, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Finance on January 30, 2008. That bill contained provisions for the extension of unemployment compensation that are similar to provisions in H.R. 5749. Differences between the estimated costs reflect small economic and technical adjustments to CBO's baseline and differences in the legislation.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Spending: Christina Hawley Anthony; Federal Revenues: Barbara Edwards; Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Lisa Ramirez-Branum; and Impact on the Private Sector: Ralph Smith.

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

These facts directly contradict the majority's pledges for a more open and honest operation of the House, as well as their pledges to pay for every piece of legislation that comes to the floor. Now we are seeing the fine print of these pledges, including that new spending deemed temporary does not have to be paid for. This is yet another violation of the majority Democrats' PAYGO rule which is looking more and more like Swiss cheese than effective budget policy. I hope my friends in the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition are watching as their leadership once again waives the rules of the House to increase spending and to increase taxes.

Make no mistake, this legislation will do both, living up to the true spirit of the Democrats' PAYGO rule.

Mr. Speaker, the President has stated his intent to veto this legislation because it does not include the 20 weeks of work requirement and proposes untargeted benefits, among other reasons. Republicans noted these flaws in our debate on the floor yesterday, and we offered to work with the majority to correct them so that we have legislation that could become law quickly to help those who need help, so the path to passage of a truly bipartisan and responsible bill is clear to address these concerns.

Two months ago, that was 8 weeks ago, every Republican on the Ways and Means Committee supported extending unemployment benefits, and I introduced a bill and offered as an amendment legislation that would have paid extended benefits in high unemployment States like Michigan, and many others, and that was in April, 8 weeks ago. Yet for the past 2 months, 8 weeks, the residents of those States where jobs are hardest to come by and these benefits are most needed, have been forced to wait on the majority in Congress. It is election-year politics. Members should have a chance to vote on a targeted proposal that would actually provide extended benefits in high-unemployment States like Michigan and others. And importantly, a vote on legislation the President would sign so these benefits can actually start being paid.

In contrast to such a constructive approach, the majority wants to continue playing politics, election-year politics, with unemployment benefits. So today,

Members will once again we forced to vote on legislation the President says he will not sign and includes a radical departure from current policy when it comes to the balance between work and benefits.

Again I ask my colleagues to vote against this legislation so we can work together in a bipartisan way because I truly believe both Republicans and Democrats want to help those who are unemployed. We need to craft an appropriate bipartisan solution quickly to this immediate concern. The legislation before us does not meet that challenge and will not be signed into law. We want to help those who need help. We can extend unemployment benefits for those who have exhausted them. It is time we work together.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCDERMOTT. 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.R. 5749.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a wonderful debate. I love to hear the Republican talking points said over and over again. I have counted now the phrase "8 weeks" since we passed this bill out of the committee. I have heard it 19 times so far and I expect we will hear it at least nineteen-hundred times before we pass the bill.

But the fact is that the ranking member knows he could have voted "yes" when it came out of committee. He could have voted "yes" when it was on the floor on the 15th of May which is when we voted on this. We already have taken action on it once; and he had a chance yesterday to vote "yes" on it, but he said "no" again. And I suspect today—well, we'll see what he does. Maybe he will change his mind.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume because it is a new day and we woke up with some bad news about the U.S. economy. The Washington Post has the story, "A new report from the Federal Reserve paints a portrait of the U.S. economy under pressure from almost every sector. Across the board, the U.S. economy is deteriorating, including jobs." And here we are again today trying to help the American people by passing the Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2008.

Yesterday, 144 Republican Members ignored the will of the people and instead followed the whim of a lame duck President.

□ 1300

If three votes had switched, we would have had enough votes to pass this bill and give the American people the help they need. They didn't, so we're back here today because we're going to make it happen.

The economic data paint a compelling case for immediate action. But my Republican colleague stood at the podium yesterday, and did it again today, waving a veto threat from the White House.

This is the President who's given us this war that's put us in a terrible mess. He's given us bank problems and every other thing that's going on, gas prices. And now he waves a letter and says, we don't want to do anything for the unemployed who've exhausted their benefits.

They hid behind rhetoric that pretends to contend itself with people qualifying for benefits. They served up a real cold red herring for dinner last night for those people that exhausted their benefits, because they simply want to deny American workers unemployment benefits.

Remember, this money didn't come out of the tax base. It came from their employers who paid it into a trust fund for exactly this purpose; when they lose their job, they should have access to it.

Now, let me be clear. This 20-week rule that we hear yelled about here, that many Republicans want included in the bill, would mean that workers could work for over 10 straight months and be denied extended benefits, depending on the vagaries of the various laws in States across this country.

The Department of Labor has estimated that around 10 percent of those who've exhausted their benefits might be excluded from extended benefits if we were to include this 20-week rule. These workers are disproportionately low-wage, part-time, minority and women.

In other words, the Republicans propose to solve a problem by creating one. Instead of helping people, the Republicans' alternative is to penalize workers on the lowest rung of the economic ladder. Very typical. Look at the tax cuts.

The American people need solutions, and that's what H.R. 5749 is about. It would immediately provide 13 weeks of extended benefits for workers in every State who've exhausted their benefits. It provides an additional 13 weeks of benefits in States with an unemployment rate of 6 percent or higher.

This bill is targeted. You hear them say we want a targeted bill. Of course it's targeted. It's targeted to do one thing, to help those people who need it the most.

Here's how it works. Anyone a State qualifies for unemployment benefits, and who has exhausted what the State has provided them, would be eligible for extended benefits of the same amount for half as long as the State provided them. So, if you received 26 weeks in your State from the State, and you run out, you get 13 more weeks of extended benefits. If you get 10 weeks from your State, you will get 5 weeks more of extended benefits.

The Federal Reserve outlook wasn't the only piece of information we re-

ceived yesterday. A little while ago the Labor Department announced that initial claims for unemployment benefits jumped more than expected last week. The number of people filing for unemployment benefits last week increased 384,000 people, in 1 week. And all the Republicans want to do is wave a veto letter from the White House.

Helping the American people should not be a partisan issue; but the Republicans and the president are trying to make it just that.

Yesterday we had a bipartisan bill. Almost 50 Republicans voted for it. I urge my Republican colleagues to follow their conscience and not their caucus and vote with the Democrats to help the American people. The Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2008 is the least we can do for the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, would you share with us how much time remains on each side, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 22 minutes. The gentleman from Washington has 21½.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to debate this legislation which makes a radical change, eliminating the Federal work requirement to qualify for federally funded unemployment benefits, I wish to yield 3 minutes to the senior Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee, Mr. HERGER of California.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle want to help U.S. workers during this period of economic uncertainty. Yet, the question has always been: How do we best provide this assistance?

Under the proposal before us today, workers in States with historically low levels of unemployment would receive 13 weeks of Federal unemployment benefits, on top of their current 26 weeks of regular State unemployment benefits. This means that workers in States like Iowa, that have a documented labor shortage, would receive 39 weeks of unemployment benefits. This makes no sense.

Instead of creating an untargeted expansion of unemployment benefits, we should be focusing on growing the economy. We want to see every State have a job surplus, not a surplus of extended unemployment benefits.

Today's legislation will result in higher taxes on our small businesses, resulting in slower job creation. This won't help U.S. workers.

The best way to help our workers is to foster economic growth that creates jobs. We can do that by passing pro-growth tax policies that keep our businesses competitive globally, and provide them with certainty to make important investments in our economy with our work, without worrying about a massive tax increase.

We can also help our workers by passing our fair trade agreements, which would create tens of thousands of jobs here in the United States.

And if we really want to help workers, we also need to be confronting rising gas prices so people can afford to get to work. We should remove our self-imposed embargo on domestic energy production, which will make energy more affordable and create more jobs.

These are the policies that Congress should be talking about here today. These are the types of policies that are going to create a strong and growing economy that will provide our workers with the jobs they need to support their families.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today is the wrong approach. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. LEVIN from Michigan will have 3 minutes. I yield to the gentleman.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I think the more we discuss this, the clearer the issue becomes, including the last statement that we heard. There's no disagreement about the need for growth policies. But to say that, and use it as an excuse not to provide extended unemployment benefits is really indefensible.

You can't say to people who have been out of work for 26 weeks, who are there through no fault of their own, and who must be looking for work, that because of the absence of growth policies they should, essentially, be out in the cold. That's close to a cold-blooded approach to this issue.

And, if you mention States like Iowa, look, in some States, if there's a surplus, people who are out of work, in most cases, if they're looking for work, and they must, will find other work.

But it makes no sense to take the position of the administration, and that's what the gentleman from California, essentially, was reflecting, where they say that historically, the unemployment rate has had to be at a certain level in order for Unemployment Compensation to be extended.

And there was, they say, an exception after September 11, 2001. It's really hard to fathom who people would use 2001, September 11, as an excuse not to extend benefits.

The unemployment rate when President Bush signed the extension was 5.7. It's now 5.5. And essentially, what you're saying is we're going to deny benefits to well over a million, with 3 million more likely to come, because of a difference of ¼ of 1 percent.

And then you say you want it to be targeted. But, as we pointed out, the data vary from month to month. One month it's 100 metropolitan areas with unemployment rates over 6 percent. More recently, it's been 65 or 66. It will probably go up. How do you, in good conscience, stand before people in those areas and say no?

I mentioned to the gentleman from Illinois—

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

Mr. LEVIN. I ask for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I asked the gentleman from Illinois how he would respond to people in certain areas. I don't know how you do that.

I asked the gentleman, and I didn't mean to get personal really, but just to raise the issue poignantly. If you're from the State of Washington, as he is, and there's higher unemployment than 6 percent in Yakima, how do you say to the people there, you don't get the extension, while people in other States receive it. It is simply not—

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Is the gentleman yielding time?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Well, I would first point out to my friend from Michigan that I represent the State of Illinois. And under the legislation which we offered in committee, my State of Illinois would receive extended unemployment benefits.

I would also state that the Republican minority on the committee supported extension of unemployment benefits.

Mr. LEVIN. Let me just take back my time. Look, the position, that hasn't been the position of the administration. It's used the 6 percent level. That's what they're talking about here. And you have to go home and explain to the areas, I mentioned three in Illinois, because the State isn't above a certain level, but areas are, you don't get it, while people who are in a State like Michigan with over 6 percent, everybody does.

But the trouble is, everybody counts in this country. Everybody who's out of work 26 weeks, through no fault of their own, and looking for work, they have to be looking for work.

I read these letters from people in Michigan, and I just say this: Just read letters from people in your State. No longer can you go to unemployment offices in most States, because they're not there, so people aren't in line. But they're in line in this country.

As I said, if you're counted—

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

Mr. LEVIN. I guess 1 more minute if I might.

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

Mr. LEVIN. If you counted the people who are now exhausting their benefits, or have, and those who are likely, it would reach, the line, from here, this Capitol to Denver.

So don't talk about energy policy. We have to face up to that. Don't talk about trade policy. We have to face up to that. Talk about the lives in the homes of over a million people.

I just hope that, you withheld, or there were withheld the three votes necessary to get to two-thirds yesterday.

□ 1315

I know the maneuvers on this floor.

But essentially, they're obeying the position, if not the orders, from the White House instead of the orders from the people at home.

I urge strong support of this. I urge that we pass it with even more votes than was passed last time and send it to the Senate so we can get this job done.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would note that the Ways and Means Committee passed a bill on unemployment benefits 8 weeks ago. And for 8 weeks, unemployed workers who've exhausted their unemployment benefits in Michigan and Illinois have gone without unemployment benefits during election-year politics.

Mr. Speaker, as we continue debate, this legislation before us, which includes a radical policy change, eliminating the Federal work requirement to qualify for federally funded unemployment benefits, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I think the American people, the American workers, they're fed up. They're probably fed up with the fact that we have to be here today debating an extension of unemployment compensation, and if we don't do something about the energy crisis in this country, we're going to be back time and time again to talk about extending compensation to unemployed workers because it's going to lead to more and more unemployment.

You know, it is a shame, and I think the American people are starting to say, What is wrong in Washington when America has 496 billion barrels of oil that can be used, but the Democrat leadership in Congress says, No, not one dime for American oil. But they're willing to spend billions upon trillions of dollars to foreign countries for oil.

What is wrong with that picture? It's okay for gas to be maybe at \$5 a gallon by the end of the summer, but no, we can't do anything about building new refineries here. We can't do anything about drilling oil here. We can't do anything about mining coal here, coal gasification.

The energy bill that the Democrats offered was solar, wind, and renewable. Not one dime for oil, not one dime for coal, not one dime for natural gas. You can't put solar in your gas tank. You can't put wind in your gas tank.

Now, I'm wondering how the United Miner Workers feel about the fact that they have a 300-year supply of coal but no help for coal gasification. I wonder how the United Auto Workers feel in Michigan, talking about losing jobs. When GM and Ford are moving as quickly as they can to electric automobiles but the Chinese are buying SUVs as fast as they can get them. There's something wrong with this picture.

And I wonder how the Teamsters feel when their trucks are sitting idly by

not being able to move the goods across this country, out of work because the Democrat Congress—where is the leadership? We need in this country leadership to step forward and say by a date certain, we are going to be energy independent from the Middle East, from Venezuela, and we're going to have our own energy, our own opportunities to create jobs.

Can you imagine the millions of jobs that would be created by building pipelines, by going after our resources? Can you imagine the millions of jobs that the United Mine Workers would have, the United Auto Workers would have, the construction union workers would have? I think the rank and file members of our unions in this country have got to say, What is wrong with these people that we've been supporting all of these years? What are they doing for us now?

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. I think they're starting to ask.

I talked to a group of citizens this morning, and they're wanting to know what is wrong with the Congress; what is wrong with the Democrat leadership; what is wrong with their presumptive nominee for the presidency who says, Yeah, I think this is good that gas is at this all-time high price. I just wish it had come along a little slower.

You know, I think there is going to have to be some answers, and they're going to have to come up fairly soon because the American people are fed up. They're not wanting worker compensation, unemployment compensation. They're wanting jobs, and energy provides jobs.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I walked into the wrong place or not. I thought we were talking about unemployment, but all I hear is a lot of talk about energy. Now, I don't know if the Members on the other side have forgotten what the subject is today or exactly what the problem is, but the fact is that we didn't wait 8 weeks. My ranking member, Mr. WELLER, knows better than that. We voted on May 15 on this issue, and it's sitting over in the Senate. The Senate Republicans have got their foot on it. And the White House hasn't said "boo" to them.

So the Republicans are killing this proposal over there in the Senate. We're going to send it back to them another way. And I think they will have a second chance to think about it. The closer we get to the election, I think the more interested they will get in this issue.

But there's one issue here that I think somehow with the straw man that keeps getting put up here for everybody to look at, this person out there somewhere in Oregon or Illinois that worked for two weeks and is going to get unemployment benefits. We're

not talking about somebody on welfare here. We're talking about somebody who worked.

Now, my opponents on the other side keep sounding like we're talking about the dregs of the earth, people who are just stealing or somehow sneaking in and maneuvering and somehow getting something they're not entitled to. When they worked, their employer put money into the unemployment trust for their benefit.

Some people on the other side believe that we ought to have States' rights. States ought to be able to do stuff. Okay. States write the unemployment laws for their State. And in Illinois, it is true that if you work for two weeks, one week in one quarter and one week in another quarter, and your total wages are \$1,600, so that means you worked one week and got \$800; and then, just lucky, your next week of work was in another quarter, you got \$800, you would be eligible in Illinois for \$51 a week for 26 weeks for a grand total of \$1,326. That comes from a letter from the Department of Employment Security signed by Joseph Mueller, which I will now insert into the RECORD.

ILLINOIS, DEPARTMENT  
OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,  
*Chicago, IL, June 12, 2008.*

Mr. INDIVAR DUTTA-GUPTA,  
*House of Representatives, Committee on Ways  
and Means, Subcommittee on Income Security  
and Family Support, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. DUTTA-GUPTA: With regard to the hypothetical you pose, if worker X worked three weeks in IL, he or she might well not be entitled to any unemployment benefits.

To qualify for unemployment benefits in IL, an individual must have been paid at least \$1600 during his/her "base period," receiving at least \$440 outside the base period quarter in which his/her wages were the highest. Consequently, to qualify, worker X's three weeks of wages would have had to straddle two base period quarters, with at least \$440 being paid in the "low quarter."

Assuming he/she did qualify, worker X's benefit amount would depend upon the amount of wages he/she was paid during his/her base period. A claimant's weekly benefit amount in IL can range from \$51 to \$376.

If worker X just met the \$1,600/\$440 requirement, he/she would be entitled to \$51/wk for up to 26 weeks (a total of \$1,326).

To qualify for what is the current average weekly benefit payment in IL, worker X would have had to receive over \$4700/wk.

As an aside, three weeks' worth of wages would not qualify an individual receiving IL's current minimum wage of \$7.75/hr, even if the payments did straddle two base period quarters.

In conclusion, it would be theoretically possible for an individual with three weeks' worth of base period wages—and 49 weeks with no wages for employment—to qualify for benefits in IL. However, the three weeks would have to fall "just right" and average over \$500/wk. IDES's system does not track the number of weeks individuals work. However, based on anecdotal feedback from program staff, it does not seem this theoretical possibility has been a common occurrence, if it has ever occurred.

You also pose a hypothetical in which worker X works just two weeks. It would be theoretically possible to qualify for benefits with just two weeks' worth of wages. Again,

however, the wages would have to straddle two base period quarters and, in that scenario, average \$800/wk. It seems this has not been a common occurrence either.

Sincerely,

JOSPEH P. MUELLER,  
*Legal Counsel.*

I don't know. Maybe Illinois is a lot easier to live in than Washington State, but getting \$1,326 for 6 months is not exactly a living wage. I mean, anybody who sits at home and waits for their \$51 check and says, Oh great, I'm going to live on \$51 this week. I don't know where they live in Illinois. I don't believe it is in Chicago. Must be way down somewhere in the south end of the State or somewhere. I don't know how you could live on that. To think that that person is a slug who's just sitting there and saying, Well, I have got this \$51 check coming, I don't believe I'm going to go look for work, is implying that that person is not a responsible human being who's been trying to get work and has worked in the past and is getting benefits that they earned to which they are entitled.

Now, if that's the reason the Republicans want to hang it up and not vote for this bill and say we're not going to give those extended benefits because there's one person in Illinois somewhere who worked for 2 weeks and made the minimum benefit and gets 26 weeks of \$51 a week, if that's what you're going to go home and explain on the campaign trail why you didn't extend unemployment benefits to people who had exhausted their benefits, that's going to be real interesting to watch because I don't think the people of Illinois or any other State are going to buy this kind of an argument.

When we asked this question in Oregon, they said it isn't true. There isn't anybody getting benefits like that.

Now, it seems to me that it just comes back to the point that you really don't want to vote for unemployment benefits. I understand it's been the party's policy since 1935. You have never liked it because you thought it weakened people's resolve. That is the talk of somebody who has never been unemployed. If you have lived in a house where somebody has been unemployed and have seen what it does to the family when the father or the mother can't bring home a paycheck, you don't look at those people and say, Well, they're taking something that isn't theirs, when they paid for this benefit into the unemployment trust. They are entitled to this. It would be the same as saying to old people, Well, you're taking that Social Security that was paid into the trust for you, and somehow you're not entitled to it.

We don't do that.

America looks after the weakest. That's how you judge whether a society is really strong or not.

I recognize the Speaker for 1 minute.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his outstanding leadership on this issue. He has been a relentless and persistent advocate for America's working families, for hard

workers in our country who, through no fault of their own, and in large measure because of the poor economic policies of the Bush administration, have lost their job.

Mr. Speaker, it is said, and it's been said directly by George Bernard Shaw, that it is the mark of a truly intelligent person to be moved by statistics. My colleagues have made the case for why we need this unemployment insurance, and I want to address once again, as they have, some of the statistics and see if it is the mark of truly intelligent people to respond to that.

Today we have the opportunity to help 3.8 million Americans who are out of work and their families in large part because of the disastrous economic policies of the White House and the Republicans in Congress.

There are 3.8 million Americans for whom 13 weeks of the unemployment insurance system, a system, as the gentleman indicated, that they have paid for, could mean not losing a home or a job or skipping meals or needed health care. Today we have that opportunity to provide that help.

More statistics.

In the Bush economy, gas prices have skyrocketed to \$4 a gallon. One in ten Americans are at risk of losing their homes, and even more families are seeing the value of their greatest financial assets, their homes, plummet.

More statistics.

On Friday, we received the alarming news that since the beginning of the year, our Nation has lost more than 325,000 jobs, including 49,000 in the month of May alone.

The Nation's unemployment rate has risen to 5.5 percent, the biggest monthly increase since 1986. In two decades, last Friday on that day, it jumped 0.5 percent to 5½ percent.

On that same day, by the way, my colleagues, the price per barrel of oil increased by over \$11 in that 1 day. In the 1990s, in 1998, the price per barrel was that exact same figure, just over \$11. 1998, price per barrel of oil, \$11-plus. Last Friday, price per barrel jumped, increased over \$11 to over \$130 per barrel.

□ 1330

So this is the economic situation in which these families find themselves. They have been hardworking, played by the rules, paid into the system, paid into the system for occasions like this where there's a downturn in the economy, and they lose their jobs through no fault of their own. And the Republicans want to make them look like charity cases.

These are strong people. They are the backbone of America. We have a responsibility to them. And if they are not moved by statistics, as George Bernard Shaw says any intelligent person should be, perhaps you would be moved by their personal stories.

This extension of unemployment benefits will help people like Kathy Henry. She was laid off her job at an advertising company last August. In February, her unemployment benefits ran

out. As she says, "I must have had 100 interviews, and no one wants to hire me." Many times people think the people that are being interviewed for these jobs are overqualified. "An extension of unemployment benefits would give me more time to look for a job," Kathy says.

And Liz Waller of Missouri, she just has 3 weeks of unemployment benefits left. She said, "Absolutely, an extension would make a big difference for me. I'm dying to get back to work." I'm dying to get back to work, "but I've done interview after interview and there are just way too many job candidates out there. I just keep getting told I'm overqualified."

There is a concern on the part of some employers that as people continue to look for work and look for jobs at lower pay, that if they hire them, then they will leave when they can find a job at higher pay with an upturn in the economy.

This isn't about people sitting on their butts back home saying, goody, I'm getting an unemployment check; now I can really look my family in the eye and say I'm providing. These people want to provide for their families. To imply anything else is an insult to these millions of people who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own and, in large measure, because of the Bush administration's failed economic policies.

Let's think about our veterans. This legislation is especially important to our returning military veterans. A recent government report prepared for the Veterans Affairs Department found that young veterans earn less and have a harder time finding work than do civilians in the same age group. The percentage of veterans not in the labor force—because they couldn't find jobs, stopped looking for work because they couldn't find jobs, or went back to school—jumped to 23 percent in 2005 from 10 percent in the year 2000.

Our veterans come home; they can't find work. Some of them need this unemployment insurance, and the Republicans are saying, "Just say no."

Extending unemployment benefits not only helps those who are looking for work, it stimulates the economy. According to the Congressional Budget Office, it is one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to stimulate the economy because the money is spent quickly. For every \$1 spent on unemployment benefits, \$1 spent generates \$1.64 in new economic demand. Stimulates the economy.

All Americans who work pay unemployment insurance, pay into a trust fund for a rainy day. The rainy day is here. Today, across the country and for millions of Americans, that rainy day is here. Congress should ensure that those who paid into the system for the benefits now can receive them, and we can do this by passing this legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, the issue and the debate is not a partisan one. All Americans

are feeling serious and deep economic pain. The people who will benefit from this are Democrats, Republicans, non-partisans, Independents, people who aren't even interested in the political system. Yet, President Bush has issued a veto threat against this legislation, despite the fact that it will help—let's get back to our statistics—3.8 million Americans and, in fact, the entire economy.

And so I get back to our friend George Bernard Shaw. "It is the mark of a truly intelligent person to be moved by statistics."

I thank Chairman McDERMOTT for your important work on this subcommittee, on this legislation. I also want to commend the chairman of the full committee for being a truly intelligent man, moved by statistics, Chairman RANGEL for his relentless work on this important legislation. To Mr. LEVIN as well and to all of the members of the committee, thank you for bringing this important legislation to the floor.

The American people are waiting to see if Congress will act to help them on a matter that is relevant to their economic survival at a difficult time in their lives for money that they paid into the system. I urge my colleagues to vote "aye."

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that I share the Speaker's admiration for Mr. RANGEL and Mr. McDERMOTT. I consider Mr. RANGEL very intelligent, and I enjoy working with Mr. McDERMOTT as well, but I do disagree with the distinguished Speaker on a point that she made.

You know, she was talking about 5.5 percent unemployment, which in my view is too high, but I would note that it seems sometimes the definition of a bad economy is who's in the White House.

In 1996, President Clinton stood before us at the State of the Union in January 1996. Unemployment was at 5.6 percent, higher than it is today. President Clinton said the economy was the healthiest it has been in three decades. Well, today unemployment is lower than it was when President Clinton made that statement.

So, we all agree the economy needs to be improved, but President Clinton would say it's the healthiest in decades, if he were standing again before us based on his definition of a healthy economy.

I would also note, as my good friend from Washington has made the point, that why are we talking about energy. When I talk to the folks back home in Illinois at the local grocery store, at the gas station, and people are commenting about food prices and energy prices, they say that when you have over \$4 gasoline, that's bad for the economy. There's people losing jobs because energy costs are so high.

As we talk about statistics, and the distinguished Speaker referred to statistics, I would note that the approval

rating of the Democrat Congress today is 16 percent. Only 16 percent of the American people think the Democrat majority is doing a good job. Now, historically, that would tell us that today's Congress is the least popular in recorded history.

No Congress has had a lower approval rating than the current Democrat majority. Why? Because since the Democratic majority became the majority in 2007, gasoline prices have gone up \$1.73. Think about that. The Democrat majority has refused to expand the supply of gasoline, has refused to expand the supply of oil. Why? Because they are locking away, under their policies, domestic sources of oil and gasoline, and continuing to make us more dependent on foreign sources of oil, people like Hugo Chavez in Venezuela and sources in the Mideast that we're dependent upon because of the Democrat majority's policies.

Again, there's a reason this Congress is the least popular in recorded history, because gasoline prices have gone up \$1.73 since our Democratic friends gained the majority.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE).

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, for 2 days now, this Congress has addressed a bill to provide increased unemployment benefits. The irony is what we are not talking about.

We must talk about why are businesses leaving America, why are we losing these jobs. The answer is overwhelmingly the cost of energy and our refusal as a Congress to capture our natural resources.

Dow Chemical stood beside us when Representative JOHN PETERSON announced the NEED Act, the bill that lifts the moratorium for natural gas in the Outer Continental Shelf. They told us of a \$30 billion expansion and 10,000 jobs that they wished were here in America, but they were going to China, Libya and Saudi Arabia. Why? The price of natural gas. You can't pay \$8 to \$10 in America for an energy source that's 85 cents in those countries. We all know we lost the fertilizer industry a long time ago.

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. I would be happy to yield 1 additional minute to the gentlelady from Virginia.

Mrs. DRAKE. Think of the jobs that could be created, the jobs that we could keep here just by this industry.

And just yesterday, the subcommittee voted on a 9-6 vote, with the Democrat majority all voting not to allow us to lift the moratorium on the Outer Continental Shelf. In the last 25 years, we've captured 7 billion barrels of oil in the Outer Continental Shelf. Do you realize the spillage has been one one-thousandth of 1 percent?

We also need to talk about those American families, those American workers who have purchased homes where they wanted them to be, not

worried about a commute to their job, but today, for several of those, their gas cost is the same as their mortgage. That impacts business in America.

Mr. Speaker, America is a great Nation because of her people. It's our responsibility to put the policies in place that allow them to have a quality of life and to create the jobs.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I had noted earlier, this Congress, the Democrat majority in the House today, has the lowest level of popularity, lowest level approval in recorded history, 16 percent. Why? Because of actions like today.

This legislation that is before us came out of committee 8 weeks ago. Eight weeks, 2 months, that those who are unemployed have exhausted their benefits and been asking for extended unemployment benefits. We in the Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee said we want to work with our Democrat friends in the majority so we can pass a bill that's bipartisan, provides extend unemployment benefits and, frankly, becomes law.

I would note, there's a publication on Capitol Hill called Congress Daily. It shows that today's exercise is frankly just election-year politics, probably one more reason this Democratic majority has the lowest level of approval in recorded history of any Congress. This Democrat leadership today is quoted as saying, It's not what we had hoped. We'll keep trying. But ultimately this is clearly going to only be possible on the supplemental.

So, ladies and gentlemen, what we're doing today is an election-year exercise, and unfortunately, we've lost 8 weeks, which means that for 8 weeks, unemployed workers who have exhausted their unemployment benefits have had to painfully wait for the action of this Congress. We want to work together in a bipartisan way. We want to pass legislation that will become law, and as my friend on the other side of the aisle knows, this bill isn't going to become law.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to one of the newest Members of the House of Representatives, the distinguished Member from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, why would we want to extend unemployment benefits when we can instead pass legislation that will create more American jobs and lower gas prices at the same time? We can create American jobs by passing legislation to increase the supply of oil by exploring our own natural resources, in places like ANWR and the Outer Continental Shelf. We can create more American jobs by passing legislation to expedite the permitting process to increase refining capacity here in our own country. We can create more American jobs by passing legislation to explore alternative sources of energy.

We can create more American jobs, and not only will these pieces of legislation do that, these pieces of legislation will also reduce unemployment and lead to lower gas prices at the pumps.

Rather than passing a bill that pays unemployment benefits for a year to someone who only worked for 2 weeks, like this legislation does, rather than passing a bill that adds more than \$8.5 billion to the Federal deficit, I call on Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership in Congress to set this bill on the side and bring up our legislation that will increase the supply of American oil, reduce our dependence on Middle Eastern oil and, most importantly, create more American jobs and reduce gas prices.

□ 1345

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, several speakers have suggested that there is plenty of funds in Federal unemployment accounts to support these benefits. Today, those trust funds include \$35 billion, and the Congressional Budget Office suggests this legislation will spend about \$14 billion over the next 2 years.

But that's just the start. This program will run from July through March of 2009; that's 9 months. But once started, such programs have always been extended. The average duration of these temporary programs is about 30 months. Do the math. That's more than three times as long as the legislation before us suggests. So this program could very well wind up costing at least three times as much as the score of this bill says. Three times 14 billion is 42 billion; 42 billion is more than the 35 billion in the current unemployment trust funds.

The last time Congress created a program like this that drained the Federal unemployment accounts in the 1970s, it had to create a temporary surtax that applies to all workers. That temporary surtax still exists today; it is more than 30 years old.

It's important to note, Mr. Speaker, this legislation not only adds to the deficit, but it's going to force a tax increase.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Republican leader of the House, Mr. BOEHNER of Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague from Illinois for yielding and make clear once again that Republicans in the House want to pass a responsible extension of unemployment benefits.

We realize that there are people in America who are hurting, who need help. But the bill that we have before us is an irresponsible bill. And it's irresponsible for two reasons; one, it's not targeted to the States that have high unemployment. It says we're going to extend 13 additional weeks of unemployment in all 50 States regardless of what the unemployment rate is. I'll use the example I used yesterday. Oklahoma has a 2.6 percent unemployment

rate. Why would we need an additional 13 weeks of unemployment in that State? And so it's not targeted to the States that need the help, and it could be targeted.

The second problem is the fact that we reduce—or basically eliminate—the work requirements. Under the current law, you've got to work 20 weeks in order to be entitled to unemployment benefits. Under this bill, you could work as little as 2 weeks and be entitled to up to a year of unemployment benefits. I just think that that's a poor use of our taxpayer funds.

Why aren't they thinking about the hardworking men and women in America, who go to work every day, they pay taxes, they do tough jobs, they have to give part of their money to us so that we can spend it on behalf of the American people to provide services? We should always remember that it's the hardworking people in America that provide the taxpayer funds that we spend. And our job is to spend those funds in a responsible way, and this is not, in my view, a responsible bill.

Republicans want to work with Democrats to pass a responsible extension of unemployment benefits. And we can do it together if we will just sit down and work it out. But we all know this bill is going nowhere. This bill is dead on arrival, the Senate is not going to take it up, it's going nowhere. And so instead of wasting all of this time having this debate about an irresponsible bill, we actually could have legislation on the floor today that allows us to produce more American energy.

I think the American people want us to achieve energy independence, and the only way we're going to get there is to do what I call, "all of the above." We need to conserve more in America. We need biofuels; we need alternative fuels; we need to get serious about nuclear energy; and we need to produce more oil and gas here in the United States instead of depending on some 70 percent of it coming from foreign sources.

But over the course of the last 18 years that I've been a Member of Congress there have been 46 energy votes on the floor of this House that would allow us to produce more American energy. And guess what? Forty-six times I voted to bring more American energy to the market. The Speaker of the House got to vote over those last 18 years on the same 46 votes. Do you know how many times she voted in favor of American energy? Twice.

When it comes to American energy, it's pretty clear what party is in favor of bringing more American energy to the marketplace. Bringing American energy to the marketplace in an environmentally safe way is possible, and we ought to do it in order to achieve energy independence and bring down the price of energy and gasoline in America. It would be far more productive doing that bill on the floor today than doing the bill that we're doing.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. We have no more speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I would note, the legislation before us, as was so eloquently described by the Republican leader of the House, makes some radical changes. For 27 years, Republicans and Democrats have had in place a work rule requirement for federally funded unemployment benefits. It said, to qualify for up to a year, 12 months, you should work 20 weeks. That seems a fair trade off between work and benefits. And this legislation before us, Mr. Speaker, removes that requirement.

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle refer to that concern as just kind of a straw man, it doesn't really matter. Well, why did they do it? Why is there a need to remove a 20-week work requirement to qualify for 12 months or a full year of unemployment benefits? We've had no hearings in committee. No one has explained why they're making this radical change. It just seems to be omitted from the presentations by the majority side of the aisle. So again we ask why. You know, under this policy that they're putting forward, someone would only need to work 2 weeks in a State like Michigan or Illinois and qualify for a full 1 year or 12 months of federally funded unemployment benefits. That's a radical policy change.

And let me just repeat what every Republican has stated: We want to extend unemployment benefits for those workers in hard-hit States who have exhausted their benefits. And we have repeatedly offered to our friends on the other side of the aisle saying we want to get a bill signed into law. Let's set aside election-year politics, let's work together, let's extend benefits for those who have exhausted their benefits another 13, and in some cases, 26 weeks. But we want to work together to get it done, because if we don't, and we just do the usual politics as usual, election-year politics, bring legislation to the floor we know is not going to become law, make speeches, the folks back home are going to be disappointed.

As has been noted by many, this Congress today only enjoys a 16-percent approval rating amongst the people of Illinois, the people of America. That is the lowest approval rating of any Congress in recorded history. Why? Because of the election-year politics that are being practiced today.

So I'm going to again offer to my good friends on the other side of the aisle, people who I am very fond of, people I enjoy working with, we need to work together because people are hurting. We need to work together to help those in our States who are unemployed and who have exhausted their benefits. And because of election-year

politics, unemployed workers in States like Michigan and Illinois, who have exhausted their benefits, have gone without. Why? Because Congress has played election-year politics.

So let's work together. I urge a "no" vote on this legislation because it's not going to become law. I urge a "no" vote so that we work together to solve this challenge and quickly place on the President's desk legislation that will become law that extends unemployment benefits because we support extending unemployment benefits.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have trouble following the logic that you would vote "no" because it isn't going to become law. Why don't you vote "yes" and put it over there, and maybe the Senate this time will come to their senses and do something with this proposal? It's been over there since May 15. And I think that it really is an issue that we ought to give them one more chance to come to their senses.

Now, when you compare the unemployment rate of today with 1996, I really appreciate that because during the Clinton administration there were 20 million new jobs created, and in 1996, they were creating hundreds of thousands of jobs per month. In this administration, over the last 5 months we've lost a quarter of a million jobs. This is a totally different time.

There are huge problems out there, and they're not getting any better. And they're not going to get solved here today by, "let's open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to drilling." Even if we did that, the oil wouldn't be here for about 4 years, and a lot of people on unemployment would be pretty hungry waiting for that job in the oil industry 4 years from now.

Mr. Speaker, the American people should only have one question in their minds today: How bad does it have to get before the President and the Republican leadership decide to join the Democrats in extending a helping hand for unemployment benefits? The revised data released by the Labor Department today shows things are even worse than we thought. Now the decision is up to us.

I introduced this legislation and invited my friend and colleague, Republican Representative PHIL ENGLISH, to join me because helping the American people to survive during tough economic times should not be a partisan issue. People say it has become a partisan issue here. Well, yeah, the White House has made it a partisan issue. They've said there's no problem, and they will not sign a bill that we craft. They've made their mind up before they even have a chance to look at it.

But too many others on the other side have made it just that. The American people woke up this morning to some bad economic news, and our efforts to help them were derailed by the Republican obstructionists. Those

headlines, "Republicans kill extended unemployment benefits," you're going to have another set if you're not careful.

We talked a lot yesterday and today about unemployment rates exceeding 6 or 7 percent in several parts of the country, and the devastating impact of those rates. Now, I confess I'm not an economist—I know that's no surprise—but let me predict that the unemployment rate among House Republican Members will go a whole lot higher than 7 percent if they continue to refuse to help the American people in this growing economic crisis.

It's called the Emergency Extended Unemployment Insurance Act of 2008 because it is an emergency, and the time to act is right now.

A vote for H.R. 5749 is a vote to help the American people and the American economy.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, democrats in Congress have pushed to extend unemployment benefits since the beginning of the year, as the economy weakened, but have faced continued resistance from the Bush Administration. Nobody can argue that our economy is struggling. For five consecutive months, the U.S. economy has lost jobs, totaling 324,000. Over the last year, the number of unemployed workers has grown by 1.6 million. The number of people looking for work climbed to 8.5 million in May. Nearly 1 in 5 jobless workers (1.6 million) is long-term unemployed (jobless for more than 26 weeks). There are 200,000 more long-term jobless Americans now than when President Bush signed the last extension of unemployment benefits into law in 2002.

The airline industry has eliminated 22,000 jobs so far this year, more than in all of 2007, most recently at Continental (3,000 jobs) and United (up to 1,600 jobs), and the automobile industry continues to face job cuts, leading industries with announced layoffs in May with over 30,000.

In May, we had the biggest one-month jump in the unemployment rate in two decades. The unemployment rate surged to 5.5 percent from 5.0 percent—the biggest one-month jump in more than two decades (since February 1986) and climbing to the highest level in nearly four years (October 2004). The unemployment rate is now a full percentage point higher than a year ago. Families can wait no longer, and neither will this Congress.

Today, the House will take up H.R. 5749, the Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act:

To immediately provide up to 13 weeks of extended unemployment benefits in every state to workers exhausting the 26 weeks of regular unemployment benefits.

In states with higher levels of unemployment (six percent or higher), an additional 13 weeks would be available, for a total of 26 weeks of extended benefits.

Relief would run through March 2009.

The bill would provide much-needed relief to 3.8 million unemployed workers to assist them with rapidly rising gas and food costs, while they continue to struggle to find work in the slowing economy.

Federal unemployment trust funds, which have more than enough reserves to cover the cost, will finance these benefits.

In Texas, this bill would help 160,239 unemployed workers. Extending these benefits is one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to stimulate the economy because the money is spent quickly. According to the Congressional Budget Office, every \$1 spent on unemployment benefits generates \$1.64 in new economic demand. This bill costs \$11 billion over 10 years, or 1.1 billion per year. That is approximately 3 days in Iraq.

I commend my colleagues, Congressman McDERMOTT and Congressman ENGLISH for introducing this bill and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5749, Emergency Extended Unemployment Act of 2008, introduced by my distinguished colleague Representative McDERMOTT. This important legislation will provide much-needed relief to 3.8 million unemployed workers who are besieged to cope with rapidly rising gas and food costs, while they continue to struggle to find work in the slowing economy.

Democrats in Congress have pushed to extend unemployment benefits since the beginning of the year, as the economy weakened, but have faced continued resistance from the Bush Administration. Today, the House will take up H.R. 5749, the Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act on the suspension calendar. The legislation would immediately provide up to 13 weeks of extended unemployment benefits in every state to workers who have exhausted the 26 weeks of regular unemployment benefits. For states with especially high unemployment rates, an additional 13 weeks would be offered, bringing the total to 26 weeks of extended benefits.

The need for action is clear. For the fifth straight month, the economy lost jobs and unemployment rose from 5.0 percent in April to 5.5 percent in May, with 49,000 jobs lost in May alone. The economy has lost nearly 325,000 jobs this year and 3.8 million Americans are unemployed. These grim statistics are yet another signal that the Bush Administration's economic policies have failed the American people. Americans are now facing higher costs for basic necessities, unemployment is up, millions of families have lost their homes or value in their homes due to the housing crisis, and 7 million more Americans are uninsured.

Extending unemployment benefits is one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to stimulate the economy because the money is spent quickly, according to the Congressional Budget Office. Every \$1 spent on unemployment benefits generates \$1.64 in new economic demand. Unfortunately, President Bush and some Republicans oppose our effort to help unemployed workers and to get our economy moving again. Instead, they want more of the same.

Middle class families can't afford four more years of the kind of policies that have weakened our economy and left hundreds of thousands of Americans looking for work and struggling to make ends meet. We hope the President and his Republican allies will change course and work with us to assist unemployed workers. Today, gas prices hit an average of \$4.05 per gallon, a new historic high. The price of a barrel of oil increased more on Friday, in one single day, than a barrel cost a decade ago, before George W. Bush became President. Even in the face of

these record increases, Senate Republicans blocked consideration of the Renewable Energy and Job Creation Act of 2008. The Renewable Energy and Job Creation Act of 2008 passed the House, and would retain and create hundreds of thousands of green energy jobs. Experts estimate biofuel blends are keeping gas prices about 15 percent lower than they otherwise would be now—and the energy law increases our commitment to these and other American-grown biofuels.

While Democrats are taking action to lessen our dependence on foreign oil and lower prices, Republicans continue to repeat the same old rhetoric: continued calling for drilling in ANWR, even though the Department of Energy has concluded that opening up the Arctic for drilling would not reduce the price of a gallon of gasoline until 20 years from now—and then only by about 1 penny. Since 2000, drilling has increased dramatically—climbing about 66 percent—while gas prices continue to increase. Additionally, the federal government has already opened up leases to 68 million acres of federal land that oil companies aren't even tapping.

From day one, the New Direction Congress has been fighting to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, bring down record gas prices, and launch a cleaner, smarter energy future for America that lowers costs and creates hundreds of thousands of green jobs. Democrats in Congress have already taken action to bring down the price of gas, passing legislation to suspend the filling of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, SPR, starting June 30th and going through the end of the year. The House also approved the Gas Price Relief for Consumers Act of 2008. The legislation gives U.S. authorities the ability to prosecute anticompetitive conduct committed by international cartels like OPEC that restricts supply and drives up prices. The House also continues to build on the work of the Energy Independence and Security Act which will transition the American economy to more efficient vehicles and reduce our dependence on foreign fuels.

I am proud to support this important legislation that will address the economic needs of the American people, and I urge my colleagues to join in so doing.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this urgently needed legislation.

The latest statistics, show that the national unemployment rate has risen from 5 percent to 5.5 percent, the biggest increase in a single month in over 20 years, and now is at the highest level in nearly four years.

The economy has been slowing and has been losing jobs for at least five months. In May the number of people looking for work reached 8.5 million—and nearly one in five has been unemployed for more than 26 weeks.

Colorado has not been as hard hit as some other States, but we are not immune. For example, Denver will be affected by United Airlines' discontinuing its low-fare "Ted" carrier as well by layoffs by other airlines and companies in other sectors.

And, in the Nation as a whole the number of long-term unemployed Americans is higher now than when Congress last extended unemployment benefits in 2002.

This legislation will respond to that problem by immediately providing up to 13 weeks of extended unemployment benefits in every

state to workers exhausting the 26 weeks of regular unemployment benefits. In addition, another 13 weeks of extended benefits will be available in States with unemployment rates of six percent or higher. According to the Congressional Budget Office, this will help some 3.8 million Americans.

And by helping them, we help the country—because extending unemployment compensation benefits is one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to stimulate the economy. In fact, an estimate by an independent expert—the chief economist of Moody's Economy.com—indicates that each dollar of unemployment benefits generates \$1.64 in new economic demand, while the existing federal unemployment trust funds have more than enough reserves to cover the cost.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this legislation deserves prompt approval. In fact, I think it should have been passed yesterday—and would have been if just 3 more of our Republican colleagues had voted for it then, when we considered it under a procedure that required a two-thirds majority for passage.

But even a day late, we still have an opportunity to do the right thing, so I urge its approval by the House.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support today's legislation to extend unemployment benefits at a time of economic hardship for families in Oregon and across the country. There are currently over 106,000 unemployed workers in Oregon and as many as 3.8 million nationally who are struggling with the rising cost of food and fuel.

Today's legislation will immediately provide up to 13 weeks of extended unemployment benefits in every state to workers exhausting their 26 weeks of regular unemployment benefits. In states with levels of unemployment at 6 percent or higher, an additional 13 weeks would be available for a total of 26 weeks of extended benefits.

In my home state of Oregon, our economy has weakened but remained at the relative national average of 5.5 percent. However, that is an unemployment rate 0.5 percent higher than this time last year. Although Oregonians would not qualify at this time for the second extension of benefits, it gives me peace of mind to know that safety nets are in place if the Oregon economy gets bleaker. Many in Oregon well remember the downturn in 2003 when during the summer the unemployment exceeded 8.5 percent, the highest in the country.

During major economic slowdowns, unemployed workers are the hardest hit. Not only do they suffer a loss of wages, but they face a tighter job market in which to return. Extending these workers' benefits is not only morally correct; it is also good for our ailing economy. The Congressional Budget office estimates that every \$1 spent on unemployment benefits generates \$1.64 in new economic demand.

I am pleased that Democrats have moved quickly to pass this benefits extension for the workers who need it most. I hope that the Senate will move quickly and the President will refrain from vetoing this legislation so that American families can get the help they need.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1265, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. WELLER OF ILLINOIS

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. In its current form I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Weller of Illinois moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5749 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendments:

In section 2(a), strike "Any State which desires to do so" and insert "Any State whose average rate of total unemployment equals or exceeds 5.0 percent or equals or exceeds 120 percent of the average rate of total unemployment in such State for the corresponding period in the preceding calendar year (as determined by the Secretary of Labor in a manner based on clause (i) or (ii) of section 203(f)(1)(A) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970, as the case may be)".

Strike paragraph (2) of section 2(d) and insert the following:

(2) the terms and conditions of the State law which apply to claims for regular compensation and to the payment thereof shall apply to claims for emergency unemployment compensation and the payment thereof, except—

(A) that an individual shall not be eligible for emergency unemployment compensation under this Act unless, in the base period with respect to which the individual exhausted all rights to regular compensation under the State law, the individual had 20 weeks of full-time insured employment or the equivalent in insured wages, as determined under the provisions of the State law implementing section 202(a)(5) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note); and

(B) where otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or with the regulations or operating instructions of the Secretary promulgated to carry out this Act; and

At the end of section 3, add the following:

(d) TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDIES TO ASSIST THOSE RETURNING TO WORK.—

(1) APPLICABILITY.—This subsection applies in the case of any individual who becomes reemployed for at least one full week after an account under this section is established for such individual but before such individual has exhausted such individual's rights under this Act (including the right to have such account augmented under subsection (c), if applicable).

(2) ELIGIBILITY FOR TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY.—In order to subsidize transportation expenses associated with returning to work, an individual described in paragraph (1) shall, for purposes of any determination of rights under this Act, be entitled to have such individual's first full week of reemployment (as referred to in paragraph (1)) treated in the same manner as if it were a week during which such individual had remained unemployed and had satisfied the work search and other requirements for receiving emergency unemployment compensation (other than filing a claim).

Mr. WELLER of Illinois (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

□ 1400

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit supports extension of unemployment benefits for long-term unemployed, those who have exhausted their unemployment benefits. And this motion to recommit makes three simple changes to the legislation before us. It adds a requirement of 20 weeks of work for workers to qualify for the extended unemployment benefits. It targets benefits to high unemployment States, and it provides additional money to many of the newly hired individuals to help them deal with the high price of gasoline.

I particularly want to thank my colleagues, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BILIRAKIS and others for the help that they have given in crafting this motion to recommit as we work towards extension of unemployment benefits to those who need help.

First, I would note that this motion reinserts the current law requirement that workers who qualify for Federal extended unemployment benefits must have worked at least 20 weeks before being laid off. This requirement was removed by the majority with the underlying legislation.

This commonsense Federal requirement has been in place since 1981 and was included in the temporary extended benefits program Congress created in 2002, our last extended benefit program.

Nearly every Democrat Member voted for that bill then, and as we have discussed on this floor for the last 2 days, there is no good reason, there is no argument that has been made by the other side to impose the reestablishment of this long-standing Federal policy now.

Second, this motion would specify that only individuals in States with unemployment rates above 5 percent or that have seen a sharp rise in unemployment would be eligible for 13 weeks of Federal extended benefits. As under H.R. 5749, individuals in States with unemployment rates above 6 percent would be eligible for up to 26 weeks of Federal extended benefits.

Today, 22 States have unemployment rates above 5 percent or have seen a sharp rise in rates, including six States above 6 percent. So workers in nearly half of the States would be eligible for extended benefits, which could rise, or more would be eligible if States experience a rise in unemployment rates.

In contrast with H.R. 5749, this motion would not extend benefits in States that currently have unemploy-

ment rates below 5 percent, and I would note that 5 percent is low by historical standards, and that have not been experiencing rising rates. They will continue to be eligible for their basic 26 weeks of unemployment benefits. So I would note that they will continue to have unemployment benefits available to laid-off workers.

Moreover, by targeting benefits to where they are needed most, this motion actually reduces the cost of the bill, reduces the deficit, and makes it much more fiscally responsible than the untargeted, unpaid-for, "in violation of the House rules" legislation that has been offered by the majority.

And third, we all know that every American family is struggling with record gasoline prices. That struggle is especially pronounced for unemployed workers and in particular the long-term unemployed. Those who return to work, however, may face high commuting costs, starting with the high price of gas they must put in their tanks to get to a new job.

And I would note that this Democratic Congress, which is the least popular Congress in recorded history because of its lack of action on energy, has refused to allow for increases in domestically produced fuels which we need to help our economy.

In fact, it is the Democrat policies in the last year and a half since January 2007 which are responsible for an increase in gasoline prices of \$1.73, basically a doubling of gasoline prices since our Democratic friends gained the majority. That's why gasoline prices are over \$4.

We want to help American workers. And that is why we are offering help to alleviate the high price of gasoline for unemployed individuals. This motion would provide 1 extra week of extended unemployment benefits for those who return to work without exhausting their extended benefits. On average, this would mean an extra \$290 per eligible worker. So for an unemployed mother who goes back to work with two children, that could mean up to four tanks of gasoline at today's \$4 gasoline prices, probably enough to get her to and from her first full month on the job. Especially for someone who might not have much money left after a long spell of unemployment, that is real relief where today it is desperately needed, at the pump and in the pocketbook.

Mr. Speaker, this motion provides timely, targeted and temporary assistance, something the Speaker herself called for earlier this year. So we talked about boosting the economy. I urge its adoption so we can send this bill to the Senate and down to the White House as soon as possible. As the President said, he will veto the underlying bill. Passage of this motion to recommit will give us a bill the President will sign, and it will become law, and we can help unemployed workers.

I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I am kind of appalled. I didn't think they could write a motion to recommit that would be worse than already their public stance is. But this motion to recommit would deny extended unemployment benefits to long-term jobless workers in 31 States. As you know, Mr. Speaker, some Members may be in their offices. They ought to listen to the list.

Alabama gets nothing. Arizona gets nothing. Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts is gone too. Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, New Mexico. Why, it goes on and on. North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Vermont. The way they have written this, those States get nothing. They don't even get 13 weeks. Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming. None of them get a single benefit from this bill if that amendment is adopted.

Now let's just talk for a second here about what we are talking about. New Jersey. Atlantic City has an unemployment rate of 6.1 percent right now. But since they are in the State of New Jersey where the unemployment rate is only 4 percent, in Atlantic City, people are tough out of luck. They aren't going to get a single benefit. Or if they live in Ocean City where it is 6.6 percent, or they live in Vineland, Millville or Bridgeton where it is 7.1 percent, not a single penny goes to those people because they live in a State where it is only 4 percent.

Now I would like to see the community meeting that the Members go to when they explain to people that they voted "no" on giving extended benefits to people who have unemployment benefits and have exhausted them in these States. This makes it much worse than the bill we have. It clearly confirms that the Republicans really want to give unemployment benefits to no one.

Now as to the question of whether or not we have given a reason, we took the 20-week provision out for a very simple reason, because it denies benefits to 10 percent of the people who are presently in our workforce. These are benefits they earned by having money taken out of their paycheck. Their employer said, "I am not going to give you this. I am going to put this in the unemployment fund." That is how it works.

So those employees that had that money being put in there and now they lose their benefits because of the fact that they have worked 10 months and they didn't get to the right place in the right time to get their 20 weeks, it is simply a denial of benefits to women, to low-wage workers and to minorities. It is basically people at the bottom of the economic rungs. And the Republicans are pleased to do that. Not only do they take it away from them, but they also take it away from 31 States.

I urge the Members to think about the election when they vote "no" on this amendment.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I do not support the minority's effort to weaken the impact of extended unemployment benefits for Americans. In this economic downturn, our workers should be able to receive the same 13-week extension granted to workers exhausting the regular 26 weeks of unemployment benefits in other states.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, since January 2001, only 5.3 million jobs have been created nationwide. In Arizona, an average of 1,470 jobs have been lost each month for the past 6 months. Only 389,700 new jobs have been created since January 2001—or 4,480 new jobs per month—as compared with a total of 691,700 new jobs during the previous decade—or 7,950 per month.

This year, Arizona's job losses have been concentrated in construction and housing-related industries, including real estate and finance, but they are beginning to appear across a wide range of industries as this economic decline continues. I support the benefits provided by H.R. 5749 because according to the Congressional Budget Office, they are a cost-effective and fast-acting means of stimulating the economy. Every \$1 spent on unemployment benefits generates \$1.64 in new economic demand.

I will vote "yea" on final passage of H.R. 574 the Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act, and do not support the minority's efforts to undermine effective economic relief for Arizonans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on the question of passage, and the motion to suspend the rules on S. 2146.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 170, nays 243, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

YEAS—170

Aderholt	Blackburn	Buchanan
Akin	Blunt	Burton (IN)
Alexander	Boehner	Calvert
Bachmann	Bonner	Camp (MI)
Bachus	Bono Mack	Campbell (CA)
Barrett (SC)	Boozman	Cannon
Bartlett (MD)	Boustany	Cantor
Barton (TX)	Brady (TX)	Carter
Biggart	Brown (GA)	Chabot
Bilbray	Brown (SC)	Coble
Bilirakis	Brown-Waite,	Cole (OK)
Bishop (UT)	Ginny	Conaway

Crenshaw	Kingston	Rehberg
Cubin	Kirk	Reichert
Culberson	Kline (MN)	Renzi
Davis (KY)	Knollenberg	Reynolds
Davis, David	Kuhl (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Deal (GA)	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Latham	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart, M.	LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen
Doolittle	Latta	Roskam
Drake	Lewis (CA)	Royce
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Ryan (WI)
Duncan	Linder	Sali
Ehlers	Lucas	Saxton
Emerson	Lungren, Daniel	Scalise
Everett	E.	Schmidt
Fallin	Mack	Sensenbrenner
Feeney	Manzullo	Sessions
Forbes	Marchant	Shadegg
Fortenberry	McCarthy (CA)	Shays
Fossella	McCaul (TX)	Shimkus
Fox	McCotter	Simpson
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Smith (NE)
Frelinghuysen	McIntyre	Smith (TX)
Gallely	McKeon	Souder
Garrett (NJ)	McMorris	Stearns
Giffords	Rodgers	Sullivan
Gingrey	McNerney	Terry
Gohmert	Mica	Thornberry
Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Tiahrt
Granger	Miller (MI)	Tiberi
Graves	Miller, Gary	Turner
Hall (TX)	Musgrave	Upton
Hastings (WA)	Myrick	Walberg
Hayes	Neugebauer	Walden (OR)
Heller	Nunes	Wamp
Hensarling	Pence	Weldon (FL)
Herger	Peterson (PA)	Weller
Hobson	Petri	Westmoreland
Hoekstra	Pickering	Whitfield (KY)
Hunter	Pitts	Wilson (NM)
Inglis (SC)	Poe	Wilson (SC)
Issa	Price (GA)	Wittman (VA)
Johnson, Sam	Putnam	Wolf
Jordan	Radanovich	Young (AK)
Keller	Ramstad	Young (FL)
King (NY)	Regula	

NAYS—243

Abercrombie	Cummings	Inslee
Ackerman	Davis (AL)	Israel
Allen	Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)
Altmire	Davis (IL)	Jackson-Lee
Andrews	Davis, Lincoln	(TX)
Arcuri	DeFazio	Jefferson
Baca	DeGette	Johnson (GA)
Baird	DeLauro	Johnson (IL)
Baldwin	Dent	Johnson, E. B.
Barrow	Dicks	Jones (NC)
Bean	Dingell	Jones (OH)
Becerra	Doggett	Kagen
Berkley	Donnelly	Kanjorski
Berman	Doyle	Kaptur
Berry	Edwards	Kennedy
Bishop (GA)	Ellison	Kildee
Bishop (NY)	Ellsworth	Kilpatrick
Blumenauer	Emanuel	King (IA)
Boren	Engel	Klein (FL)
Boswell	English (PA)	Kucinich
Boucher	Eshoo	Lampson
Boyd (FL)	Etheridge	Langevin
Boyd (KS)	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Larson (CT)
Brown, Corrine	Filner	Lee
Butterfield	Foster	Levin
Capito	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)
Capps	Gerlach	Lipinski
Capuano	Gilchrest	LoBiondo
Cardoza	Gillibrand	Lofgren, Zoe
Carnahan	Goode	Lowe
Carney	Gordon	Lynch
Carson	Green, Al	Mahoney (FL)
Castle	Green, Gene	Maloney (NY)
Castor	Grijalva	Markey
Cazayoux	Gutierrez	Marshall
Chandler	Hall (NY)	Matheson
Childers	Hare	Matsui
Clarke	Harman	McCarthy (NY)
Clay	Hastings (FL)	McCollum (MN)
Cleaver	Herse	McDermott
Clyburn	Hill	McGovern
Cohen	Hinchey	McHugh
Congers	Hirono	McNulty
Cooper	Hodes	Meek (FL)
Costa	Holden	Meeks (NY)
Costello	Holt	Melancon
Courtney	Honda	Michaud
Cramer	Hoolley	Miller (NC)
Crowley	Hoyer	Miller, George
Cuellar		Mitchell

Mollohan	Ross	Stark	Boyd (KS)	Hodes	Petri	Crenshaw	Kingston	Radanovich
Moore (KS)	Rothman	Stupak	Brady (PA)	Hoekstra	Platts	Cubin	Kirk	Rehberg
Moore (WI)	Roybal-Allard	Sutton	Brown, Corrine	Holden	Pomeroy	Culberson	Klaine (MN)	Renzi
Moran (VA)	Ruppersberger	Tanner	Buchanan	Holt	Porter	Davis (KY)	Lamborn	Reynolds
Murphy (CT)	Ryan (OH)	Tauscher	Butterfield	Honda	Price (NC)	Davis, David	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Murphy, Patrick	Salazar	Taylor	Camp (MI)	Hooley	Rahall	Deal (GA)	Latta	Rohrabacher
Murphy, Tim	Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (CA)	Capito	Hoyer	Ramstad	Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Roskam
Murtha	T.	Thompson (MS)	Capps	Inslee	Rangel	Drake	Lewis (KY)	Royce
Nadler	Sanchez, Loretta	Tierney	Capuano	Israel	Regula	Dreier	Linder	Sali
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Towns	Jackson (IL)	Jackson (IL)	Reichert	Duncan	Lucas	Saxton
Neal (MA)	Schakowsky	Tsongas	Jackson-Lee	Jackson-Lee	Reyes	Everett	Lungren, Daniel	Scalise
Oberstar	Schiff	Udall (CO)	(TX)	(TX)	Richardson	Fallin	E.	Sensenbrenner
Obey	Schwartz	Udall (NM)	Carson	Jefferson	Rodriguez	Feeney	Mack	Sessions
Olver	Scott (GA)	Van Hollen	Castle	Johnson (GA)	Forbes	Forbes	Manzullo	Shadegg
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Velázquez	Castor	Johnson (IL)	Fortenberry	Marchant	Shimkus	Shuster
Pascrell	Serrano	Visclosky	Cazayoux	Johnson, E. B.	Fox	McCarthy (CA)	Shuster	Simpson
Pastor	Sestak	Walsh (NY)	Chabot	Jones (NC)	Franks (AZ)	McCauley (TX)	Simpson	Smith (NE)
Payne	Shea-Porter	Walz (MN)	Chandler	Jones (OH)	Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Smith (TX)	Stearns
Pearce	Sherman	Wasserman	Childers	Kagen	Gallegly	McMorris	Smith (TX)	Sullivan
Pelosi	Shuler	Schultz	Clarke	Kanjorski	Garrett (NJ)	Rodgers	Stearns	Terry
Perlmutter	Shuster	Waters	Clay	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)	Gingrey	Sullivan	Thornberry
Peterson (MN)	Sires	Watson	Cleaver	Kennedy	Ryan (WI)	Gohmert	Terry	Tiahrt
Platts	Skelton	Watt	Clyburn	Kildee	Salazar	Miller (FL)	Tiahrt	Walden (OR)
Pomeroy	Slaughter	Waxman	Cohen	Kilpatrick	Sánchez, Linda	Miller, Gary	Wamp	Weldon (FL)
Porter	Smith (NJ)	Weiner	Conyers	King (NY)	T.	Murphy, Tim	Weller	Westmoreland
Price (NC)	Smith (WA)	Welch (VT)	Cooper	King (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta	Musgrave	Weldon (OR)	Whitfield (KY)
Rahall	Snyder	Wexler	Cooper	Klein (FL)	Sarbanes	Myrick	Wolfe	Wilson (NM)
Rangel	Solis	Wilson (OH)	Costa	Knollenberg	Schakowsky	Hensarling	Wolf	Wilson (SC)
Reyes	Space	Woolsey	Costello	Kucinich	Schiff	Herger	Young (FL)	Wolfe
Richardson	Speier	Wu	Courtney	Kuhl (NY)	Hobson	Pearce	Young (FL)	Wolfe
Rodriguez	Spratt	Yarmuth	Cramer	Lampson	Hunter	Pence		
			Crowley	Langevin	Schwartz	Inglis (SC)		
			Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Scott (GA)	Pickering		
			Cummings	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)	Pitts		
			Davis (AL)	Larson (CT)	Serrano	Jordan		
			Davis (CA)	LaTourette	Sestak	Keller		
			Davis (IL)	Lee	Shays	King (IA)		
			Davis, Lincoln	Levin	Shea-Porter			
			DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Sherman			
			DeGette	Lipinski	Shuler			
			Delahunt	LoBiondo	Sires			
			DeLauro	Lofgren, Zoe	Skelton			
			Dent	Lynch	Slaughter			
			Diaz-Balart, L.	Mahoney (FL)	Smith (NJ)			
			Diaz-Balart, M.	Maloney (NY)	Smith (WA)			
			Dicks	Markey	Snyder			
			Dingell	Marshall	Solis			
			Doggett	Matheson	Souder			
			Donnelly	Matsui	Space			
			Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Spratt			
			Edwards	McCollum (MN)	Stark			
			Ehlers	McCotter	Stupak			
			Ellison	McDermott	Sutton			
			Ellsworth	McGovern	Tanner			
			Emanuel	McHenry	Tauscher			
			Emerson	McHugh	Taylor			
			Engel	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)			
			English (PA)	McNerney	Thompson (MS)			
			Eshoo	McNulty	Tiberi			
			Etheridge	Meek (FL)	Tierney			
			Farr	Meeks (NY)	Towns			
			Fattah	Melancon	Tsongas			
			Filner	Michaud	Turner			
			Fossella	Miller (MI)	Udall (CO)			
			Foster	Miller (NC)	Udall (NM)			
			Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Upton			
			Gerlach	Mitchell	Van Hollen			
			Giffords	Mollohan	Velázquez			
			Gilchrest	Moore (KS)	Visclosky			
			Gillibrand	Moore (WI)	Walberg			
			Goode	Moran (VA)	Walsh (NY)			
			Gordon	Murphy (CT)	Walsh (MN)			
			Graves	Murphy, Patrick	Walz (MN)			
			Green, Al	Murtha	Wasserman			
			Green, Gene	Nadler	Schultz			
			Grijalva	Napolitano	Waters			
			Gutierrez	Neal (MA)	Watson			
			Hall (NY)	Oberstar	Watt			
			Hare	Obey	Waxman			
			Harman	Olver	Weiner			
			Hastings (FL)	Pallone	Welch (VT)			
			Hayes	Pascrell	Wexler			
			Heller	Pastor	Wilson (OH)			
			Herseth Sandlin	Payne	Woolsey			
			Hill	Pelosi	Wu			
			Hinchee	Perlmutter	Yarmuth			
			Hirono	Peterson (MN)	Young (AK)			

NOT VOTING—21

Braley (IA)	Higgins	Moran (KS)
Burgess	Hinojosa	Ortiz
Buyer	Hulshof	Paul
Davis, Tom	Kind	Pryce (OH)
Ferguson	LaHood	Rogers (MI)
Flake	Loeb sack	Rush
Gonzalez	McCrery	Tancredo

□ 1432

Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, DEFAZIO, CLYBURN, GERLACH, MURPHY of Connecticut, MITCHELL, FILNER, HODES, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Messrs. PORTER, PLATTS, JOHNSON of Illinois, KING of Iowa, JOHNSON of Georgia and SHUSTER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. BOOZMAN, SIMPSON, POE and REYNOLDS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, today I intended to vote "no" on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 5749, the Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act, vote No. 411. Despite my efforts to ensure that my vote was recorded as "no," it was recorded as "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. 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 274, nays 137, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]

YEAS—274

Abercrombie	Baird	Bishop (GA)
Ackerman	Baldwin	Bishop (NY)
Allen	Barrow	Blumenauer
Altmire	Bean	Boren
Andrews	Becerra	Boswell
Arcuri	Berkley	Boucher
Baca	Berry	Boyd (FL)

Davis (CA)	Davis (IL)	Davis, Lincoln	DeFazio	DeGette	Delahunt	DeLauro	Dent	Diaz-Balart, L.	Diaz-Balart, M.	Dicks	Dingell	Doggett	Donnelly	Doyle	Edwards	Ehlers	Ellison	Ellsworth	Emanuel	Emerson	Engel	English (PA)	Eshoo	Etheridge	Farr	Fattah	Filner	Fossella	Foster	Frank (MA)	Gerlach	Giffords	Gilchrest	Gillibrand	Goode	Gordon	Graves	Green, Al	Green, Gene	Grijalva	Gutierrez	Hall (NY)	Hare	Harman	Hastings (FL)	Hayes	Heller	Herseth Sandlin	Hill	Hinchee	Hirono
------------	------------	----------------	---------	---------	----------	---------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-------	---------	---------	----------	-------	---------	--------	---------	-----------	---------	---------	-------	--------------	-------	-----------	------	--------	--------	----------	--------	------------	---------	----------	-----------	------------	-------	--------	--------	-----------	-------------	----------	-----------	-----------	------	--------	---------------	-------	--------	-----------------	------	---------	--------

NAYS—137

Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Brown-Waite,
Akin	Blackburn	Ginny
Alexander	Blunt	Burton (IN)
Bachmann	Boehner	Calvert
Bachus	Bonner	Campbell (CA)
Bartlett (SC)	Bono Mack	Cannon
Bartlett (MD)	Boozman	Cantor
Barton (TX)	Boustany	Carter
Biggert	Brady (TX)	Coble
Bilbray	Brown (GA)	Cole (OK)
Bilirakis	Brown (SC)	Conaway

Kingston	Kirk	Klaine (MN)	Lamborn	Latham	Latta	Lewis (CA)	Lewis (KY)	Linder	Lucas	Lungren, Daniel	Everett	Fallin	Feeney	Forbes	Fortenberry	Fox	Franks (AZ)	Frelinghuysen	Gallegly	Garrett (NJ)	Gingrey	Gohmert	Goodlatte	Granger	Hall (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Hensarling	Herger	Hobson	Hunter	Inglis (SC)	Issa	Johnson, Sam	Jordan	Keller	King (IA)
----------	------	-------------	---------	--------	-------	------------	------------	--------	-------	-----------------	---------	--------	--------	--------	-------------	-----	-------------	---------------	----------	--------------	---------	---------	-----------	---------	-----------	---------------	------------	--------	--------	--------	-------------	------	--------------	--------	--------	-----------

NOT VOTING—23

Berman	Higgins	Ortiz
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Paul
Burgess	Hulshof	Pryce (OH)
Buyer	Kind	Rogers (MI)
Davis, Tom	LaHood	Rush
Ferguson	Loeb sack	Speier
Flake	McCrery	Tancredo
Gonzalez	Moran (KS)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1439

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my support for H.R. 5749, the Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2008. I am not able to cast my vote today. However, as a co-sponsor of this bill if I had been present, I would have voted "yea" on final passage of H.R. 5749.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 412, H.R. 5749, to provide for a program of emergency unemployment compensation, I was mistakenly recorded as voting "no." I should have been recorded as voting "yea" on final passage. I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 5749.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 412, I was speaking with a constituent right off the floor and by the time I realized a second vote was called, I was too late to cast my vote in favor of this important legislation. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT DIESEL EMISSION REDUCTION SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2146, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2146, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 0, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 413]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie	Costello	Herseth Sandlin
Aderholt	Courtney	Hill
Akin	Cramer	Hinchee
Alexander	Crenshaw	Hirono
Allen	Crowley	Hobson
Altmire	Cuellar	Hodes
Andrews	Culberson	Hoekstra
Arcuri	Cummings	Holden
Baca	Davis (AL)	Holt
Bachmann	Davis (CA)	Honda
Bachus	Davis (IL)	Hooley
Baird	Davis (KY)	Hoyer
Baldwin	Davis, David	Hunter
Barrett (SC)	Davis, Lincoln	Inglis (SC)
Barrow	Deal (GA)	Inslee
Bartlett (MD)	DeFazio	Israel
Barton (TX)	DeGette	Issa
Bean	Delahunt	Jackson (IL)
Becerra	DeLauro	Jackson-Lee
Berkley	Dent	(TX)
Berman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jefferson
Berry	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (GA)
Biggert	Dicks	Johnson (IL)
Bilbray	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.
Bilirakis	Doggett	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (GA)	Donnelly	Jones (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Doolittle	Jones (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Doyle	Jordan
Blackburn	Drake	Kagen
Blumenauer	Dreier	Kanjorski
Blunt	Duncan	Kaptur
Boehner	Ehlers	Keller
Bonner	Ellison	Kennedy
Bono Mack	Ellsworth	Kildee
Boozman	Emanuel	Kilpatrick
Boren	Emerson	King (IA)
Boswell	Engel	King (NY)
Boucher	English (PA)	Kingston
Boustany	Eshoo	Kirk
Boyd (FL)	Etheridge	Kline (MN)
Boyd (KS)	Everett	Knollenberg
Brady (PA)	Fallin	Kucinich
Brady (TX)	Farr	Kuhl (NY)
Broun (GA)	Fattah	Lamborn
Brown (SC)	Feeney	Lampson
Brown, Corrine	Filmer	Langevin
Brown-Waite,	Forbes	Larsen (WA)
Ginny	Fortenberry	Larson (CT)
Buchanan	Fossella	Latham
Burton (IN)	Foster	LaTourette
Butterfield	Fox	Latta
Calvert	Frank (MA)	Lee
Camp (MI)	Franks (AZ)	Levin
Campbell (CA)	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)
Cannon	Gallely	Lewis (GA)
Cantor	Garrett (NJ)	Lewis (KY)
Capito	Gerlach	Linder
Capps	Giffords	Lipinski
Capuano	Gilchrest	LoBiondo
Cardoza	Gillibrand	Lofgren, Zoe
Carnahan	Gingrey	Lowe
Carney	Gohmert	Lucas
Carson	Goode	Lungren, Daniel
Carter	Goodlatte	E.
Castle	Gordon	Lynch
Castor	Granger	Mack
Cazaayoux	Graves	Maloney (NY)
Chabot	Green, Al	Manzullo
Chandler	Green, Gene	Marchant
Childers	Grijalva	Markey
Clarke	Gutierrez	Marshall
Clay	Hall (NY)	Matheson
Cleaver	Hall (TX)	Matsui
Clyburn	Hare	McCarthy (CA)
Coble	Harman	McCarthy (NY)
Cohen	Hastings (FL)	McCaul (TX)
Cole (OK)	Hastings (WA)	McCollum (MN)
Conaway	Hayes	McCotter
Conyers	Heller	McDermott
Cooper	Hensarling	McGovern
Costa	Herger	McHenry

McHugh	Ramstad	Space
McIntyre	Rangel	Speier
McKeon	Regula	Spratt
McMorris	Rehberg	Stark
Rodgers	Reichert	Stearns
McNerney	Renzi	Stupak
McNulty	Reyes	Sullivan
Meek (FL)	Reynolds	Sutton
Meeks (NY)	Richardson	Tanner
Melancon	Rodriguez	Tauscher
Mica	Rogers (AL)	Taylor
Michaud	Rogers (KY)	Terry
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Thompson (CA)
Miller (MI)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (MS)
Miller (NC)	Roskam	Thornberry
Miller, Gary	Ross	Tiahrt
Miller, George	Rothman	Tiberi
Mitchell	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Mollohan	Royce	Towns
Moore (KS)	Ruppersberger	Tsongas
Moore (WI)	Ryan (OH)	Turner
Moran (VA)	Ryan (VA)	Udall (CO)
Murphy (CT)	Salazar	Udall (NM)
Murphy, Patrick	Sali	Upton
Murphy, Tim	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Murtha	T.	Velázquez
Musgrave	Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Myrick	Sarbanes	Walberg
Nadler	Saxton	Walden (OR)
Neapolitano	Scalise	Walsh (NY)
Neal (MA)	Schakowsky	Walz (MN)
Neugebauer	Schiff	Wamp
Nunes	Schmidt	Wasserman
Oberstar	Schwartz	Schultz
Obey	Scott (GA)	Waters
Oliver	Scott (VA)	Watson
Pallone	Sensenbrenner	Watt
Pascrell	Serrano	Waxman
Pastor	Sessions	Weiner
Payne	Sestak	Welch (VT)
Pearce	Shadegg	Weldon (FL)
Perce	Shays	Weller
Perlmutter	Shea-Porter	Westmoreland
Peterson (MN)	Sherman	Wexler
Peterson (PA)	Shuler	Whitfield (KY)
Petri	Shuster	Wilson (NM)
Pickering	Simpson	Wilson (OH)
Pitts	Sires	Wilson (SC)
Platts	Skelton	Wittman (VA)
Poe	Slaughter	Wolf
Pomeroy	Smith (NE)	Woolsey
Porter	Smith (NJ)	Wu
Price (GA)	Smith (TX)	Yarmuth
Price (NC)	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)
Putnam	Snyder	Young (FL)
Radanovich	Solis	
Rahall	Souder	

NOT VOTING—27

Ackerman	Gonzalez	McCrery
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Moran (KS)
Burgess	Hinojosa	Ortiz
Buyer	Hulshof	Paul
Cubin	Kind	Pryce (OH)
Davis, Tom	Klein (FL)	Rogers (MI)
Edwards	LaHood	Rush
Ferguson	Loebbeck	Shimkus
Flake	Mahoney (FL)	Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1450

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 12, 2008 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 413.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 12, 2008 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 413.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Maryland, the majority leader, to tell us about next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Republican whip for yielding.

On Monday, the House is not in session. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The final list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

We will take any pending votes on H.R. 6063, the NASA Authorization Act of 2008, which we will debate later today after this colloquy; and we will consider H.R. 5781, the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act of 2008. We will also consider H.R. 5876, Stop Child Abuse in Residential Programs for Teens Act of 2008; and we hope to consider and I expect to consider the Iraq-Afghanistan supplemental appropriations bill.

I yield back.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that.

On that last topic, I believe this is the third week straight that we said we hope to have the supplemental on the floor next week. My understanding is that if that supplemental is not completed, that our troops will begin to work without pay in July and civilian employees of the military would be laid off in July. We have next week and the week after that. I really have two questions here. One is do you think there will be a bill next week? And two, are we expecting a bill that will be vetoed or a bill that will be signed?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

He observes that I said we hope to have it on the floor. I want to reiterate that I hoped each one of those weeks that we would have it on the floor, and I hope that we will have it on the floor next week.

I would say to my friend that I hope we have a bill on the floor next week, pass it through the House and pass it through the Senate and that the President will sign that bill. Obviously, one of the reasons that we have not gotten the bill on the floor as quickly as I had hoped is that there have been very, very substantial discussions between the House and the Senate, between the House and the White House, and the Senate and the White House about what their thoughts are with respect to various aspects of the supplemental bill and what they would or would not consider a signable bill.

So I think there have been extensive discussions on that. I am hopeful that

when we finally pass something to the President he will sign it and we will have that bill done. As the gentleman indicated, we are aware of the fact that it is timely that we pass this bill certainly within the next 2 weeks. And when I say pass it, not just pass it but have it signed by the President so we have a law in effect that gives the President and the Department of Defense the funds they need to continue the deployment that currently exists. That does not adopt the policy of the appropriateness of that, but it does recognize the reality of the fact that we have men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman.

The bill that we talked about, the portion of the bill that would require furlough notices to go out, that portion of the bill has been here in the Congress for over a year now. I do hope we can deal with this before not only any members of the Armed Forces are asked to work without pay, but before civilian employees that run things like day care centers and things that work with families in the military are having to be notified that those efforts will stop because the Congress hasn't appropriated the money to provide those services.

I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman will recall, we had a bill on this House to make those funds available. It did not pass. It did not pass as you recall because many of your Members voted present. I think they would have supported it, and many of our Members did not support that funding. They want to see the policies changed. I agree with them on the policies.

The fact is that we now have that funding passed from the Senate in the supplemental to us and we are trying to resolve as you know the differences. But there is a desire to get that bill done in a timely fashion so that the problems that you portray, which I believe are accurate, do not occur.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that.

This week we voted twice, including one vote yesterday and one vote today, on an unemployment insurance bill. I think the unemployment rate nationwide had gone up one-half of 1 percent. As the gentleman knows, a lot of our concern was that it was widely targeted, instead of States that had a significant unemployment problem. The Speaker said last week that "America's families and workers can wait no longer, neither will the Congress. This bill will come to the floor of the House," and it did; and it did again.

With a 75 percent increase in the price of gasoline during this Congress, Republicans have been arguing that we need to have an energy bill that would produce more energy on the House floor. Will the Democrats work with us to schedule that legislation that allows for more energy to be produced in the country.

I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I said last week, with respect to more drilling in various parts of the country, whether it is in Alaska, in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge or on the Outer Continental Shelf, I would like to reiterate the information I referred to last week, but before I do that let me say that we are very supportive of any legislation that will lead this country towards energy independence within the framework of what we think is necessary and needed. Now I say it in this context. I support and I think we support on this side a diversified clean energy portfolio. We think that is critically important for our country.

In the area of supporting energy supply, I hope the Senate will return the tax extender bill which invests in alternative energy sources which can be put online so we can be more energy independent and not dependent upon the producers of petroleum, many of whom are not friendly to us, and others of whom are not as reliable as we would like.

I have listened for some period of time in the last few weeks that all we need to do to solve this problem is more drilling. We don't believe that is the case. In fact, as I said to the gentleman last week, we have nearly a whole refinery's worth of capacity idle right now.

□ 1500

What I mean by that, Mr. Whip, is that our refineries were operating, at the end of last week, at 89 percent capacity. That is the lowest operational capacity of refineries in our country in the last 10 years at this time of year. So our refineries still have another 8 to 9 percent capacity. 8 to 9 percent is a very significant portion.

Now, we've introduced two bills today to make oil companies use their existing leases. Before we go to new leases, before we go to the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge or the Outer Continental Shelf, which is very controversial on both sides of the aisle, we believe that oil and gas companies should use the present leases they have. They hold nearly 68 million acres of Federal land and waters on which they are not producing oil and gas. These 68 million acres of leased but currently inactive land and waters could produce, I tell my friend, an additional 4.8 million barrels of oil and 44.7 billion cubic feet of natural gas each day. So that when we talk about looking for new spots to drill, we first ought to look at those spots. Vast acreage, millions of acres have already been authorized.

If we took those actions, I tell my friend, the information I have is that it would nearly double total U.S. oil production and increase domestic national gas production by 75 percent. That is on existing leaseholds.

It would also cut U.S. oil imports by more than a third, if all we did was use

existing leaseholds. It would be more than six times the estimated peak production from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

In other words, using existing leases that have already been authorized, would produce six times what the projections are, and the most optimistic projections are for the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge.

Let me say that we also introduced two bills today to look at and study the investments in oil futures, in petroleum futures. We're very concerned that that is having an impact on price, not because of supply and demand, but because of speculation. Mr. DINGELL and Mr. BARTON, as you know, have cosponsored legislation, and I've cosponsored it myself with them.

So I'm hopeful that we will move ahead vigorously, as I know the gentleman from Missouri wants to do, to see what can be done to make our country more energy efficient, to utilize the energy sources which are already authorized.

I would say one additional thing in terms of refineries. There's been some discussion about refineries. There's been one application for a new refinery in the last 30 years. One application. It was approved. That refinery has not been built, notwithstanding the fact that the application was approved.

And obviously, with refinery capacity not being at the capacity it's been at in the last 10 years, it would seem that a new refinery was not built because the oil companies made a determination that it was not needed because, at this critical time when demand is so high, they're not operating at peak performance.

So let me just reiterate that we all want to work together to try to have our country be energy independent. We think that's important for our national security, our economic security. And indeed, we think that going to alternative energies is critically important for the health of our global climate.

I yield back.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend for that information. There are really two topics there I want to talk about just briefly. One is the refinery capacity itself. I think there's probably more reason than capacity that there's only been one permit in 30 years for refineries.

But refineries are really a separate issue from whether the oil is available or not. In fact, you could argue, we'd have more refinery use if we had more oil available.

I do know that we imported gas last year. I think importing oil is bad. I think importing gas and paying somebody to take that raw material of oil and turn it into gas is a worse idea. It's hard for me to believe that people that run refineries would be doing that if the refineries were the problem.

In terms of the leases, clearly, in the last 7 years, the amount of leased public lands has almost doubled. Most of that drilling has been for gas. In fact,

our natural gas numbers are quite a bit better than they were before that started.

Secondly, I think something like 52 percent of the exploration produces no product. It's a 10-year lease. Most of those leases are now beginning to get into the middle of that 10-year period of time. I certainly hope that we're encouraging, without doing anything that violates what we've already agreed to, that we're encouraging that to be done.

And I think, frankly, I personally think, and have for a long time, that drilling in the ANWR in the area that was set aside for drilling by President Carter and the Congress in 1980, is part of the solution. But it's only part of the solution. And wherever we have those resources, we're the only country in the world where coastal drilling is possible that doesn't allow it to happen. I think we need to revisit that. And I think the American people are at the point that they want to revisit that as well.

But this discussion is exactly the discussion we hope to have, a discussion that leads to more production and looking for the future.

My good friend said that many on our side think that drilling's the only solution. I haven't heard that. What I've heard is many on our side think it's part of an immediate, short-term solution. But in the last Congress and the Republican Congresses before that, there was lots of legislation that encouraged alternatives, renewables. We want to still do that. Most of that requires a lot of transition in the economy and will take a while.

Announcing that we were going to go vigorously after our own resources, I, at least, believe would have impact on that last topic you brought up, the futures market. If we announced we were going after substantial resources that we have, in fact, resources that are now believed to be significantly more substantial than they were 5 or 10 years ago, that would have impact on the futures market. And we should be looking at that market and see what's driving that and what we could do about it, in addition to thinking we're going to just simply regulate a worldwide market from the United States of America.

I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

My friend mentioned the Outer Continental Shelf, and I agree with him. But the facts I have are this. Four times more natural gas is available in areas already open to drilling. Let me reiterate that. In areas already approved and open for drilling, four times more natural gas is available than in OCS waters protected by the moratorium.

In other words, that which is protected has only 25 percent perceived to be available than does the already approved available Outer Continental Shelf areas. So if we started vigorously

pursuing exploration and drilling in those areas, we'd get 75 percent more than we get now.

In fact, the figure is that we are using only 18 percent of the 7,740 active leases currently available on the Outer Continental Shelf, only 1,655 are in production; so that when we talk about the problem is that the Democrats are not allowing us to drill and explore and to recover resources that are in our Outer Continental Shelf or on our lower 48, that is not, I think, accurate. I think it's not accurate because of the extraordinarily high percentage of currently approved leaseholds that are not being utilized in this very day.

Now, I'm sure that the oil companies, very frankly, want to increase supply and see prices come down. I say that somewhat with tongue in cheek. If perhaps we were finding more supply, utilizing those leaseholds, perhaps the price would not be quite as high and the profits wouldn't be either.

But I will tell you that Americans are, at \$4 a gallon, seeing the companies that are selling them oil receiving extraordinarily high profits. God bless them for getting profits. They have invested, they've worked hard. They put their capital at risk. I'm for that.

But at the same time, when they are failing to use leaseholds that would bring more supply, that would presumably then bring down the price, I think the American public have a right to ask, why are we only using 18 percent of the currently available leaseholds on the Outer Continental Shelf and about one-quarter or a little less than one-quarter of what's available on the mainland?

I yield back to my friend.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend for yielding.

I was actually pleased to hear two things there. One is I heard my good friend use the word "drilling" in a positive sense, and that's good news.

Mr. HOYER. I have an automobile.

Mr. BLUNT. And two is the numbers I see for the deep water drilling of natural gas indicate that there is an 18-year supply in the deep water. If you're right, and there's four times that supply on public lands that could be drilled on, I suppose that means we have almost a 100-year supply of natural gas if we just go after it. We should find out whatever it takes to go after that, and insist that that happen.

My view is both, and wherever the infrastructure is most amenable to getting that natural gas and oil into the energy system the quickest, that's where we should be drilling the quickest. If we've got a leasehold that's 500 miles away from the nearest place you can hook it up to a line, that's probably less appealing than a leasehold somewhere in the deep water or other places that's near a current way to get that gas or that oil into the system.

I do know in the 181 area that we opened in 2006 in the gulf, opened for a brief period of time, that there's one 2-

acre platform there, at least I'm told there's a 2-acre platform there that's producing roughly 10 percent of all the natural gas that we're producing in the United States of America.

I do believe that these resources are greater than we thought they were 5 or 10 years ago. I think we ought to be pursuing that on all fronts.

I saw where one of our colleagues in the Senate, the senior Senator from New York, said that if we had a million barrels more of oil every day, that that would reduce pump prices by 50 cents a gallon. I'm not sure how he calculates that, but I'm prepared to accept that.

A million barrels is what we'd be getting from ANWR today if we'd started drilling there 12 years ago, or any of the other times that the Republican House sent a bill to the Senate that would have allowed that. There may be other million-barrel locations, as my friend has just suggested there were, that we should vigorously be pursuing, and we are eager to have that discussion on the House floor, see it had on the Senate floor, see something get on the President's desk that encourages American use of American resources for America's future.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. My friend, at the beginning of his last comments, said "on public lands." I want to make it very clear that the implication, perhaps that we're not allowing that on public lands, there are, as I said, 80 percent of the already authorized spots on public land not being utilized today; so that this is not a question of where we have not authorized drilling. We're for that. We want to find more product.

What we are saying is that we have now got the majority of authorized spots being unutilized. Now, why that is so, when the product is getting the highest price it's ever gotten, which ought to be incentive, in and of itself, to look for new product and to explore and to drill and to get new product to the market, which would then bring the price down.

I hope that nobody is controlling supply simply to escalate price. We know that when demand goes up and supply is constrained, that prices inevitably rise. The American public is paying the price for that. Great profits are being made. But it is adversely affecting our economy and our families. And we share your view that we want to address this problem.

But I want to say, we talk about today. Unfortunately, for too long, I'm old enough to have experienced the gas lines of the late seventies where you waited hours to get gasoline in your car. Hopefully that won't reoccur.

But had we, Democrats and Republicans, Americans all, focused in a disciplined way on looking for, developing more efficient automobiles, more efficient refrigerators and other electric utilities, focused on conservation, focused on alternative sources of energy, we would be far ahead of the game.

□ 1515

In the final analysis, we cannot get distracted, in my opinion. We need to go down both paths, making sure today we have the most efficient process possible but that tomorrow we're energy independent, because in the final analysis, that will be the only way in which we will continue to keep our economy moving, our national security intact, and our environment clean and healthy.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend.

I believe for those things that look toward better solutions for the future, better conservation now, we all should be focused there. We also should be focused on using American resources, and frankly asking every question why they haven't been used. Again, I will just conclude my remarks by saying I know that these leases have been almost doubled in the last 7 years. And how long it takes to develop, some of them issued only in the last 1 or 2 years for 10 years at a time, I don't know what the planning is on that, but I am absolutely committed to the most efficient and effective use of America's resources for America's future, and I would like to see this Congress work together to get there.

---

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

---

#### HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow; and further, that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 17, for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

---

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 6063.

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

There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1257 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 6063.

□ 1517

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6063) to authorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes, with Ms. BORDALLO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GORDON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, today I am asking my colleagues in the House to ensure this country's leadership in space and aeronautics program by passing H.R. 6063, the NASA Authorization Act of 2008.

First, I want to thank and commend Chairman UDALL of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics on his leadership in introducing this bill and for taking a clear bipartisan approach to the development of H.R. 6063. I was pleased to be original cosponsor, but I was even more pleased that ranking minority member of our Committee on Science and Technology, Mr. HALL of Texas, and ranking minority member of our Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, Mr. FEENEY of Florida, were also original cosponsors.

Madam Chairman, their actions show that the importance of NASA's future in space and aeronautics is truly a bipartisan concern. And I want to thank them for their full support.

In that regard, I also would like to thank Ed Feddeman, Ken Monroe, Katy Crooks, and Lee Arnold of the minority staff for their help on this legislation. I also want to thank and acknowledge the hard work of our majority staff involved in the development of the bill, Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee staff director Dick Obermann, Allen Li, Pam Whitney, Devin Bryant, and John Piazza.

This bill passed the subcommittee and the full committee unanimously. And I think that record is in no small part due to the hard work that both sides of the aisle put into this legislation.

Madam Chairman, as we look to the transition to the new administration

next year, it's important that Congress send a strong message on the best future course for our Nation's space and aeronautics program. The bipartisan consensus we have reached on H.R. 6063 signals that Congress believes a balanced NASA program of science, aeronautics, and human spaceflight, and exploration is important and worthy of the Nation's support. Yet I want to emphasize that H.R. 6063 takes a fiscally-responsible approach to providing this support.

The baseline authorization represents a 2.8 percent increase, which is inflationary at best, over the level of the authorization of fiscal year 2008. The bill also includes a special funding augmentation to accelerate the development of the crew exploration vehicle and thus minimize the human spaceflight gap that will make us dependent on the Russians to get our astronauts to and from the International Space Station until the CEV is operational.

I don't think any of us wants to or looks forward to the day when we must rely on another Nation to launch U.S. astronauts into space, but that is what we face. I want to minimize that dependency as much as possible.

However, even including that augmentation, the total funding authorization will only get us back to NASA's fiscal year 1992 funding level in terms of purchasing power.

H.R. 6063's baseline authorization also reflects the importance of NASA to the Nation's innovation agenda. NASA science and technology activities contribute much to our national competitiveness initiative, and I think we need to recognize NASA's role in that regard. NASA was included in last year's America COMPETES Act, but we didn't include an authorization then since we knew we would be reauthorizing NASA this year.

H.R. 6063 does that providing by providing a baseline authorization for NASA that includes a rate of increase over the fiscal year 2008 appropriated level that is consistent with the rate of increase proposed for agencies included under the America COMPETES Act.

Madam Chairman, this bill includes many provisions that are critical to ensuring the future strength of our Nation, including both the future health of our aviation system and our ability to better understand and respond to climate change and other challenges facing the earth's system.

It isn't always recognized that NASA counts for some three-fifths of the Nation's climate research funding. And it's a critical part of the Nation's climate research efforts. In addition, H.R. 6063 demonstrates that a properly structured human spaceflight and exploration program can provide benefits of technological, scientific, and geopolitical significance that are worthy of our Nation's investment.

This bill also includes provisions that will ensure a productive return on the Nation's investment in developing and

assembling an international space station and encourages the use of the commercial services to transport cargo and eventually crew to the station. We need to ensure that NASA has sufficient resources for all of these and other important tasks that the Nation has asked to carry out, and I believe this bill does that.

Madam Chairman, the United States has been a global leader in technology and innovation for decades. However, an esteemed committee of the National Academies raised a deep concern in its groundbreaking report, *Rise Above the Gathering Storm*, stating “that the scientific and technical building blocks critical to our economic leadership are eroding at a time when many other nations are gathering strength.”

With China, India, and other global players committed to building robust aeronautics and space programs, that it is incumbent upon the United States to rise to the challenge.

This year is the fiftieth anniversary of the dawn of the space age and the fiftieth anniversary of the creation of NASA. NASA has been one of the crown jewels of the Nation’s R&D enterprise over the past 50 years. I want to ensure that it remains so for the next 50, and I believe this bill will help turn that into a reality.

Madam Chairman, this bill has been endorsed by a host of organizations ranging from the American Association of Universities to the National Association of Manufacturers. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6063 to ensure America’s continued leadership and accomplishments in space and aeronautics over the next 50 years.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume and make sure that I can reserve enough for those that will follow me.

Madam Chairman, H.R. 6063, sponsored by my good friend MARK UDALL, authorizes the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2009. As our chairman has very adequately stated, it’s a product of very close bipartisan consultation and cooperation led by Chairman UDALL and by Chairman GORDON.

Representative TOM FEENEY, ranking member of the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee, and I are original co-sponsors of this bill, and it builds a 1-year authorization. The intent of the bill is to keep NASA on its current path towards completing the International Space Station, retiring the Space Shuttle, maintaining a balanced set of science and aeronautics research programs, and developing a new launch system capable of taking humans beyond the low earth orbit, a feat the Shuttle cannot do.

The bill is also meant to reaffirm Congress’s unwavering support for NASA so as to remove any doubt the next administration might have about Congress’s commitment to NASA’s program and to NASA’s policies.

By being a 1-year bill, it also is designed, I think, to not tie the hands of the next administration to a long-term strategy. To the contrary, H.R. 6063 is designed to give the next President an opportunity to work with the next Congress to fashion a long-term strategy that is consistent with the administration’s desires as well as the wishes of Congress.

H.R. 6063 contains a number of important provisions. It authorizes \$19.2 billion for NASA for fiscal year 2009 and provides an additional \$1 billion to accelerate development of the new *Constellation* crew vehicle launch system. It emphasizes that NASA should maintain a strong and balanced array of science, aeronautics, and human spaceflight programs and also directs NASA to fly out its full manifest of Shuttle missions, including those dedicated to flying spare parts to the International Space Station, as well as adding a flight to take the Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer to the ISS as we originally committed to do so some years ago. This experiment was stricken from the Shuttle manifest following the *Columbia* tragedy, but I think given the huge sunk investment in AMS, we ought to make good on our original commitments to fly this expensive instrument to the ISS.

H.R. 6063 directs NASA to continue the important task of developing the *Constellation* system which will provide our country with a modern, more robust and safer manned spaceflight capability that will enable our astronauts to fly out of low earth orbit, an ability we haven’t had since the retirement of *Apollo* over 30 years ago.

As most of you are aware, once the Shuttle is retired at the end of this decade, our country will have to buy seats from the Russians for as long as maybe 5 years even to assure U.S. presence on the International Space Station. Our payments for rides on Soyuz spacecraft have not yet been negotiated, but it’s going to be expensive. NASA estimates it will cost more than \$2 billion, and sadly, we’re making these purchases at a time when NASA will be laying off thousands of engineers and technicians from the Shuttle program in an effort to minimize our reliance on the Russians.

As I mentioned a moment ago, this bill authorizes an additional \$1 billion to speed up the development of the new *Constellation* system. This initial investment is more than justified.

This bill also includes a number of provisions to encourage NASA working with the private sector to foster development of a domestic cargo launch capability primarily designed to take supplies to the space station. In addition, 6063 includes language directing NASA to solicit for commercial crew launch capability.

Turning to other parts of NASA, let me quickly say H.R. 6063 embraces a number of recommendations that were put forth by the witnesses from government, from industry, from academia,

and testified, all of them testified in hearings before our committee over the previous 18 months. These are sensible provisions designed to strengthen aeronautics space science and earth science research programs, encourage technology, risk reduction policies and activities, foster efficient technology, transfer from NASA to other Federal agencies under the private sector, detect and mitigate the threat of near-earth objects, and research and monitor the effects of space weather on satellites.

□ 1530

This list is not exhaustive, but I wanted to mention these few examples to emphasize to all Members the breadth of this bill and how it improves upon many of NASA’s activities and programs.

So as we stand here today, the space shuttle is in orbit, wrapping up another assembly mission to the International Space Station. May I add that the spouse of one of our Members, Representative GIFFORDS of Arizona, is currently commanding this mission.

NASA has had two other recent success activities. Just 15 days ago, the Phoenix Mars Lander successfully completed a soft landing on the red planet’s surface and is in the early stages of searching for evidence of ice and organic compounds. And yesterday, NASA successfully launched a gamma-ray large area space telescope onboard a Delta II rocket.

These are but three of the most current NASA accomplishments. There are many, many other great achievements in aeronautics, space science, and Earth science research that I could talk about, but time doesn’t permit. Suffice it to say that NASA is one of the most exciting and innovative Federal agencies, and it serves as a huge inspiration to our young people to take a serious interest in math and science education.

Before closing, I want to point out that during development of this bill, the subcommittee Democratic staff have been very open and forthright, sharing early ideas and drafts of the bill with our Republican staff. It has been a close and productive partnership, and I want to especially praise the work and hard work of my good, personal friend Dick Obermann. And I certainly want to thank our chairman, Chairman BART GORDON.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, first let me say very sincerely say that there is no Member of Congress that has had greater interest than Mr. HALL in NASA. As a Texan and a proud American, he has taken particular interest in the safety of the astronauts, as well as trying to reap the maximum amount of health benefits from the investment that we’ve made. He has played just an enormously constructive role, and I thank him for that.

We also thank Mr. UDALL, the chairman of the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee, for working in a bipartisan way. He had a number of really thoughtful hearings. He's put together a bill that came out of his subcommittee unanimously, and because he did such a good job there, it was unanimous out of the full committee. So I thank my friend from Colorado.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) 5 minutes.

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, earlier this year, I introduced the NASA Authorization Act of 2008, a bill to reauthorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year 2009. Today, I rise to urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to pass this bill and send it on to the Senate.

The bill passed the Committee on Science and Technology and the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics with unanimous support, as our chairman pointed out. It represents a strong, bipartisan effort to ensure our continued leadership in space and aeronautics and to ensure that NASA's programs contribute to our science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education efforts, to our Nation's Innovation Agenda, and to practical benefits for our citizens.

I, too, want to thank Science and Technology Committee Chairman BART GORDON, Ranking Member RALPH HALL, and my fellow ranking member on the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee, TOM FEENEY from Florida, for being original cosponsors, as well as providing thoughtful input into this bill.

I would also like to thank the excellent staff on both the majority and minority side for their outstanding work on this bill. On my staff, my dedicated and tireless staff member, Wendy Adams, Richard Obermann, Pam Whitney, Allen Li, and Devin Bryant, as well as John Piazza have all been instrumental in moving this bill forward.

I want to particularly point out the great contribution—I think the chairman would agree with me—of Dick Obermann. We benefit in the committee, the Nation benefits and this House of Representatives benefits from Dick's insights, his knowledge, and the relationships he's built. Anyone in the NASA orbit knows Dick Obermann's many, many contributions. So I want to particularly point out his great contributions to the committee and to NASA.

On the minority side, I want to thank Ed Feddeman, Ken Monroe, and Lee Arnold as well. They have been very helpful in the work on this piece of legislation.

Madam Chairman, the bill sets fiscally responsible policies and provisions for a balanced set of science, aer-

onautics, and human spaceflight programs.

The baseline funding level authorized for NASA in fiscal year 2009, \$19.21 billion, represents simply an inflation increase of about 2.8 percent over the NASA Authorization Act of 2005, legislation that the President signed into law.

I don't want to go into great detail about the many provisions of the bill but will include my longer statement for the RECORD.

Madam Chairman, 2008 represents the 50th anniversary of the birth of the U.S. space program and the establishment of NASA. NASA has accomplished a great deal in both space and aeronautical R&D over these past five decades, and we can all take pride in what has been accomplished. However, we cannot become complacent.

The testimony and constructive input of countless hearings, witnesses, and outside experts and organizations that led to H.R. 6063 conveyed a consistent message: that NASA has not been given the funding it needs to successfully carry out all of the important tasks that the Nation has asked of it. If we fail to adequately invest in NASA now, it is unlikely that we will see a comparable record of accomplishment over the next five decades, at a great opportunity cost to the Nation.

I am gratified by the support that H.R. 6063 has garnered to date, including the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Aerospace Industries Association, the Association of American Universities, the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, and the University Space Research Association.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 6063 to ensure that our Nation remains the leader in space and aeronautics programs.

Madam Chairman, on May 15, 2008 I introduced the "NASA Authorization Act of 2008," H.R. 6063, a bill to reauthorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for Fiscal Year 2009.

Today I rise to urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to pass this bill and send it on to the Senate.

This bill passed the Committee on Science and Technology and the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics with unanimous support.

It represents a strong bipartisan effort to ensure our leadership in space and aeronautics and to ensure that NASA's programs contribute to our science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education efforts, to the Nation's innovation agenda, and to practical benefits for our citizens.

I would like to thank Science and Technology Committee Chairman BART GORDON, Ranking Minority Member RALPH HALL, and Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee Ranking Minority Member TOM FEENEY for being original cosponsors of this bill.

Madam Chairman, this bill sets fiscally-responsible policies and provisions for a balanced set of science, aeronautics, and human spaceflight programs.

The baseline funding level authorized for NASA in FY 2009—\$19.21 billion—represents simply an inflationary increase of about 2.8 percent over the NASA Authorization Act of 2005, legislation that the President signed into law.

H.R. 6063 also reflects the conviction that NASA is as much a contributor to the nation's innovation agenda as any of the other agencies included in the America COMPETES Act that was enacted into law last year.

Thus, includes provisions and funding directed at supporting opportunities for hands-on training of the next generation of scientists and engineers.

In addition to the baseline authorization, H.R. 6063 contains a directed funding augmentation intended to help accelerate the date when the Orion Crew Exploration Vehicle and Ares Crew Launch Vehicle can attain operational status.

A series of policy failures over a number of years have brought us to the point where we will have an unavoidable gap in the United States' ability to get its astronauts into space independently.

Providing the additional funding in FY 2009 can help narrow the gap while also putting in place the space transportation system that will help us carry out exciting and important exploration missions beyond low Earth orbit in the decades to come.

Madam Chairman, NASA's programs are strongly relevant to addressing the nation's needs.

In short, a properly balanced and focused NASA portfolio can pay large dividends to our society as well as to our standing in the world, and maximizing the value of the NASA portfolio to the nation is one of the main goals of the NASA Authorization Act of 2008.

To that end, H.R. 6063 establishes a role for NASA in leading a cooperative international effort on Earth observations research and applications, especially with respect to climate change—one of the major challenges facing our generation.

In addition, the bill includes a series of provisions to ensure that NASA's aeronautics program gets the resources it needs to remain one of the most relevant activities of the agency—one that impacts our quality of life, public safety, the vitality of the economy, and our national security.

H.R. 6063 also includes provisions to ensure that the International Space Station—a unique orbiting R&D facility that represents a significant investment of resources by both American citizens and those of a host of other nations—will be utilized in as productive a manner as possible.

The ISS is also a compelling example of the value of undertaking a cooperative approach to space exploration. To that end, H.R. 6063 makes clear that any human exploration initiative to return to the Moon and venture to other destinations in the solar system should be undertaken as a cooperative international undertaking under strong U.S. leadership.

Madam Chairman, 2008 marks the 50th anniversary of the birth of the U.S. space program and the establishment of NASA.

NASA has accomplished a great deal in both space and aeronautical R&D over those past five decades, and we can all take pride in what has been accomplished. However, we cannot become complacent.

The testimony and constructive input of countless hearing witnesses, outside experts,

and organizations that led to H.R. 6063 conveyed a consistent message: that NASA has not been given the funding it needs to successfully carry out all of the important tasks that the nation has asked of it.

If we fail to invest adequately in NASA now, it is unlikely that we will see a comparable record of accomplishment over the next five decades—at a great opportunity cost to the nation.

I am gratified by the support that H.R. 6063 has garnered to date, including the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Aerospace Industries Association, the American Astronautical Society, the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, the American Meteorological Society, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, the Association of American Universities, the General Aviation Manufacturers Association, the Information Technology Association of America, the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers-USA, the National Business Aviation Association, the National Space Society, the Personal Spaceflight Federation, the Planetary Society, the Universities Space Research Association, and the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research.

I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives support H.R. 6063 to ensure that our Nation remains the leader in space and aeronautics programs.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield to Mr. FEENEY, the gentleman from Florida, 3 minutes.

Mr. FEENEY. I want to thank Ranking Member HALL and Chairman GORDON and, as they pointed out, all of the staff on both sides that made possible a bipartisan bill that got unanimous support in the committee.

I also want to suggest that terrific staff work on both sides and transparency and openness in the process is sort of a model that this Congress ought to try to emulate more often, and I want to thank, again, Chairman GORDON and Chairman UDALL for doing that.

By the way, this is likely to be, since he's not running for reelection, Chairman UDALL's last reauthorization as a House Member. He has been a champion on space issues. He's been a great friend and a delight to work with, and I know that he will continue to be a champion for space and aeronautics. And so I really appreciated the chance to work with you.

And following me I think at some point will be Congressman WELDON, my neighbor to the south. We share the different assets of Kennedy Space Center, Patrick Air Force Base, and Congressman WELDON will not be running for office again anytime soon, at least not the House. We appreciate DAVE WELDON's leadership. He's been a terrific advocate for space in general and Kennedy Space Center and human spaceflight in specific.

So it's been terrific to work with two great leaders that will not be working with us in all likelihood next year.

NASA was created in response to the Soviet Union's launch of Sputnik in

1957. The space age had begun. Fifty years have now passed. America is still the world's preeminent spacefaring Nation. NASA helped lead us to that status.

Today, we build on that foundation. We have laid out a comprehensive blueprint for sustaining a healthy and vigorous NASA during the next administration, and as Chairman GORDON pointed out, we don't know who the next President will be. We don't know who their next NASA administrator will be, but the starting point for the next administration's space program has been designed right here in the House of Representatives, thanks to the leadership of the people that you are hearing from.

Considerable care has been devoted to all elements of NASA's portfolio, human spaceflight, earth and space sciences, and aeronautics. I look forward to continued success and excellence in all of these endeavors. Each success sustains America's technical prowess and brings enormous prestige to the American people.

Because I represent the Kennedy Space Center, I want to particularly note this bill's unambiguous endorsement of America's human spaceflight program. By the way, all of our human spaceflight program has an international component to it.

Five years ago, America was stunned by the loss of the Shuttle Columbia. We had to re-examine our objectives for human spaceflight and articulate a more sustainable vision for our future spacefaring. We have done so, and this bill continues that progress by providing much-needed stability, on a bipartisan basis, in our strategy and architecture for human spaceflight.

The shuttle has resumed flight. We are having a successful mission as we speak today. We will complete the International Space Station and then strive to utilize its enormous potential. And we will also set forth to explore beyond lower orbit, starting with the moon and then beyond, for the future of humankind.

These are ambitious goals, but Americans are a strong, optimistic people willing to take up and meet any challenge. And as this bill highlights, America invites others throughout the world to join us in this journey. It is done on behalf of all mankind.

NASA's human space exploration and satellite programs publicly demonstrate America's spacefaring prowess. Other Nations are striving to achieve what America has already accomplished.

In prior generations, mastery of the sea and air brought global power and prestige. Today, such power and respect accrues to those mastering space. This bill sustains America's prowess in space, and I urge its passage.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I recognize the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for 3 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I rise to support the

NASA authorization act and to thank Chairman GORDON and Representative UDALL for their leadership and exceptional work on this bill.

On May 31, I experienced the thrill of attending the most recent shuttle launch in Cape Canaveral, Florida. As I witnessed the intense brightness of the rockets' afterburners and felt the rumble of the Earth as the shuttle lifted off, I could feel the pride and strength of American innovation and technological leadership.

I have to tell you that I was surprised at how emotional I felt watching the shuttle hurtle towards the sky, and my heart really burst with pride in the American spirit and our ability to move forward generation after generation. The continuity of the space program is critical to maintaining this leadership.

The space shuttle is scheduled to retire in just 2 years, yet a lack of funding has delayed its replacement until at least 2015. Without adequate funding, not only would we lose jobs, but we would be forced to rely on Russia to access the International Space Station.

The economic return on our investment in the space program is far greater than many realize. In fact, NASA's budget accounts for less than six-tenths of 1 percent of the Federal budget, and yet the benefits of space exploration are vital to our daily lives.

Our TVs, cell phones and computers, as well as the military and weather forecasters all rely on satellite technology developed through space exploration.

Last year, Speaker PELOSI announced "The Speaker's Innovation Agenda," an action plan to keep America as the leader in global science and technology. This agenda includes educating a new generation of innovators and committing to research and development.

By supporting NASA today, we are committing to innovate, to create new opportunities and markets, to drive discovery, and to push the boundaries and limitations that are before us.

It is vital that we instill this curiosity and drive in the next generation. I know it was instilled in the next generation that I'm raising because my son announced to me after he saw the shuttle launch, he said, "Mom, I want to be an astronaut."

And for me, as the National Chair of the Women's High Tech Coalition and co-chair of the Young Women's Task Force, I want to express particular support for the Hodes amendment, which establishes a scholarship program in honor of Christa McAuliffe, the teacher who died in the *Challenger* Space Shuttle disaster.

The scholarships will go to women pursuing degrees in mathematics, science, and engineering, and would further support women seeking careers in fields related to NASA's mission. We really need to expand the young women's and young girls' interest in the science and mathematical fields.

As leaders and legislators, we must work to harness the talent, intellect, and entrepreneurial spirit of Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to ensure that NASA has the resources to continue to promote American competitiveness.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to Dr. WELDON, the gentleman from Florida.

□ 1545

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of the underlying bill. And I commend the gentlelady from Florida for her inspiring words.

This bill is on the right track by extending shuttle operations, giving NASA the option to extend shuttle operations beyond 2010. Taking away the artificial 2010 deadline and allowing NASA to finish all the flights currently on the manifest will give NASA more flexibility and provide needed transportation to the International Space Station and help lessen the severity of the gap.

However, I want to underscore that this bill does not fix the problem established by this administration. And my hope is that the next administration and the next Congress will fix this problem of putting NASA and the United States in a situation where we will be dependent on the Russians to put our astronauts into space for possibly longer than 5 years.

The Government Accountability Office recently testified before a congressional committee indicating that there are a number of technological challenges facing the Constellation program, the program to replace the shuttle, and that delays in the program could occur and could lengthen this gap beyond the 4½ to 5 years that it currently is.

History has shown time and time again that complex technological problems often lead to delays, and that attempts at closing gaps can often be frustrated. Therefore, it is my opinion that the only way to assure that we do not get a lengthening of the gap, and the only way to make sure that we eliminate this gap is to extend shuttle operations.

Now, I was very disappointed in the Statement of Administration Policy on this bill that whoever was responsible for drafting this thing, they chose to dig up the canard that it is unsafe to extend shuttle operations beyond 2010. The truth is that the last shuttle that flies in 2010 will be the same shuttle that flies in 2011 if we extend shuttle operations. And if we are to argue that it is unsafe to fly the shuttle beyond 2010, you could just as easily argue that it's unsafe to fly it today. The truth is, after the improvements that have been made after the Columbia and the Challenger disasters, the shuttle that flies today is the safest shuttle that we have ever flown. And yes, going into outer space has its risks, but we choose to do

so because we are a Nation of explorers, and we feel that the risks are justified for the benefits of space exploration.

I just also want to point out that relying on the Soyuz vehicle—supposedly because it's safer, as the administration is implying in their statement—is not exactly correct. We just recently saw a situation where the returning Soyuz vehicle was thrown off course into a dangerous ballistic reentry, exposing the astronauts on board, including a female astronaut, Peggy Whitson, to very dangerous G forces.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. This bill is a step in the right direction. It gives NASA the ability to extend shuttle operations. And I want to just point out, there is a very important scientific mission, the Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer mission. We spent \$1.5 billion building that piece of machinery, and NASA's current plan is to leave it on the ground. This bill correctly calls for launching that mission, and it is the right thing to do. To spend all that money to build that thing and then to never launch it is just wrong.

However, I do want to underscore that the future Congress and the next administration is going to have to wrestle with the issue of getting the funding in the appropriation process. But I just want to say that, based on current economic growth, over the next 5 to 7 years 1 trillion additional dollars is going to come into this U.S. Treasury.

This is a matter of priorities. The American people support our space program. It's the right thing to do to keep the shuttle flying beyond 2010.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to another friend and champion of the space program from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Chairman, I am honored to join my colleagues from the Science Committee to support H.R. 6063. I particularly want to commend Chairman GORDON and Chairman UDALL, and Ranking Members HALL and FEENEY, the committee staff, for all of their hard work and their effort to make this an inclusive process. This legislation enjoys broad support, and I believe that it provides the stability and direction necessary to sustain NASA through this transition period.

I am proud that we will be able to provide a much needed 11 percent increase in the funding over FY08 that will help NASA get back on track. This inflationary increase will allow NASA to operate the shuttle program, accelerate the development of Constellation, and refocus its efforts on science and research without having to rob Peter to pay Paul.

I'm also pleased that this legislation directs NASA to fly the "contingency flights" and to take all necessary steps to deliver the Alpha Magnetic Spec-

trometer that we just heard about from our colleague, Mr. WELDON to the International Space Station. This will ensure the space station's viability and use for its intended purpose as a national lab well into the next decade.

In addition to being one of the most valuable foreign policy tools that we have, there is no doubt in my mind that research conducted on the space station will yield great discoveries that will benefit all Americans and all of mankind.

I would especially like to thank the chairmen and ranking members for adopting language on issues that I have particularly championed and believe will also help secure NASA's future. This includes the Small Business Alliance Outreach and Technology Assistance Program (SATOP).

Building on the partnership between NASA centers, institutions of higher learning, and industry partners, this initiative will further the agency's mission of technology transfer in a unique way by providing free technical assistance to small businesses who cannot afford to have an engineer or a rocket scientist on their staff. Solving technical problems will mean these businesses will help grow our economy and create and retain jobs.

I have also worked to make sure that, as we face the space flight gap and the loss of a highly skilled workforce, that we are cognizant of the fact that we risk losing the imagination of the next generation of scientists and engineers and diminishing their desire to serve our Nation's space program.

Well, the fact that we are already falling behind when it comes to awarding advanced degrees in math, science and engineering means that we must focus on K-12 education now more than ever so that we don't lose our technological edge.

This bill provides an 11 percent increase over FY08 funding, including NASA's educational programs. I believe that some of this increase should go toward continuing the EarthKAM program and expanding NASA's participation in robotics competition. Bringing NASA directly into classrooms across the country and encouraging hands-on learning is a great way to spark a hopefully life-long interest in math and science.

So as we continue with this transition from shuttle to Constellation and a new administration in about 6 months, we must be mindful of providing stability and support for our Nation's space program at this critical juncture. I believe this bill provides both, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the chairman of the Technology Innovation Subcommittee, Mr. WU of Oregon.

Mr. WU. Madam Chairman, I rise as a cosponsor in support of H.R. 6063.

When NASA was born in response to the launch of Sputnik, many Americans were scared of what it meant for

Russia to have space capabilities. Congress' passage of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 created NASA and marked the beginning of the space race between America and Russia.

Just 11 years after NASA was created, and only 9 years after President Kennedy threw a cap over the wall, the United States landed the first humans on the Moon. Since then, NASA has had its share of its successes and challenges, but in the end NASA is an example of what can be accomplished when the President and Congress share a vision, a common vision, and when funds are devoted toward that vision.

As Speaker PELOSI says, "a budget is the tangible embodiment of our values, of what is important to us and what is not." We are considering this bill 50 years after the creation of NASA. We are at a singular point in time, the space shuttle will retire soon. And while we develop the next generation crew exploration vehicle, we will, for the first time, rely on other countries to take Americans to space. In the meantime, more and more countries are developing space capabilities. To keep us in the game, this bill provides an extra \$1 billion to accelerate the development of the next crew exploration vehicle and shorten the American space flight gap.

Space has become more competitive. Where we only competed with Russia, we will soon compete with several countries to maintain our leadership in space. This bill includes a provision to ensure that the United States leads an international cooperation initiative with these countries promoting the peaceful exploration of space.

Today, NASA is funded at a much lower percentage of our GDP than when it was first created. At a time when other countries are aggressively investing in their space capabilities, Congress needs to send the message that it continues to support NASA and its mission by providing the appropriate and necessary funds. This bill does just that. And I want to commend Mr. UDALL, Chairman GORDON, and Ranking Member HALL for a very strong bill, and I urge its passage.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. First and foremost, I would like to congratulate my colleagues for the hard work that's been put into this legislation, MARK UDALL and BART GORDON, of course, on the majority side, and also, of course, TOM FEENEY and RALPH HALL on the minority side of this. This is a bipartisan effort. It always has been.

RALPH HALL will be submitting my amendment for me, which will be the second amendment up today. Let me just note that my amendment simply suggests that NASA should put on its priority list seeking cooperation between the United States and our European and Russian friends to try to have

an international effort to detect and deflect near-Earth objects. What that means is, if there are asteroids or comets that might be out there and might threaten the Earth, perhaps threatening millions of lives, that my amendment simply says the United States should not bear the entire burden and cost of identifying them and tracing their trajectory to see if they threaten the Earth, but we should be trying to recruit our friends and make it an international effort.

I just recently came back from Berlin and Moscow, where this idea received a very, very warm response from these other spacefaring nations, and they're really anxious to work with us. This instructs NASA to take advantage of that spirit of cooperation, take the burden off the American taxpayers a little bit, and make sure this job gets done.

I appreciate that Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL have both supported this legislation. And RALPH will be submitting it for me in a few minutes.

Thank you very much, BART. Thank you very much, RALPH. And I want to thank all of you and the staff for doing such a great job in this committee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas, a great supporter of NASA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished chairman of the committee. It's really good to be with him, in spite of holding us over. We are still here fighting the good fight.

Chairman GORDON, thank you for your leadership and the work that you've done, of course, with the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. UDALL, and my very dear colleague, who has been an advocate, Congressman NICK LAMPSON, who has worked closely on this issue, to the ranking member, Mr. HALL, and of course the ranking members on the respective committees. I rise today to enthusiastically support this legislation dealing with NASA's authorization.

I was reflecting on the history of authorization, and the committee should be commended. This is not a very easy task to get an authorization bill out, and we have done so. And I'm very proud that this Congress, this Democratic Congress has done so.

Today's legislation will allow NASA to continue to push the boundaries of what is possible, keeping our Nation on the forefront of innovation and exploration. After the *Columbia* disaster, NASA stands at a pivotal moment in its history. It is the responsibility of this Congress to ensure that the future of NASA is one of continued progress. Our children depend on us to do this.

Space exploration remains part of our national destiny. Knowing the cutting edge of technology, the research

on HIV/AIDS, on stroke, on heart disease, on cancer, all of this has occurred through NASA exploration and the International Space Station. It inspires our children to look at the stars and dream of what they, too, one day may achieve.

Space exploration allows us to push the bounds of our scientific knowledge as we carry out research projects not possible within the constraints of the planet Earth. Just an anecdote, when I have an annual Christmas party of 3,000 children, the astronauts that come are more popular than Santa Claus. That should be the test for continuing this wonderful effort to ensure that America always stands at the forefront of innovativeness.

□ 1600

As a Nation, we have made tremendous strides forward in the pursuit of space exploration since President John F. Kennedy set the course for our Nation in 1962 calling it the "greatest adventure on which man has ever embarked." Despite the setbacks of recent years, including the tragedy that befell the Space Shuttles *Columbia* and *Challenger*, NASA and the American people have refused to abandon the pursuit of knowledge of our universe. On October 1, 1958, NASA began its operation. It consisted of only about 8,000 employees and an annual budget of \$100 million, but it is now in its 50th year, and we are going further.

President Kennedy in 1961 said, "I believe this Nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to Earth."

Believe it not, we have now had men going into space, and we have just recently had the fiftieth woman going into space. This is an important challenge. And this legislation today provides us with an opportunity to save the 18,000 employees and to begin to look to a funding system that will continue our journey.

H.R. 6063 is addressing serious concerns. Between 2010, when the space shuttle will be phased out, and 2015 when the next generation human space flight is likely to become operational, the United States will have no method of transportation to the space station that we have already invested in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. With this legislation, we are going to deliver important hardware, the Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer, through an additional extension. The bill also authorizes \$1 billion in augmented funding to accelerate the development of the Orion Crew Exploration Vehicle, the successor to the space shuttle, in hopes of narrowing the gap.

We are also allowing one more shuttle trip for the space shuttle. This is helpful to Johnson. We don't want to

lose jobs. We want to support this effort. And we may want to reconsider, as we go forward, the retiring of the space shuttle.

Let me thank the committee for supporting, as well, my small business amendment that addresses the question of giving training, technological training, to veterans-owned businesses, to HUB businesses, to women-owned businesses and minority-owned businesses so they can be part of the cutting edge of science.

I conclude simply by saying that President Kennedy set the mark. I am glad this committee and this Congress is carrying the torch. We must continue space exploration. It is our duty. It is our challenge. It is our obligation as patriots. And it is for the future of our children. On with the space. This legislation gets us there.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6063, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2008. As we mark the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the United States space program, this legislation reaffirms the ever growing and changing role of NASA, providing resources to carry the agency forward with its ambitious agenda of research, exploration, and discovery. I would like to thank Congressman UDALL for introducing this important legislation, as well as Science Committee Chairman GORDON for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today.

I would also like to thank Chairman GORDON for his support of an amendment that I am offering. My amendment modifies section 1108 of the bill, and it states:

(1) in subsection (a), strike “small businesses” and insert “small, minority-owned, and women-owned businesses”; and

(2) In subsection (b)(2), insert “, giving preference to socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and HUB Zone small business concerns” after “to small businesses.”

My amendment clarifies that the NASA Outreach and Technology Assistance Program will include small, minority-owned, and women-owned businesses. It would also give preference, in selection of businesses to participate in the program, to socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and HUBZone small business concerns. I would like to thank my colleague and fellow Texan, Congressman LAMPSON, for his leadership in authoring the important section describing the NASA Outreach and Technology Assistance Program, and for supporting my amendment.

Madam Chairman, today's legislation will allow NASA to continue to push the boundaries of what is possible, keeping our nation on the forefront of innovation and exploration. After the Columbia disaster, NASA stands at a pivotal moment in its history. It is the responsibility of this Congress to ensure that the future of NASA is one of continued progress. Space exploration remains a part of our national destiny. It inspires our children to look to the stars and dream of what they too, one day, may achieve. Space exploration allows us to push the bounds of our scientific knowledge, as we carry out research projects not possible within

the constraints of the planet Earth. As a nation, we have made tremendous strides forward in the pursuit of space exploration since President John F. Kennedy set the course for our nation in 1962, calling it the “greatest adventure on which man has ever embarked.” Despite the setbacks of recent years, including the tragedy that befell the Space Shuttle *Columbia*, NASA and the American people have refused to abandon the pursuit of knowledge of our universe. On October 1, 1958, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration began operation. At the time it consisted of only about 8,000 employees and an annual budget of \$100 million. Over the next 50 years, NASA and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory have been involved in many defining events occurred which have shaped the course of human history and demonstrated to the world the character of the people of the United States.

Many of us remember how inspired we were when on May 25, 1961, President John F. Kennedy proclaimed: “I believe this Nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth. No single space project in this period will be more impressive to mankind, or more important for the long-range exploration of space; and none will be so difficult or expensive to accomplish.” The success of the United States space exploration program in the 20th Century augurs well for its continued leadership in the 21st Century. This success is largely attributable to the remarkable and indispensable partnership between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its 10 space and research centers. One of these important research centers is located in my home city of Houston. The Johnson Space Center, which manages the development, testing, production, and delivery of all United States human spacecraft and all human spacecraft-related functions, is one of the crown jewels of the Houston area.

Today, NASA is the nations' primary civil space and aeronautics research and development agency, and its current activities employ over 18,000 Americans. Today's legislation reaffirms the fundamental operating principles of NASA, emphasizes the importance of NASA leadership in a range of endeavors such as Earth observations and research, aeronautics reach and development, and an exploration program. It authorizes \$20.21 billion in NASA funding for FY 2009.

Madam Chairman, in addition to this funding, H.R. 6063 begins to address what many of us believe is a serious problem that we will face in the coming years. Between 2010, when the space shuttle will be phased out, and 2015, when the next-generation human spaceflight vehicle is likely to become operational, the United States will have no method of transportation to the International Space Station, which we have already invested a great deal of American resources in. This legislation allows for an additional space shuttle flight to the International Space Station, to deliver important hardware (the Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer). The bill also authorizes \$1 billion in augmented funding to accelerate the development of the Orion Crew Exploration Vehicle, the successor to the space shuttle, in hopes of narrowing the gap.

Always on the forefront of technological innovation, NASA has been home to countless

“firsts” in the field of space exploration. America has, countless times, proven itself to be a leader in innovation, and many technologies that have become part of our everyday lives were developed by NASA scientists. The benefits of NASA's programming and innovation are felt far beyond scientific and academic spheres. Space technologies provide practical, tangible benefits to society, and NASA provides valuable opportunities to businesses in our community. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation, and in support of the future of American innovation and exploration.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I have no further speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. In conclusion, Madam Chairman, let me once again thank my partner and friend from Texas (Mr. HALL) for his help and leadership in putting this bill together. RALPH, this is the 36th bill that we have brought to this floor, all of which have been bipartisan. All but one has been unanimous. Thank you for your help.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 6063, the NASA Authorization Act of 2008.

Since the beginning of flight, my home State of Ohio has played a critical role in the aerospace industry. From Wilbur and Orville Wright and the invention of the airplane, to the first American-manned orbital mission by Senator John Glenn, to Neil Armstrong's famous walk on the Moon—Ohioans have been instrumental in maintaining the United States leadership in space.

Fifty years after the creation of NASA, Ohio continues to play an important role in the aerospace industry. Ohio's NASA Glenn facility pioneered the use of liquid hydrogen as a rocket fuel—enabling astronauts to reach the Moon. And today, NASA Glenn is working to build cutting-edge vehicles that will one day send a new generation of explorers to the Moon and Mars.

NASA's economic impact in Ohio is deep and far-reaching. Today, Ohio's aerospace industry includes 600 companies and employs more than 66,000 Ohioans each year.

It is clear that NASA provides significant benefits to the American people. That's why I am proud to support H.R. 6063. It is a fiscally responsible bill that works to ensure that NASA has the resources it needs to successfully conduct a balanced set of missions in human spaceflight, science, and aeronautics.

This bill recognizes that NASA is an important contributor to the Nation's innovation agenda and builds on the provisions included in last year's “America COMPETES Act.” H.R. 6063 includes provisions that will provide our Nation's next generation of engineers and scientists with the hands-on training and education they need to advance our space program.

Madam Chairman, on the 50th anniversary of the U.S. space program and the establishment of NASA, I urge my colleagues in joining with me in supporting this important bill.

Mr. CALVERT, Madam Chairman, I commend Subcommittee Chairman UDALL, Chairman GORDON and Ranking Members HALL and FEENEY and their staff for their work on this bipartisan bill. It is most appropriate that we commit our Federal support and investment to

our Nation's civilian space and aeronautics agency during this 50 anniversary year.

NASA has been the Nation's leading catalyst for innovation and technology based on 50 years of broad public support and strong bipartisan political leadership. The agency's work is linked to larger issues like national security, global warming, and American competitiveness. This valuable research is also the genesis of tens of thousands of high-tech jobs in America and millions of dollars into our economy.

H.R. 6063 largely follows in the tradition of the NASA Authorization Act of 2005, the first authorization bill to endorse the Vision for Space Exploration which chartered the agency to move beyond low-Earth orbit.

I enthusiastically support most measures in this reauthorization including: the reasonable increase in authorization levels which allows the agency to maintain a balanced and robust portfolio of exploration, science and aeronautics activities; the accelerated development of the Orion and Ares launch systems in order to minimize U.S. reliance on Russia for access to the International Space Station; and the full authorization of the Commercial Orbital Transportation Services program, as well as the funding to develop a commercial crew capability under this program.

I am somewhat concerned about language that may inappropriately tie the administrator's hands by requiring three shuttle flights; two contingency and one for the Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer, before the fleet's final retirement. I understand why the committee has included the language but I also encourage the Science Committee leadership to work with the NASA administrator to alleviate the outstanding concerns about NASA's ability to properly manage the shuttle fleet and the remaining flight manifest without the mandated flexibility; especially if under unexpected budget and safety constraints.

Overall, I am happy to lend my strong support to this reauthorization. I believe it does a comprehensive job of providing NASA the rules and tools to succeed in this Second Space Age. There is not a NASA center in the 44th Congressional District of California, but I understand the criticality of the agency's success and its impact on our Nation's prosperity. I encourage all my colleagues to rediscover the many ways our constituents benefit from the agency's important work. We do not consider this legislation in a vacuum. Other nations are actively pursuing human spaceflight and exploration. China and India are out-producing us in engineering graduates each year many times over. NASA, with its excellent reputation in exploration, science and aeronautics is the one national agency which can focus and inspire America's youth to take up the challenging work of math and science careers.

Again, I want to thank the Science Committee leadership and their hard-working staff for their efforts in putting together this bill. I understand it will be important to have a solid civilian space and aeronautics blueprint for the next Administration to follow. I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 6063.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is a strong economic driver in the State of Texas and an important national resource.

My colleagues and I on the House Committee on Science and Technology have

worked on this legislation to reauthorize many of NASA's programs for 1 year. This action will provide a funding bridge until next year, and it will provide important funding for research and programs in the areas of science, aeronautics, exploration, education, space operations, cross-agency support programs and other activities.

NASA celebrates 50 years since its establishment. For 50 years, NASA research has enabled scientists to continue to do groundbreaking research in a zero-gravity environment, with untold benefits. For example, one of the many spinoff technologies from the Hubble telescope is the use of its Charge Coupled Device (CCD) chips for digital imaging breast biopsies.

The resulting device images tissue more clearly and efficiently than other technologies. The CCD chips can detect the small differences between a malignant or benign tumor, without the need for a surgical biopsy. This saves the patient weeks of recovery time, and the cost for this procedure is hundreds of dollars vs. thousands for a surgical biopsy. With over 500,000 women needing biopsies a year, the economic benefits are tremendous, not to mention the reduction in pain, scarring, radiation exposure, time, and money associated with surgical biopsies. Of course, this is just one of so many examples of NASA research that benefits society with broader applications.

H.R. 6063 authorizes \$20.21 billion in funding for NASA in fiscal year 2009. I support this legislation and urge NASA to continue its education efforts. A well-educated technical workforce is essential to NASA's success, and it is imperative for the agency to continue to invest in education as well as its other activities.

Again, I want to congratulate NASA for 50 years of stellar work.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 6063, which authorizes the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) for fiscal year 2009. As a member of the Science and Technology Committee, I am pleased that this bill has reached the floor with the full bipartisan support of the committee. H.R. 6063 reaffirms the basic principles that NASA is and should remain a multi-mission agency with a balanced portfolio of programs in science, aeronautics, and human space flight, including human and robotic exploration beyond low-Earth orbit.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the dawn of the United States space program. H.R. 6063 honors this accomplishment with an affirmation of the administration's goals of transitioning to new space vehicles, sending astronauts to Mars and repairing the Hubble telescope. I believe this bill makes important investments in aeronautic research and development while continuing NASA's important work to carry us into the next half century of space exploration. Madam Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment is as follows:

H.R. 6063

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2008".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

**TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009**

Sec. 101. Fiscal year 2009.

**TITLE II—EARTH SCIENCE**

Sec. 201. Goal.

Sec. 202. Governance of United States Earth observations activities.

Sec. 203. Decadal survey missions.

Sec. 204. Transitioning experimental research into operational services.

Sec. 205. Landsat thermal infrared data continuity.

Sec. 206. Reauthorization of Glory Mission.

Sec. 207. Plan for disposition of Deep Space Climate Observatory.

**TITLE III—AERONAUTICS**

Sec. 301. Environmentally friendly aircraft research and development initiative.

Sec. 302. Research alignment.

Sec. 303. Research program to determine perceived impact of sonic booms.

Sec. 304. External review of NASA's aviation safety-related research programs.

Sec. 305. Interagency research initiative on the impact of aviation on the climate.

Sec. 306. Research program on design for certification.

Sec. 307. Aviation weather research.

Sec. 308. Joint Aeronautics Research and Development Advisory Committee.

Sec. 309. Funding for research and development activities in support of other mission directorates.

Sec. 310. University-based centers for research on aviation training.

**TITLE IV—INTERNATIONAL EXPLORATION INITIATIVE**

Sec. 401. Sense of Congress.

Sec. 402. Stepping stone approach to exploration.

Sec. 403. Lunar outpost.

Sec. 404. Exploration technology development.

Sec. 405. Exploration risk mitigation plan.

Sec. 406. Exploration crew rescue.

Sec. 407. Participatory exploration.

Sec. 408. Science and exploration.

**TITLE V—SPACE SCIENCE**

Sec. 501. Technology development.

Sec. 502. Provision for future servicing of observatory-class scientific spacecraft.

Sec. 503. Mars exploration.

Sec. 504. Importance of a balanced science program.

Sec. 505. Restoration of radioisotope thermoelectric generator material production.

Sec. 506. Assessment of impediments to interagency cooperation on space and Earth science missions.

Sec. 507. Assessment of cost growth.

Sec. 508. Outer planets exploration.

**TITLE VI—SPACE OPERATIONS**

*Subtitle A—International Space Station*

Sec. 601. Utilization.

Sec. 602. Research management plan.

Sec. 603. Contingency plan for cargo resupply.

*Subtitle B—Space Shuttle*

Sec. 611. Flight manifest.

Sec. 612. Disposition of shuttle-related assets.  
 Sec. 613. Space Shuttle transition liaison office.  
 Subtitle C—Launch Services

Sec. 621. Launch services strategy.

#### TITLE VII—EDUCATION

Sec. 701. Response to review.

Sec. 702. External review of Explorer Schools program.

#### TITLE VIII—NEAR-EARTH OBJECTS

Sec. 801. In general.

Sec. 802. Findings.

Sec. 803. Requests for information.

Sec. 804. Establishment of policy.

Sec. 805. Planetary radar capability.

Sec. 806. Arecibo Observatory.

#### TITLE IX—COMMERCIAL INITIATIVES

Sec. 901. Sense of Congress.

Sec. 902. Commercial crew initiative.

#### TITLE X—REVITALIZATION OF NASA INSTITUTIONAL CAPABILITIES

Sec. 1001. Review of information security controls.

Sec. 1002. Maintenance and upgrade of Center facilities.

Sec. 1003. Assessment of NASA laboratory capabilities.

#### TITLE XI—OTHER PROVISIONS

Sec. 1101. Space weather.

Sec. 1102. Space traffic management.

Sec. 1103. Study of export control policies related to civil and commercial space activities.

Sec. 1104. Astronaut health care.

Sec. 1105. National Academies decadal surveys.

Sec. 1106. Innovation prizes.

Sec. 1107. Commercial space launch range study.

Sec. 1108. NASA outreach and technology assistance program.

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds, on this, the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the following:

(1) NASA is and should remain a multimission agency with a balanced and robust set of core missions in science, aeronautics, and human space flight and exploration.

(2) Investment in NASA's programs will promote innovation through research and development, and will improve the competitiveness of the United States.

(3) Investment in NASA's programs, like investments in other Federal science and technology activities, is an investment in our future.

(4) Properly structured, NASA's activities can contribute to an improved quality of life, economic vitality, United States leadership in peaceful cooperation with other nations on challenging undertakings in science and technology, national security, and the advancement of knowledge.

(5) NASA should assume a leadership role in a cooperative international Earth observations and research effort to address key research issues associated with climate change and its impacts on the Earth system.

(6) NASA should undertake a program of aeronautical research, development, and where appropriate demonstration activities with the overarching goals of—

(A) ensuring that the Nation's future air transportation system can handle up to 3 times the current travel demand and incorporate new vehicle types with no degradation in safety or adverse environmental impact on local communities;

(B) protecting the environment;

(C) promoting the security of the Nation; and  
 (D) retaining the leadership of the United States in global aviation.

(7) Human and robotic exploration of the solar system will be a significant long term undertaking of humanity in the 21st century and be-

yond, and it is in the national interest that the United States should assume a leadership role in a cooperative international exploration initiative.

(8) Developing United States human space flight capabilities to allow independent American access to the International Space Station, and to explore beyond low Earth orbit, is a strategically important national imperative, and all prudent steps should thus be taken to bring the Orion Crew Exploration Vehicle and Ares I Crew Launch Vehicle to full operational capability as soon as practicable.

(9) NASA's scientific research activities have contributed much to the advancement of knowledge, provided societal benefits, and helped train the next generation of scientists and engineers, and those activities should continue to be an important priority.

(10) NASA should make a sustained commitment to a robust long-term technology development activity. Such investments represent the critically important "seed corn" on which NASA's ability to carry out challenging and productive missions in the future will depend.

(11) NASA, through its pursuit of challenging and relevant activities, can provide an important stimulus to the next generation to pursue careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

(12) Commercial activities have substantially contributed to the strength of both the United States space program and the national economy, and the development of a healthy and robust United States commercial space sector should continue to be encouraged.

(13) It is in the national interest for the United States to have an export control policy that protects the national security while also enabling the United States aerospace industry to compete effectively in the global market place and the United States to undertake cooperative programs in science and human space flight in an effective and efficient manner.

#### SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of NASA.

(2) NASA.—The term "NASA" means the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(3) NOAA.—The term "NOAA" means the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(4) OSTP.—The term "OSTP" means the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

#### TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

##### SEC. 101. FISCAL YEAR 2009.

(a) BASELINE AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to NASA for fiscal year 2009 \$19,210,000,000, as follows:

(1) For Science, \$4,932,200,000, of which—

(A) \$1,518,000,000 shall be for Earth Science, including \$29,200,000 for suborbital activities and \$2,500,000 for carrying out section 313 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-155);

(B) \$1,483,000,000 shall be for Planetary Science, including \$486,500,000 for the Mars Exploration program, \$2,000,000 to continue planetary radar operations at the Arecibo Observatory in support of the Near-Earth Object program, and \$5,000,000 for radioisotope material production, to remain available until expended;

(C) \$1,290,400,000 shall be for Astrophysics, including \$27,300,000 for suborbital activities;

(D) \$640,800,000 shall be for Heliophysics, including \$50,000,000 for suborbital activities; and

(E) \$75,000,000 shall be for Cross-Science Mission Directorate Technology Development, to be taken on a proportional basis from the funding subtotals under subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D).

(2) For Aeronautics, \$853,400,000, of which \$406,900,000 shall be for system-level research, development, and demonstration activities related to—

(A) aviation safety;

(B) environmental impact mitigation, including noise, energy efficiency, and emissions;

(C) support of the Next Generation Air Transportation System initiative; and

(D) investigation of new vehicle concepts and flight regimes.

(3) For Exploration, \$3,886,000,000, of which \$100,000,000 shall be for the activities under sections 902(b) and 902(d); and \$737,800,000 shall be for Advanced Capabilities, including \$106,300,000 for the Lunar Precursor Robotic Program, \$276,500,000 for International Space Station-related research and development activities, and \$355,000,000 for research and development activities not related to the International Space Station.

(4) For Education, \$128,300,000.

(5) For Space Operations, \$6,074,700,000, of which—

(A) \$150,000,000 shall be for an additional Space Shuttle flight to deliver the Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer to the International Space Station;

(B) \$100,000,000 shall be to augment funding for International Space Station Cargo Services to enhance research utilization of the International Space Station, to remain available until expended; and

(C) \$50,000,000 shall be to augment funding for Space Operations Mission Directorate reserves and Shuttle Transition and Retirement activities.

(6) For Cross-Agency Support Programs, \$3,299,900,000.

(7) For Inspector General, \$35,500,000.

(b) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION TO ADDRESS HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT GAP.—In addition to the sums authorized by subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes described in subsection (a)(3) \$1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2009, to be used to accelerate the initial operational capability of the Orion Crew Exploration Vehicle and the Ares I Crew Launch Vehicle and associated ground support systems, to remain available until expended.

#### TITLE II—EARTH SCIENCE

##### SEC. 201. GOAL.

The goal for NASA's Earth Science program shall be to pursue a program of Earth observations, research, and applications activities to better understand the Earth, how it supports life, and how human activities affect its ability to do so in the future. In pursuit of this goal, NASA's Earth Science program shall ensure that securing practical benefits for society will be an important measure of its success in addition to securing new knowledge about the Earth system and climate change. In further pursuit of this goal, NASA shall assume a leadership role in developing and carrying out a cooperative international Earth observations-based research and applications program.

##### SEC. 202. GOVERNANCE OF UNITED STATES EARTH OBSERVATIONS ACTIVITIES.

(a) STUDY.—The Director of the OSTP shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academies for a study to determine the most appropriate governance structure for United States Earth Observations programs in order to meet evolving United States Earth information needs and facilitate United States participation in global Earth Observations initiatives.

(b) REPORT.—The Director shall transmit the study to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and shall provide OSTP's plan for implementing the study's recommendations not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

##### SEC. 203. DECADAL SURVEY MISSIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The missions recommended in the National Academies' decadal survey "Earth Science and Applications from Space" provide the basis for a compelling and relevant program of research and applications, and the

Administrator should work to establish an international cooperative effort to pursue those missions.

(b) **PLAN.**—The Administrator shall prepare a plan for submission to Congress not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act that shall describe how NASA intends to implement the missions recommended as described in subsection (a), whether by means of dedicated NASA missions, multi-agency missions, international cooperative missions, data sharing, or commercial data buys, or by means of long-term technology development to determine whether specific missions would be executable at a reasonable cost and within a reasonable schedule.

**SEC. 204. TRANSITIONING EXPERIMENTAL RESEARCH INTO OPERATIONAL SERVICES.**

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of the Congress that experimental NASA sensors and missions that have the potential to benefit society if transitioned into operational monitoring systems be transitioned into operational status whenever possible.

(b) **INTERAGENCY PROCESS.**—The Director of OSTP, in consultation with the Administrator, the Administrator of NOAA, and other relevant stakeholders, shall develop a process to transition, when appropriate, NASA Earth science and space weather missions or sensors into operational status. The process shall include coordination of annual agency budget requests as required to execute the transitions.

(c) **RESPONSIBLE AGENCY OFFICIAL.**—The Administrator and the Administrator of NOAA shall each designate an agency official who shall have the responsibility for and authority to lead NASA's and NOAA's transition activities and interagency coordination.

(d) **PLAN.**—For each mission or sensor that is determined to be appropriate for transition under subsection (b), NASA and NOAA shall transmit to Congress a joint plan for conducting the transition. The plan shall include the strategy, milestones, and budget required to execute the transition. The transition plan shall be transmitted to Congress not later than 60 days after the successful completion of the mission or sensor critical design review.

**SEC. 205. LANDSAT THERMAL INFRARED DATA CONTINUITY.**

(a) **PLAN.**—In view of the importance of Landsat thermal infrared data for both scientific research and water management applications, the Administrator shall prepare a plan for ensuring the continuity of Landsat thermal infrared data or its equivalent, including allocation of costs and responsibility for the collection and distribution of the data, and a budget plan. As part of the plan, the Administrator shall provide an option for developing a thermal infrared sensor at minimum cost to be flown on the Landsat Data Continuity Mission with minimum delay to the schedule of the Landsat Data Continuity Mission.

(b) **DEADLINE.**—The plan shall be provided to Congress not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 206. REAUTHORIZATION OF GLORY MISSION.**

(a) **REAUTHORIZATION.**—Congress reauthorizes NASA to continue with development of the Glory Mission, which will examine how aerosols and solar energy affect the Earth's climate.

(b) **BASELINE REPORT.**—Pursuant to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-155), not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall transmit a new baseline report consistent with section 103(b)(2) of such Act. The report shall include an analysis of the factors contributing to cost growth and the steps taken to address them.

**SEC. 207. PLAN FOR DISPOSITION OF DEEP SPACE CLIMATE OBSERVATORY.**

(a) **PLAN.**—NASA shall develop a plan for the Deep Space Climate Observatory (DSCOVR), including such options as using the parts of the

spacecraft in the development and assembly of other science missions, transferring the spacecraft to another agency, reconfiguring the spacecraft for another Earth science mission, establishing a public-private partnership for the mission, and entering into an international cooperative partnership to use the spacecraft for its primary or other purposes. The plan shall include an estimate of budgetary resources and schedules required to implement each of the options.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—NASA shall consult, as necessary, with other Federal agencies, industry, academic institutions, and international space agencies in developing the plan.

(c) **REPORT.**—The Administrator shall transmit the plan required under subsection (a) to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

**TITLE III—AERONAUTICS**

**SEC. 301. ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY AIRCRAFT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE.**

The Administrator shall establish an initiative involving NASA, universities, industry, and other research organizations as appropriate, of research, development, and demonstration, in a relevant environment, of technologies to enable the following commercial aircraft performance characteristics:

(1) Noise levels on takeoff and on airport approach and landing that do not exceed ambient noise levels in the absence of flight operations in the vicinity of airports from which such commercial aircraft would normally operate, without increasing energy consumption or nitrogen oxide emissions compared to aircraft in commercial service as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions compared to aircraft in commercial services as of the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 302. RESEARCH ALIGNMENT.**

In addition to pursuing the research and development initiative described in section 301, the Administrator shall, to the maximum extent practicable within available funding, align the fundamental aeronautics research program to address high priority technology challenges of the National Academies' Decadal Survey of Civil Aeronautics, and shall work to increase the degree of involvement of external organizations, and especially of universities, in the fundamental aeronautics research program.

**SEC. 303. RESEARCH PROGRAM TO DETERMINE PERCEIVED IMPACT OF SONIC BOOMS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The ability to fly commercial aircraft over land at supersonic speeds without adverse impacts on the environment or on local communities would open new markets and enable new transportation capabilities. In order to have the basis for establishing an appropriate sonic boom standard for such flight operations, a research program is needed to assess the impact in a relevant environment of commercial supersonic flight operations.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Administrator shall establish a cooperative research program with industry, including the conduct of flight demonstrations in a relevant environment, to collect data on the perceived impact of sonic booms that would enable the promulgation of a standard that would have to be met for overland commercial supersonic flight operations.

**SEC. 304. EXTERNAL REVIEW OF NASA'S AVIATION SAFETY-RELATED RESEARCH PROGRAMS.**

(a) **REVIEW.**—The Administrator shall enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council for an independent review of NASA's aviation safety-related research programs. The review shall assess whether—

(1) the programs have well-defined, prioritized, and appropriate research objectives;

(2) the programs are properly coordinated with the safety research programs of the Federal Aviation Administration and other relevant Federal agencies;

(3) the programs have allocated appropriate resources to each of the research objectives; and

(4) suitable mechanisms exist for transitioning the research results from the programs into operational technologies and procedures and certification activities in a timely manner.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 14 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the results of the review.

**SEC. 305. INTERAGENCY RESEARCH INITIATIVE ON THE IMPACT OF AVIATION ON THE CLIMATE.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator, in coordination with the United States Climate Change Science Program and other appropriate agencies, shall establish a research initiative to assess the impact of aviation on the climate and, if warranted, to evaluate approaches to mitigate that impact.

(b) **RESEARCH PLAN.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the participating Federal entities shall jointly develop a plan for the research initiative that contains objectives, proposed tasks, milestones, and a 5-year budgetary profile.

(c) **REVIEW.**—The Administrator shall enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council for conducting an independent review of the interagency research program plan, and shall provide the results of that review to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 306. RESEARCH PROGRAM ON DESIGN FOR CERTIFICATION.**

(a) **PROGRAM.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, NASA, in consultation with other appropriate agencies, shall establish a research program on methods to improve both confidence in and the timeliness of certification of new technologies for their introduction into the national airspace system.

(b) **RESEARCH PLAN.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, as part of the activity described in subsection (a), NASA shall develop a plan for the research program that contains objectives, proposed tasks, milestones, and a 5-year budgetary profile.

(c) **REVIEW.**—The Administrator shall enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council for conducting an independent review of the research program plan, and shall provide the results of that review to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 307. AVIATION WEATHER RESEARCH.**

The Administrator shall establish a program of collaborative research with NOAA on convective weather events, with the goal of significantly improving the reliability of 2-hour to 6-hour aviation weather forecasts.

**SEC. 308. JOINT AERONAUTICS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—A joint Aeronautics Research and Development Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the "Advisory Committee") shall be established.

(b) **DUTIES.**—The Advisory Committee shall—

(1) make recommendations regarding the coordination of research and development activities of NASA and the Federal Aviation Administration;

(2) make recommendations for and monitor development and implementation of processes for

transitioning research and development from NASA and the Federal Aviation Administration to external entities for further development as appropriate;

(3) make recommendations regarding the status of the activities of NASA and the Federal Aviation Administration's research and development programs as they relate to the recommendations contained in the National Research Council's 2006 report entitled "Decadal Survey of Civil Aeronautics", and the recommendations contained in subsequent National Research Council reports of a similar nature; and

(4) not later than March 15 of each year, transmit a report to the Administrator, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the Advisory Committee's findings and recommendations under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).

(c) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Advisory Committee shall consist of 10 members, none of whom shall be a Federal employee, including—

(1) 5 members selected by the Administrator; and

(2) 5 members selected by the Chair of the Federal Aviation Administration's Research, Engineering, and Development Advisory Committee (REDAC).

(d) **SELECTION PROCESS.**—Initial selections under subsection (c) shall be made within 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as provided in subsection (c).

(e) **CHAIRPERSON.**—The Advisory Committee shall select a chairperson from among its members.

(f) **COORDINATION.**—The Advisory Committee shall coordinate with the advisory bodies of other Federal agencies, which may engage in related research activities.

(g) **COMPENSATION.**—The members of the Advisory Committee shall serve without compensation, but shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(h) **MEETINGS.**—The Advisory Committee shall convene, in person or by electronic means, at least 4 times per year.

(i) **QUORUM.**—A majority of the members serving on the Advisory Committee shall constitute a quorum for purposes of conducting the business of the Advisory Committee.

(j) **DURATION.**—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to the Advisory Committee.

**SEC. 309. FUNDING FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN SUPPORT OF OTHER MISSION DIRECTORATES.**

Research and development activities performed by the Aeronautics Research Mission Directorate with the primary objective of assisting in the development of a flight project in another Mission Directorate shall be funded by the Mission Directorate seeking assistance.

**SEC. 310. UNIVERSITY-BASED CENTERS FOR RESEARCH ON AVIATION TRAINING.**

Section 427(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-155) is amended by striking "may" and inserting "shall".

**TITLE IV—INTERNATIONAL EXPLORATION INITIATIVE**

**SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should invite America's friends and allies to participate in a long-term international initiative under the leadership of the United States to expand human and robotic presence into the solar system, including the exploration and utilization of the Moon, near Earth asteroids, Lagrangian points, and eventually Mars and its moons, among other exploration and utilization goals.

**SEC. 402. STEPPING STONE APPROACH TO EXPLORATION.**

In order to maximize the cost-effectiveness of the long-term exploration and utilization activities of the United States, the Administrator shall take all necessary steps to ensure that activities in its lunar exploration program shall be designed and implemented in a manner that gives strong consideration to how those activities might also help meet the requirements of future exploration and utilization activities beyond the Moon. The timetable of the lunar phase of the long-term international exploration initiative shall be determined by the availability of funding and agreement on an international cooperative framework for the conduct of the international exploration initiative. However, once an exploration-related project enters its development phase, the Administrator shall seek, to the maximum extent practicable, to complete that project without undue delays.

**SEC. 403. LUNAR OUTPOST.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—As NASA works toward the establishment of a lunar outpost, NASA shall make no plans that would require a lunar outpost to be occupied to maintain its viability. Any such outpost shall be operable as a human-tended facility capable of remote or autonomous operation for extended periods.

(b) **DESIGNATION.**—The United States portion of the first human-tended outpost established on the surface of the Moon shall be designated the "Neil A. Armstrong Lunar Outpost".

(c) **CONGRESSIONAL INTENT.**—It is the intent of Congress that NASA shall make use of commercial services to the maximum extent practicable in support of its lunar outpost activities.

**SEC. 404. EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—A robust program of long-term exploration-related technology research and development will be essential for the success and sustainability of any enduring initiative of human and robotic exploration of the solar system.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Administrator shall establish and maintain a program of long-term exploration-related technology research and development that is not tied to specific flight projects and that has a funding goal of at least 10 percent of the total budget of the Exploration Systems Mission Directorate.

(c) **GOALS.**—The long-term technology program shall have the goal of having at least 50 percent of the funding allocated to external grants and contracts with universities, research institutions, and industry.

**SEC. 405. EXPLORATION RISK MITIGATION PLAN.**

(a) **PLAN.**—The Administrator shall prepare a plan that identifies and prioritizes the human and technical risks that will need to be addressed in carrying out human exploration beyond low Earth orbit and the research and development activities required to address those risks. The plan shall address the role of the International Space Station in exploration risk mitigation and include a detailed description of the specific steps being taken to utilize the International Space Station for that purpose.

(b) **REPORT.**—The Administrator shall transmit to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the plan described in subsection (a) not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 406. EXPLORATION CREW RESCUE.**

In order to maximize the ability to rescue astronauts whose space vehicles have become disabled, the Administrator shall enter into discussions with the appropriate representatives of spacefaring nations who have or plan to have crew transportation systems capable of orbital flight or flight beyond low Earth orbit for the purpose of agreeing on a common docking system standard.

**SEC. 407. PARTICIPATORY EXPLORATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall develop a technology plan to enable dissemination of information to the public to allow the public to experience missions to the Moon, Mars, or other bodies within our solar system by leveraging advanced exploration technologies. The plan shall identify opportunities to leverage technologies in NASA's Constellation systems that deliver a rich, multi-media experience to the public, and that facilitate participation by the public, the private sector, nongovernmental organizations, and international partners. Technologies for collecting high-definition video, 3-dimensional images, and scientific data, along with the means to rapidly deliver this content through extended high bandwidth communications networks shall be considered as part of this plan. It shall include a review of high bandwidth radio and laser communications, high-definition video, stereo imagery, 3-dimensional scene cameras, and Internet routers in space, from orbit, and on the lunar surface. The plan shall also consider secondary cargo capability for technology validation and science mission opportunities. In addition, the plan shall identify opportunities to develop and demonstrate these technologies on the International Space Station and robotic missions to the Moon, Mars, and other solar system bodies.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit the plan to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

**SEC. 408. SCIENCE AND EXPLORATION.**

It is the sense of Congress that NASA's scientific and human exploration activities are synergistic, i.e. science enables exploration and human exploration enables science. The Congress encourages the Administrator to coordinate, where practical, NASA's science and exploration activities with the goal of maximizing the success of human exploration initiatives and furthering our understanding of the Universe that we explore.

**TITLE V—SPACE SCIENCE**

**SEC. 501. TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.**

The Administrator shall establish a cross-Directorate long-term technology development program for space and Earth science within the Science Mission Directorate for the development of new technology. The program shall be independent of the flight projects under development. NASA shall have a goal of funding the cross-Directorate technology development program at a level of 5 percent of the total Science Mission Directorate annual budget. The program shall be structured to include competitively awarded grants and contracts.

**SEC. 502. PROVISION FOR FUTURE SERVICING OF OBSERVATORY-CLASS SCIENTIFIC SPACECRAFT.**

The Administrator shall take all necessary steps to ensure that provision is made in the design and construction of all future observatory-class scientific spacecraft intended to be deployed in Earth orbit or at a Lagrangian point in space for robotic or human servicing and repair.

**SEC. 503. MARS EXPLORATION.**

Congress reaffirms its support for a systematic, integrated program of exploration of the Martian surface to examine the planet whose surface is most like Earth's, to search for evidence of past or present life, and to examine Mars for future habitability and as a long-term goal for future human exploration. To the extent affordable and practical, the program should pursue the goal of launches at every Mars launch opportunity, leading to an eventual robotic sample return.

**SEC. 504. IMPORTANCE OF A BALANCED SCIENCE PROGRAM.**

It is the sense of Congress that a balanced and adequately funded set of activities, consisting of NASA's research and analysis grants

programs, technology development, small, medium-sized, and large space science missions, and suborbital research activities, contributes to a robust and productive science program and serves as a catalyst for innovation. It is further the sense of Congress that suborbital flight activities, including the use of sounding rockets, aircraft, and high-altitude balloons, offer valuable opportunities to advance science, train the next generation of scientists and engineers, and provide opportunities for participants in the programs to acquire skills in systems engineering and systems integration that are critical to maintaining the Nation's leadership in space programs. The Congress believes that it is in the national interest to expand the size of NASA's suborbital research program.

**SEC. 505. RESTORATION OF RADIOISOTOPE THERMOELECTRIC GENERATOR MATERIAL PRODUCTION.**

(a) **PLAN.**—The Director of OSTP shall develop a plan for restarting and sustaining the domestic production of radioisotope thermoelectric generator material for deep space and other space science missions.

(b) **REPORT.**—The plan developed under subsection (a) shall be transmitted to Congress not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 506. ASSESSMENT OF IMPEDIMENTS TO INTERAGENCY COOPERATION ON SPACE AND EARTH SCIENCE MISSIONS.**

(a) **ASSESSMENT.**—The Administrator shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academies to assess impediments to the successful conduct of interagency cooperation on space and Earth science missions, to provide lessons learned and best practices, and to recommend steps to help facilitate successful interagency collaborations on space and Earth science missions.

(b) **REPORT.**—The report of the assessment carried out under subsection (a) shall be transmitted to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than 15 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 507. ASSESSMENT OF COST GROWTH.**

(a) **STUDY.**—The Administrator shall enter into an arrangement for an independent external assessment to identify the primary causes of cost growth in the large, medium-sized, and small space and Earth science spacecraft mission classes, and make recommendations as to what changes, if any, should be made to contain costs and ensure frequent mission opportunities in NASA's science spacecraft mission programs.

(b) **REPORT.**—The report of the assessment conducted under subsection (a) shall be submitted to Congress not later than 15 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 508. OUTER PLANETS EXPLORATION.**

It is the sense of Congress that the outer solar system planets and their satellites can offer important knowledge about the formation and evolution of the solar system, the nature and diversity of these solar system bodies, and the potential for conditions conducive to life beyond Earth. NASA should move forward with plans for an Outer Planets flagship mission to the Europa-Jupiter system or the Titan-Saturn system as soon as practicable within a balanced Planetary Science program.

**TITLE VI—SPACE OPERATIONS**

**Subtitle A—International Space Station**

**SEC. 601. UTILIZATION.**

The Administrator shall take all necessary steps to ensure that the International Space Station remains a viable and productive facility capable of potential United States utilization through at least 2020 and shall take no steps that would preclude its continued operation and utilization by the United States after 2016.

**SEC. 602. RESEARCH MANAGEMENT PLAN.**

(a) **RESEARCH MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The Administrator shall develop a research manage-

ment plan for the International Space Station. The plan shall include a process for selecting and prioritizing research activities (including fundamental, applied, commercial, and other research) for flight on the International Space Station. This plan shall be used to prioritize resources such as crew time, racks and equipment, and United States access to international research facilities and equipment. The plan shall also identify the organization to be responsible for managing United States research on the International Space Station, including a description of the relationship of the management institution with NASA (e.g., internal NASA office, contract, cooperative agreement, or grant), the estimated length of time for the arrangement, and the budget required to support the management institution. The plan shall be developed in consultation with other Federal agencies, academia, industry, and other relevant stakeholders. The plan shall be transmitted to Congress not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **ACCESS TO NATIONAL LABORATORY.**—The Administrator shall—

(1) establish a process by which to support International Space Station National Laboratory users in identifying their requirements for transportation of research supplies to and from the International Space Station, and for communicating those requirements to NASA and International Space Station transportation services providers; and

(2) develop an estimate of the transportation requirements needed to support users of the International Space Station National Laboratory and develop a plan for satisfying those requirements by dedicating a portion of volume on NASA supply missions to the International Space Station and missions returning from the International Space Station to Earth.

(c) **ASSESSMENT.**—The Administrator shall—

(1) identify existing research equipment and racks and support equipment that are manifested for flight;

(2) provide a detailed description of the status of research equipment and facilities that were completed or in development prior to being cancelled, and provide the budget and milestones for completing and preparing the equipment for flight on the International Space Station; and

(3) provide the results of the assessment to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall establish an advisory panel under the Federal Advisory Committee Act to monitor the activities and management of the International Space Station National Laboratory.

**SEC. 603. CONTINGENCY PLAN FOR CARGO RESUPPLY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The International Space Station represents a significant investment of national resources, and it is a facility that embodies a cooperative international approach to the exploration and utilization of space. As such, it is important that its continued viability and productivity be ensured, to the maximum extent possible, after the Space Shuttle is retired.

(b) **CONTINGENCY PLAN.**—The Administrator shall develop a contingency plan and arrangements, including use of International Space Station international partner cargo resupply capabilities, to ensure the continued viability and productivity of the International Space Station in the event that United States commercial cargo resupply services are not available during any extended period after the date that the Space Shuttle is retired. The plan shall be delivered to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transpor-

tation of the Senate not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

**Subtitle B—Space Shuttle**

**SEC. 611. FLIGHT MANIFEST.**

(a) **BASELINE MANIFEST.**—In addition to the Space Shuttle flights listed as part of the baseline flight manifest as of January 1, 2008, the Utilization flights ULF-4 and ULF-5 shall be considered part of the Space Shuttle baseline flight manifest and shall be flown prior to the retirement of the Space Shuttle.

(b) **ADDITIONAL FLIGHT TO DELIVER THE ALPHA MAGNETIC SPECTROMETER TO THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.**—In addition to the flying of the baseline manifest as described in subsection (a), the Administrator shall take all necessary steps to fly one additional Space Shuttle flight to deliver the Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer to the International Space Station prior to the retirement of the Space Shuttle.

(c) **SPACE SHUTTLE RETIREMENT DATE.**—The Space Shuttle shall be retired following the completion of the baseline flight manifest and the flight of the additional flight specified in subsection (b), events that are anticipated to occur in 2010.

**SEC. 612. DISPOSITION OF SHUTTLE-RELATED ASSETS.**

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall provide a plan to Congress for the disposition of the remaining Space Shuttle orbiters and other Space Shuttle program-related hardware and facilities after the retirement of the Space Shuttle fleet. The plan shall include a process by which educational institutions and science museums and other appropriate organizations may acquire, through loan or disposal by the Federal Government, Space Shuttle program-related hardware. The Administrator shall not dispose of any Space Shuttle-related hardware prior to the completion of the plan.

**SEC. 613. SPACE SHUTTLE TRANSITION LIAISON OFFICE.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Administrator shall establish an office within NASA's Office of Human Capital Management that shall assist local communities affected by the termination of the Space Shuttle program. The office shall offer technical assistance and serve as a clearinghouse to assist communities in identifying services available from other Federal agencies.

(b) **SUNSET.**—The Office established under subsection (a) shall cease operations 24 months after the last Space Shuttle flight.

**Subtitle C—Launch Services**

**SEC. 621. LAUNCH SERVICES STRATEGY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In preparation for the award of contracts to follow up on the current NASA Launch Services (NLS) contracts, the Administrator shall develop a strategy for providing domestic commercial launch services in support of NASA's small and medium-sized Science, Space Operations, and Exploration missions, consistent with current law and policy.

(b) **REPORT.**—The Administrator shall transmit a report to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate describing the strategy developed under subsection (a) not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The report shall provide, at a minimum—

(1) the results of the Request for Information on small to medium-sized launch services released on April 22, 2008;

(2) an analysis of possible alternatives to maintain small and medium-sized lift capabilities after June 30, 2010, including the use of the Department of Defense's Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV);

(3) the recommended alternatives, and associated 5-year budget plans starting in October 2010 that would enable their implementation; and

(4) a contingency plan in the event the recommended alternatives described in paragraph (3) are not available when needed.

#### TITLE VII—EDUCATION

##### SEC. 701. RESPONSE TO REVIEW.

(a) PLAN.—The Administrator shall prepare a plan identifying actions taken or planned in response to the recommendations of the National Academies report, “NASA’s Elementary and Secondary Education Program: Review and Critique”. For those actions that have not been implemented, the plan shall include a schedule and budget required to support the actions.

(b) REPORT.—The plan prepared under subsection (a) shall be transmitted to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

##### SEC. 702. EXTERNAL REVIEW OF EXPLORER SCHOOLS PROGRAM.

(a) REVIEW.—The Administrator shall make arrangements for an independent external review of the Explorer Schools program to evaluate its goals, status, plans, and accomplishments.

(b) REPORT.—The report of the independent external review shall be transmitted to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### TITLE VIII—NEAR-EARTH OBJECTS

##### SEC. 801. IN GENERAL.

The Congress reaffirms the policy direction established in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-155) for NASA to detect, track, catalogue, and characterize the physical characteristics of near-Earth objects equal to or greater than 140 meters in diameter. NASA’s Near-Earth Object program activities will also provide benefits to NASA’s scientific and exploration activities.

##### SEC. 802. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Near-Earth objects pose a serious and credible threat to humankind, as many scientists believe that a major asteroid or comet was responsible for the mass extinction of the majority of the Earth’s species, including the dinosaurs, nearly 65,000,000 years ago.

(2) Several such near-Earth objects have only been discovered within days of the objects’ closest approach to Earth and recent discoveries of such large objects indicate that many large near-Earth objects remain undiscovered.

(3) Asteroid and comet collisions rank as one of the most costly natural disasters that can occur.

(4) The time needed to eliminate or mitigate the threat of a collision of a potentially hazardous near-Earth object with Earth is measured in decades.

(5) Unlike earthquakes and hurricanes, asteroids and comets can provide adequate collision information, enabling the United States to include both asteroid-collision and comet-collision disaster recovery and disaster avoidance in its public-safety structure.

(6) Basic information is needed for technical and policy decisionmaking for the United States to create a comprehensive program in order to be ready to eliminate and mitigate the serious and credible threats to humankind posed by potentially hazardous near-Earth asteroids and comets.

(7) As a first step to eliminate and to mitigate the risk of such collisions, situation and decision analysis processes, as well as procedures and system resources, must be in place well before a collision threat becomes known.

##### SEC. 803. REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.

The Administrator shall issue requests for information on—

(1) a low-cost space mission with the purpose of rendezvousing with, attaching a tracking device, and characterizing the Apophis asteroid, which scientists estimate will in 2029 pass at a distance from Earth that is closer than geostationary satellites; and

(2) a medium-sized space mission with the purpose of detecting near-Earth objects equal to or greater than 140 meters in diameter.

##### SEC. 804. ESTABLISHMENT OF POLICY.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of OSTP shall—

(1) develop a policy for notifying Federal agencies and relevant emergency response institutions of an impending near-Earth object threat, if near term public safety is at stake; and

(2) recommend a Federal agency or agencies to be responsible for protecting the Nation from a near-Earth object that is anticipated to collide with Earth and implementing a deflection campaign, in consultation with international bodies, should one be required.

##### SEC. 805. PLANETARY RADAR CAPABILITY.

The Administrator shall maintain a planetary radar that is, at minimum, comparable to the capability provided through the NASA Deep Space Network Goldstone facility.

##### SEC. 806. ARECIBO OBSERVATORY.

Congress reiterates its support for the use of the Arecibo Observatory for NASA-funded near-Earth object-related activities. The Administrator shall ensure the availability of the Arecibo Observatory’s planetary radar to support these activities until the National Academies’ review of NASA’s approach for the survey and deflection of near-Earth objects, including a determination of the role of Arecibo, that was directed to be undertaken by the Fiscal Year 2008 Omnibus Appropriations Act, is completed.

#### TITLE IX—COMMERCIAL INITIATIVES

##### SEC. 901. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that a healthy and robust commercial sector can make significant contributions to the successful conduct of NASA’s space exploration program. While some activities are inherently governmental in nature, there are many other activities, such as routine supply of water, fuel, and other consumables to low Earth orbit or to destinations beyond low Earth orbit, and provision of power or communications services to lunar outposts, that potentially could be carried out effectively and efficiently by the commercial sector at some point in the future. Congress encourages NASA to look for such service opportunities and, to the maximum extent practicable, make use of the commercial sector to provide those services.

##### SEC. 902. COMMERCIAL CREW INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to stimulate commercial use of space, help maximize the utility and productivity of the International Space Station, and enable a commercial means of providing crew transfer and crew rescue services for the International Space Station, NASA shall—

(1) make use of United States commercially provided International Space Station crew transfer and crew rescue services to the maximum extent practicable, if those commercial services have demonstrated the capability to meet NASA-specified ascent, entry, and International Space Station proximity operations safety requirements;

(2) limit, to the maximum extent practicable, the use of the Crew Exploration Vehicle to missions carrying astronauts beyond low Earth orbit once commercial crew transfer and crew rescue services that meet safety requirements become operational;

(3) facilitate, to the maximum extent practicable, the transfer of NASA-developed technologies to potential United States commercial crew transfer and rescue service providers, consistent with United States law; and

(4) issue a notice of intent, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to

enter into a funded, competitively awarded Space Act Agreement with two or more commercial entities for a Phase 1 Commercial Orbital Transportation Services (COTS) crewed vehicle demonstration program.

(b) COTS CREWED VEHICLE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to NASA for the program described in subsection (a)(4) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2009, to remain available until expended.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL INTENT.—It is the intent of Congress that funding for the program described in subsection (a)(4) shall not come at the expense of full funding of the amounts authorized under section 101(a)(3), and for future fiscal years, for Orion Crew Exploration Vehicle development, Ares I Crew Launch Vehicle development, or International Space Station cargo delivery.

(d) ADDITIONAL TECHNOLOGIES AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to NASA for the provision of International Space Station-compatible docking adaptors and other relevant technologies to be made available to the commercial crew providers selected to service the International Space Station \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(e) CREW TRANSFER AND CREW RESCUE SERVICES CONTRACT.—If a commercial provider demonstrates the capability to provide International Space Station crew transfer and crew rescue services and to satisfy NASA ascent, entry, and International Space Station proximity operations safety requirements, NASA shall enter into an International Space Station crew transfer and crew rescue services contract with that commercial provider for a portion of NASA’s anticipated International Space Station crew transfer and crew rescue requirements from the time the commercial provider commences operations under contract with NASA through calendar year 2016, with an option to extend the period of performance through calendar year 2020.

#### TITLE X—REVITALIZATION OF NASA INSTITUTIONAL CAPABILITIES

##### SEC. 1001. REVIEW OF INFORMATION SECURITY CONTROLS.

(a) REPORT ON CONTROLS.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall transmit to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a review of information security controls that protect NASA’s information technology resources and information from inadvertent or deliberate misuse, fraudulent use, disclosure, modification, or destruction. The review shall focus on networks servicing NASA’s mission directorates. In assessing these controls, the review shall evaluate—

(1) the network’s ability to limit, detect, and monitor access to resources and information, thereby safeguarding and protecting them from unauthorized access;

(2) the physical access to network resources; and

(3) the extent to which sensitive research and mission data is encrypted.

(b) RESTRICTED REPORT ON INTRUSIONS.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, and in conjunction with the report described in subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall transmit to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a restricted report detailing results of vulnerability assessments conducted by the Government Accountability Office on NASA’s network resources. Intrusion attempts during such vulnerability assessments shall be divulged to NASA senior

management prior to their application. The report shall put vulnerability assessment results in the context of unauthorized accesses or attempts during the prior two years and the corrective actions, recent or ongoing, that NASA has implemented in conjunction with other Federal authorities to prevent such intrusions.

**SEC. 1002. MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADE OF CENTER FACILITIES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In order to sustain healthy Centers that are capable of carrying out NASA's missions, the Administrator shall ensure that adequate maintenance and upgrading of those Center facilities is performed on a regular basis.

(b) **REVIEW.**—The Administrator shall determine and prioritize the maintenance and upgrade backlog at each of NASA's Centers and associated facilities, and shall develop a strategy and budget plan to reduce that maintenance and upgrade backlog by 50 percent over the next five years.

(c) **REPORT.**—The Administrator shall deliver a report to Congress on the results of the activities undertaken in subsection (b) concurrently with the delivery of the fiscal year 2011 budget request.

**SEC. 1003. ASSESSMENT OF NASA LABORATORY CAPABILITIES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—NASA's laboratories are a critical component of NASA's research capabilities, and the Administrator shall ensure that those laboratories remain productive.

(b) **REVIEW.**—The Administrator shall enter into an arrangement for an independent external review of NASA's laboratories, including laboratory equipment, facilities, and support services, to determine whether they are equipped and maintained at a level adequate to support NASA's research activities. The assessment shall also include an assessment of the relative quality of NASA's in-house laboratory equipment and facilities compared to comparable laboratories elsewhere. The results of the review shall be provided to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

**TITLE XI—OTHER PROVISIONS**

**SEC. 1101. SPACE WEATHER.**

(a) **PLAN FOR REPLACEMENT OF ADVANCED COMPOSITION EXPLORER AT L-1 LAGRANGIAN POINT.**—

(1) **PLAN.**—The Director of OSTP shall develop a plan for sustaining space-based measurements of solar wind from the L-1 Lagrangian point in space and for the dissemination of the data for operational purposes. OSTP shall consult with NASA, NOAA, and other Federal agencies, and with industry, in developing the plan.

(2) **REPORT.**—The Director shall transmit the plan to Congress not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **RESEARCH PROGRAM ON SPACE WEATHER AND AVIATION.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Administrator shall, in coordination with the National Science Foundation, NOAA, and other relevant agencies, initiate a research program to—

(A) conduct or supervise research projects on impacts of space weather to aviation, including impacts on communication, navigation, avionic systems, and airline passengers and personnel; and

(B) facilitate the transfer of technology from space weather research programs to Federal agencies with operational responsibilities and to the private sector.

(2) **USE OF GRANTS OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—The Administrator may use grants or cooperative agreements in carrying out this subsection.

(c) **ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF SPACE WEATHER ON AVIATION.**—

(1) **STUDY.**—The Administrator shall enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council for a study of the impacts of space weather on the current and future United States aviation industry, and in particular to examine the risks for Over-The-Pole (OTP) and Ultra-Long-Range (ULR) operations. The study shall—

(A) examine space weather impacts on at least communications, navigation, avionics, and human health in flight;

(B) assess the benefits of space weather information and services to reduce aviation costs and maintain safety;

(C) provide recommendations on how NASA, NOAA, and the National Science Foundation can most effectively carry out research and monitoring activities related to space weather and aviation; and

(D) provide recommendations on how to integrate space weather information into the Next Generation Air Transportation System.

(2) **REPORT.**—A report containing the results of the study shall be provided to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 1102. SPACE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As more nations acquire the capabilities for launching payloads into outer space, there is an increasing need for a framework under which information intended to promote safe access into outer space, operations in outer space, and return from outer space to Earth free from physical or radio-frequency interference can be shared among those nations.

(b) **DISCUSSIONS.**—The Administrator, in consultation with other appropriate agencies of the Federal Government, shall initiate discussions with the appropriate representatives of other spacefaring nations with the goal of determining an appropriate framework under which information intended to promote safe access into outer space, operations in outer space, and return from outer space to Earth free from physical or radio-frequency interference can be shared among those nations.

**SEC. 1103. STUDY OF EXPORT CONTROL POLICIES RELATED TO CIVIL AND COMMERCIAL SPACE ACTIVITIES.**

(a) **REVIEW.**—The Director of OSTP shall carry out a study of the impact of current export control policies and implementation directives on the United States aerospace industry and its competitiveness in global markets, and on the ability of United States Government agencies to carry out cooperative activities in science and technology and human space flight, including the impact on research carried out under the sponsorship of those agencies.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—In carrying out the study, the Director shall seek input from industry, academia, representatives of the science community, all affected United States Government agencies, and any other appropriate organizations and individuals.

(c) **REPORT.**—The Director shall provide a report detailing the findings and recommendations of the study to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 1104. ASTRONAUT HEALTH CARE.**

(a) **SURVEY.**—The Administrator shall administer an anonymous survey of astronauts and flight surgeons to evaluate communication, relationships, and the effectiveness of policies. The survey questions and the anal-

ysis of results shall be evaluated by experts independent of NASA. The survey shall be administered on at least a biennial basis.

(b) **REPORT.**—The Administrator shall transmit a report of the results of the survey to Congress not later than 90 days following completion of the survey.

**SEC. 1105. NATIONAL ACADEMIES DECADAL SURVEYS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall enter into agreements on a periodic basis with the National Academies for independent assessments, also known as decadal surveys, to take stock of the status and opportunities for Earth and space science discipline fields and Aeronautics research and to recommend priorities for research and programmatic areas over the next decade.

(b) **INDEPENDENT COST ESTIMATES.**—The agreements described in subsection (a) shall include independent estimates of the life cycle costs and technical readiness of missions assessed in the decadal surveys whenever possible.

(c) **REEXAMINATION.**—The Administrator shall request that each National Academies decadal survey committee identify any conditions or events, such as significant cost growth or scientific or technological advances, that would warrant NASA asking the National Academies to reexamine the priorities that the decadal survey had established.

**SEC. 1106. INNOVATION PRIZES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Prizes can play a useful role in encouraging innovation in the development of technologies and products that can assist NASA in its aeronautics and space activities, and the use of such prizes by NASA should be encouraged.

(b) **AMENDMENTS.**—Section 314 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) **TOPICS.**—In selecting topics for prize competitions, the Administrator shall consult widely both within and outside the Federal Government, and may empanel advisory committees. The Administrator shall give consideration to prize goals such as the demonstration of the ability to provide energy to the lunar surface from space-based solar power systems, demonstration of innovative near-Earth object survey and deflection strategies, and innovative approaches to improving the safety and efficiency of aviation systems.”; and

(2) in subsection (i)(4) by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$50,000,000”.

**SEC. 1107. COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH RANGE STUDY.**

(a) **STUDY BY INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE.**—The Director of OSTP shall work with other appropriate Federal agencies to establish an interagency committee to conduct a study to—

(1) identify the issues and challenges associated with establishing a space launch range and facilities that are fully dedicated to commercial space missions in close proximity to Federal launch ranges or other Federal facilities; and

(2) develop a coordinating mechanism such that States seeking to establish such commercial space launch ranges will be able to effectively and efficiently interface with the Federal Government concerning issues related to the establishment of such commercial launch ranges in close proximity to Federal launch ranges or other Federal facilities.

(b) **REPORT.**—The Director shall, not later than May 31, 2010, submit to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

**SEC. 1108. NASA OUTREACH AND TECHNOLOGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—NASA shall contract with an organization that has demonstrated the

ability to partner with NASA centers, aerospace contractors, and academic institutions to carry out a program to transfer the knowledge and technology of the space and aeronautics programs to small businesses in communities across the United States. The program shall support the mission of NASA's Innovative Partnerships Program to provide technical assistance through joint partnerships with industry, academia, government agencies, and national laboratories.

(b) **PROGRAM STRUCTURE.**—In carrying out the program described in subsection (a), the organization shall support the mission of NASA's Innovative Partnerships Program by undertaking the following activities:

(1) Facilitating technology transfer to the private sector to produce viable commercial products.

(2) Creating a network of academic institutions, aerospace contractors, and NASA centers that will commit to donating technical assistance to small businesses.

(3) Creating a network of economic development organizations to increase the awareness and enhance the effectiveness of the program nationwide.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall submit a report to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate describing the efforts and accomplishments of the program established under subsection (a) in support of NASA's Innovative Partnerships Program. As part of the report, the Administrator shall provide—

(1) data on the number of small businesses receiving assistance, jobs created and retained, and volunteer hours donated by NASA, contractors, and academic institutions nationwide;

(2) an estimate of the total dollar value of the economic impact made by small businesses that received technical assistance through the program; and

(3) an accounting of the use of funds appropriated for the program.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to NASA for the program established under subsection (a), \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 2009 from the funding available for the Innovative Partnerships Program, to remain available until expended.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 110-707. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GORDON OF TENNESSEE

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110-707.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer an amendment?

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Yes, I do, Madam Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. GORDON of Tennessee:

In section 303, add at the end the following new subsection:

(c) **COORDINATION.**—The Administrator shall ensure that sonic boom research is coordinated as appropriate with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, and as appropriate make use of the expertise of the Partnership for Air Transportation Noise and Emissions Reduction Center of Excellence sponsored by NASA and the Federal Aviation Administration.

Amend section 305 to read as follows:

**SEC. 305. INTERAGENCY RESEARCH INITIATIVE ON THE IMPACT OF AVIATION ON THE CLIMATE.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, in coordination with NASA and the United States Climate Change Science Program, shall establish a research initiative to assess the impact of aviation on the climate and, if warranted, to evaluate approaches to mitigate that impact.

(b) **RESEARCH PLAN.**—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the participating Federal entities shall jointly develop a plan for the research program that contains the objectives, proposed tasks, milestones, and 5-year budgetary profile.

Amend section 306 to read as follows (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 306. RESEARCH ON DESIGN FOR CERTIFICATION.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Aviation Administration, in consultation with other agencies as appropriate, shall establish a research program on methods to improve both confidence in and the timeliness of certification of new technologies for their introduction into the national airspace system.

(b) **RESEARCH PLAN.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, as part of the activity described in subsection (a), the Federal Aviation Administration shall develop a plan for the research program that contains the objectives, proposed tasks, milestones, and five-year budgetary profile.

(c) **REVIEW.**—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall have the National Research Council conduct an independent review of the research program plan and provide the results of that review to the Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

In section 504, strike “and high-altitude balloons,” and insert “high-altitude balloons, and suborbital reusable launch vehicles.”

In title VII, add at the end the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 703. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of Congress that NASA's educational programs are important sources of inspiration and hands-on learning for the next generation of engineers and scientists and should be supported. In that regard, programs such as EarthKAM, which brings NASA directly into American classrooms by enabling students to talk directly with Astronauts aboard International Space Station and take photographs of Earth from space, and NASA involvement in robotics competitions for students of all levels, are particularly worthy undertakings and NASA should support them and look for additional opportunities to engage students through NASA's space and aeronautics activities.

In section 901, insert “It is further the sense of Congress that United States entrepreneurial space companies have the potential to develop and deliver innovative technology solutions at affordable costs. NASA is encouraged to use United States entrepreneurial space companies to conduct appropriate research and development activities. NASA is further encouraged to seek ways to ensure that firms that rely on fixed-price proposals are not disadvantaged when NASA seeks to procure technology development.” after “provide those services.”

In title XI, add at the end the following new sections (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 1109. REDUCTION-IN-FORCE MORATORIUM.**

NASA shall not initiate or implement a reduction-in-force, or conduct any other involuntary separations of permanent, non-Senior Executive Service, civil servant employees except for cause on charges of misconduct, delinquency, or inefficiency prior to December 31, 2010.

**SEC. 1110. LIMIT ON THE USE OF TERM POSITIONS.**

NASA shall limit the percentage of employees in term positions, excluding students and cooperatives, within NASA to less than or equal to ten percent of the total number of non-Senior Executive Service, civil servant employees in fiscal year 2009.

**SEC. 1111. TEMPORARY CONTINUATION OF COVERAGE OF HEALTH BENEFITS.**

(a) Section 8905a (d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6)(A) If the basis for continued coverage under this section is, as a result of the termination of the Space Shuttle Program, an involuntary separation from a position due to a reduction-in-force or declination of a directed reassignment or transfer of function, or a voluntary separation from a surplus position in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—

“(i) the individual shall be liable for not more than the employee contributions referred to in paragraph (1)(A)(i); and

“(ii) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall pay the remaining portion of the amount required under paragraph (1)(A).

“(B) This paragraph shall only apply with respect to individuals whose continued coverage is based on a separation occurring on or after the date of enactment of this paragraph and before December 31, 2010.

“(C) For purposes of this paragraph, “surplus position” means a position which is—

“(i) identified in pre-reduction-in-force planning as no longer required, and which is expected to be eliminated under formal reduction-in-force procedures as a result of the termination of the Space Shuttle Program; or

“(ii) encumbered by an employee who has received official certification from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration consistent with the Administration's career transition assistance program regulations that the position is being abolished as a result of the termination of the Space Shuttle Program.”

(b) Paragraph (1)(A) of such subsection (d) is amended by striking “(4) and (5)” and inserting “(4), (5), and (6)”.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1257, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman this is a bipartisan manager's amendment that has been developed in close collaboration with the Science and Technology Committee minority leadership.

It provides several aeronautics-related provisions in the bill to conform them to provisions that were included in last year's House-passed FAA reauthorization bill.

It also includes a provision in section 303 related to coordination with the FAA on sonic boom research, which will help ensure that NASA's research results can help inform any future FAA rulemaking.

The amendment also encourages the potential scientific utility of emerging commercial, reusable launch vehicles by citing them as potential options for suborbital scientific research once they become available.

The amendment also includes language provisions by Mr. LAMPSON on the value of NASA's EarthKAM and robotics competitions for aspiring students.

Both of these activities were great ways to inspire students to learn about math, science and technology by providing exciting learning experiences. And I want to commend Mr. LAMPSON for his initiative in this area.

The amendment also expands section 901 to include a sense of Congress urging NASA's use of entrepreneurial companies to conduct corporate R&D.

Innovative ideas and products have repeatedly come out of these small entrepreneurial companies, and this amendment encourages NASA to seek ways to ensure such firms are not disadvantaged when the agency seeks to procure technology development.

Finally, the manager's amendment includes several important NASA workforce-related provisions, including an extension of the RIF moratorium, a limit on the use of certain positions in fiscal year 2009, and temporary continuation of health care benefits.

We have worked with NASA, the IFPTE union, and Chairman DAVIS' subcommittee on Federal Workforce to come up with a reasonable set of provisions.

The workforce provisions included in the manager's amendment are acceptable to all parties, and I believe they will help strengthen and protect the NASA workforce.

In sum, I believe the manager's amendment will make a good deal even better. And I urge Members to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes Mr. HALL from Texas.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time, and I am going to encourage my colleagues to support this amendment. But first I want to yield 3 minutes to Mr. FEENEY, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FEENEY. I thank Ranking Member HALL, and I thank Chairman GORDON for this amendment. I did want to take a moment or two to point out a

very important aspect of this manager's amendment. It directs the White House Office of Science and Technology to establish an interagency committee to study issues related to locating a commercial space launch range in close proximity to a Federal launch range.

In order to have viable commercial launch operations in the United States, effective coordination and cooperation must exist between potential commercial ranges and existing Federal ranges. Federal agencies have to endeavor to assist and not choke off commercial space ranges. The interagency committee will focus on these agencies and the importance of this issue.

Let me say that for the last 50 years, space has been really a bipolar world. Either you were a part of the former Soviet orbit and space power, or you were part of the American-led free nations in space power.

Today it is a very different world. I just recently came back from the first ever global space summit in Beijing, China, where over 15 nations were represented, some six or seven major spacefaring powers. It is not just people that have to come ask the United States to get permission to get commercial opportunities in space today. There are some 50 different international agreements, many of which don't even involve the United States of America.

In some ways, our competitors are beating us to the punch in commercial launch opportunities. It is not just bad for business. Let me say, for example, the Chinese have launched over 33 satellites from other countries. They are doing this to help countries we would consider troublesome, for example, Venezuela or Nigeria. They are also using it to buy influence with our friends, like Japan or Brazil. America cannot shoot itself in the foot in developing and maintaining our historic leadership in commercial opportunities any more than we can give up predominance in the civilian side of human space exploration.

And so this manager's amendment contains a very important aspect. I sincerely applaud the chairman and others, including John Culberson, for advocating for this specific piece of the manager's amendment.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the manager's amendment. We have all worked together to fashion a constructive amendment. And I believe it includes a number of useful provisions that enhance the bill. Chairman GORDON already described them. So I am not going to restate them. But I want to note in particular that the workforce provisions included in the amendment have been under consideration for some time. We wanted to make sure however

that we had the concurrence of all the stakeholders before we added any of these provisions. That has been done. The provisions will strengthen and protect the NASA workforce. I would ask the Members to support this amendment. It is a good amendment. It deserves the support of the body.

Mr. FEENEY. I am claiming time, without objection, for the minority side. We have no further speakers and would urge support and adoption of the manager's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to my friend from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the manager's amendment and the underlying bill that reauthorizes the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I want to thank the chairman of the Federal Workforce Subcommittee for working with me on three critical provisions that are included in this amendment. I also want to thank the chairman of the Science and Technology Committee and the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee for putting together yet another bill that protects NASA and for working with me on this amendment.

The most important provision in this amendment is an extension of the ban on layoffs until at least 2011. Since announcing the ambitious vision for space exploration, the administration underfunded NASA. But Congress has consistently, and I might point out, in a bipartisan way, rejected these destructive cuts and layoffs. I am particularly proud of the way our own Ohio delegation has worked together on this.

Layoffs undermine not only workers' lives and the mission of the agency but also the regional economy. According to the researchers at Cleveland State University, NASA Glenn in Brook Park generated a demand for products and services of \$955 million and was responsible for over 6,000 jobs in northeast Ohio in 2006.

Over the last few years, NASA has hired nearly three-quarters of its new science and engineering employees as short-term employees, thereby denying them full Civil Service protections. The 10 percent cap on short-term positions in this amendment will help NASA compete for the best and brightest in the field.

The third provision would temporarily extend health care benefits for employees in transition. The sudden loss of health care coverage is a major factor currently discouraging employees from taking a buy-out. The provision would be helpful in fostering a respectful workforce transition plan during this time of change for NASA.

This amendment and the underlying bill keep NASA healthy by supporting its employees. All across this country,

from one end of the country to the other, there are NASA employees who are performing a valuable service, who are helping us to create the jobs of the future and enabling America to fulfill its vision to keep reaching.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Manager's Amendment to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2008 (NASA Reauthorization), offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, Representative BART GORDON, Chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology. I commend Chairman GORDON for his work on this important bill, which provides approximately \$20 billion in funding authorization for fiscal year 2009, including approximately \$853 million for aeronautical research, which is vital to commercial aviation.

The Manager's Amendment includes two revisions to the base authorization bill to reflect previous agreements between the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Science Committee on provisions that were part of H.R. 2881, The FAA Reauthorization Act of 2007, which passed the House on September 20, 2007. The Manager's Amendment revises Section 305 of the bill, to require the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Administrator, in coordination with NASA and the United States Climate Change Science Program to establish a research initiative to assess the impact of aviation on the climate and to evaluate mitigation approaches. In addition, this section, as amended, requires, within one year of the date of enactment, the participating federal agencies to develop a plan for a research program dedicated to aviation's impact on the climate.

The Manager's Amendment also amends Section 306 of the bill to require the FAA, in consultation with other agencies, to establish a research program on ways to improve the confidence in and timeliness of certification of new technologies for introduction into the National Airspace System. In addition, this section, as amended, requires the FAA to develop a research plan, and to contract with the National Research Council to conduct an independent review of the research program plan, with a subsequent report to the committees of jurisdiction, including the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Madam Chairman, I support H.R. 6063, as amended by the Manager's Amendment, and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FEENEY

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110-707.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment under the name of Mr. ROHRBACHER at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. FEENEY:

In title VIII, add at the end the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 807. INTERNATIONAL RESOURCES.**

It is the sense of Congress that, since an estimated 25,000 asteroids of concern have

yet to be discovered and monitored, the United States should seek to obtain commitments for cooperation from other nations with significant resources for contributing to a thorough and timely search for such objects and an identification of their characteristics.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1257, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

□ 1615

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Chairman, on behalf of this amendment, as Congressman ROHRBACHER explained earlier, this amendment is a sense of the Congress provision stating the U.S. should seek to obtain commitments for cooperation from other nations in the search for near-Earth objects.

Mr. ROHRBACHER has been an ardent advocate in our committee for the potential threat posed by asteroids and comets having orbits that bring them close to Earth and the devastation they could create should one of them impact us.

By the way, I have sat through hearings, along with Congressman UDALL and others, and we have incredibly sophisticated technology and capabilities one day to protect Earth if we know we are going to be targeted by an asteroid or comet, for example. In fact, the testimony was that some 99 percent of the resources today globally to prepare for this eventuality are American tax dollars. It seems seeking cooperation on behalf of all humankind only makes sense.

Our committee held a highly informative set of hearings on near-Earth objects late last fall. It is clear to me that the entire world community needs to be much more vigilant in finding, tracking and characterizing near-Earth objects and developing deflection capabilities and technologies.

I urge support for this amendment.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEENEY. I will be glad to.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Let me just quickly add that our colleague and friend to both of us, Mr. ROHRBACHER, has long been an advocate for the detection and monitoring of near-Earth objects. I don't know that anybody has done any more on that. I certainly commend this constructive amendment.

Mr. FEENEY. Reclaiming my time just to close on behalf of Mr. ROHRBACHER's amendment, he is a great advocate, but I felt more comfortable after I heard from a bevy of the world's best astrophysicists that this is not only a real threat, but a real potential way to solve a threat to humankind.

With that, I would urge my colleagues to support the Rohrabacher amendment.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Chairman, my amendment offered by Mr. FEENEY encourages NASA to seek increased international cooperation to

find and characterize all natural bodies in outer space over 140 meters in size that pass close to the Earth, referred to as near-Earth objects. Estimates of the total numbers of such objects vary from 25,000 to 100,000. This threat to the Earth is a worldwide matter of potentially catastrophic proportions should a collision with Earth occur, and the responsibility of dealing with it should not fall entirely on the United States or NASA, in particular.

The motivation and timing for this amendment arises from discussions with Russian and German government officials on furthering cooperation with the U.S. in science and technology that occurred during a CODEL that I attended over the Memorial Day recess.

The specific suggestion to cooperate in the effort to find and characterize near-Earth objects was greeted with great enthusiasm by the government officials with whom I met during the CODEL.

The initiative encouraged under my amendment is intended to provide relief for the enormous burden being placed on NASA to find and characterize the vast number of these objects estimated to exist. Many countries around the world have very capable astronomical observatories that can assist (and probably have to some extent).

In addition to telescopes, deep space radars play a critical role in quickly authenticating any impending threats that may be indicated from optical observations. Though the United States has the world's most capable deep space radar, namely the Arecibo Radar, and also the somewhat less capable Goldstone Radar, the Russian RT-70 Radar may be able to provide some contributions as well. Furthermore, certain large radio astronomy facilities around the world may be able to participate by pairing with these powerful U.S. deep space radars.

Mr. FEENEY. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WU

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110-707.

Mr. WU. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. WU:

In section 401, insert at the end the following: "When appropriate, the United States should lead confidence building measures that advance the long-term initiative for international cooperation."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1257, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Wu) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WU. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to build international trust and confidence in human space flight.

For decades, the United States and Russia were the only countries that had viable human space programs. In recent years, a number of countries have entered space or have expressed their intent to do so. This amendment recognizes the new playing field in space and includes a sense of Congress that the President of the United States should invite other spacefaring nations and soon-to-be spacefaring nations to participate in a long-term international initiative under our leadership.

My amendment would add a sentence to this sense of Congress that the United States should engage in confidence-building measures that advance this long-term initiative. With more countries in space, we need to ensure that space will not be used for hostile purposes.

I commend Chairman UDALL for proposing a long-term international initiative that will work toward that end. Confidence-building measures will encourage short-term actions that advance the long-term initiative for international cooperation in space. The United States and Russia engaged in confidence-building measures when Apollo 18 and Soyuz 19 connected in space. My amendment encourages similar actions between the United States and other members of the international space community. Actions like these will encourage the peaceful exploration of space.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FEENEY. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I do not rise in opposition to the amendment. I should say I have no objection to the amendment. I have read it very carefully, and I appreciate the language "when appropriate." Of course, it would be the United States that determined, in my view, when international confidence-building measures would be appropriate.

I should say there are times when, for example, sharing sensitive technologies with certain countries may be inappropriate, if we don't have confidence what they may use those technologies for or what their long-term intentions are. On the other hand, there are things we ought to clearly explore sharing with every spacefaring Nation; for example, a common docking device with the Shuttle, perhaps, so any nation in the event of emergency may be able to help rescue our astronauts.

I should also suggest, as I talked about earlier, that space is developing. It is no longer a bipolar world. Historically, people have out of habit and out of practicality had to rely on asking the U.S. if they wanted to send a sat-

ellite, for example, into orbit, to see whether or not that satellite would safely orbit the Earth without colliding into another country's satellite. That is not true because of any international treaty or convention. Anybody can send anything into space. The truth is, in terms of space law, we have really sort of an international anarchy, just as originally when we with had travel by navy or by commerce through the seas and ultimately international air travel.

There has to be some way to communicate ultimately in terms of maintaining space traffic. Stopping the creation of space junk or debris that would threaten all peacefaring uses of space would be another example of appropriate times the U.S. should lead in confidence-building measures to advance long-term initiatives for international cooperation.

With that, again, I have no objection to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WU. Madam Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. WU

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 110-707.

Mr. WU. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. WU:

In title XI, add at the end the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 1109. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of Congress that NASA should not dilute, distort, suppress, or impede scientific research or the dissemination thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1257, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WU. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of scientific integrity at NASA and everywhere else in this Federal Government.

Earlier this month, the Inspector General at NASA released a report regarding allegations that NASA suppressed climate change science and denied media access to a NASA scientist. As recent news reports have documented, this report came from the revelation in 2006 that an administration official had intervened in communications between climate change scientists and the press for political purposes.

The report acknowledged that from the fall of 2004 through early 2006, the NASA Public Affairs Office managed the topic of climate science "in a man-

ner that reduced, marginalized, or mischaracterized climate change science made available to the general public through those particular media over which the Office of Public Affairs had control."

The report also found that these actions were inconsistent with NASA's mandate and purpose to allow "the widest practical and appropriate dissemination of information concerning NASA's activities and results."

My amendment expresses the sense of Congress to reiterate the original intent of NASA's responsibilities. We are at a singular moment in time when climate change constitutes the challenge of our generation. Let us not fail. Let us base climate change information on science, not ideology.

This amendment is about far more than climate change. I believe scientific integrity should be held as a value throughout NASA and throughout our government. The safety of astronauts who are sent to space is dependent on sound science. We should not compromise scientific integrity for political gain or private profit. We should not compromise it in any situation. My amendment sends a message that Congress rebuffs the attempts of those who would marginalize science for the sake of ideology or politics.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in order to address the amendment, to claim the minority time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman opposed to the amendment?

Mr. FEENEY. For purposes of debate, I may well be opposed, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Chairman, I have carefully read the amendment, and while I may not press my objection, I will state that the amendment, in my view, is unnecessary, that NASA has a policy in place that goes to the very same points expressed in the amendment, and perhaps unintentionally this amendment implies that NASA cannot be trusted to factually in an unbiased manner publicize research results conducted by agency scientists.

Several years ago, NASA's Public Affairs Office was accused with inappropriately choosing which NASA scientists participated in specific interviews with the press. Once this interference was brought to NASA Administrator Michael Griffin's attention, he quickly and forcefully intervened, assuring Congress, NASA researchers and employees, and the public that NASA will never seek to censor agency scientists.

In a letter dated March 30, 2006, and this issue has been addressed over and over again, addressed to former Science Committee Chairman Sherry Boehlert, Mr. Griffin stated, "I will not tolerate any policy or action where any NASA employee may filter, alter or

ensor scientific findings and facts, and I want to reaffirm that NASA has always been and will continue to be committed to open scientific and technical inquiry and dialogue with the public.”

Mr. Griffin then formed a policy development team comprised of NASA employees with science, legal and public affairs backgrounds to review existing policies, identify ways to improve them, and develop agency practices to maintain NASA’s commitment for full and open discourse on scientific, technical and safety issues. The result of their work was a series of revisions to 14 Code of Federal Regulations, section 1213, which guides the agency’s public affairs policies, which all Americans can visit.

Mr. Griffin then formed a policy development team comprised of NASA employees with science, legal and public affairs backgrounds to review existing policies, identify ways to improve them, and develop agency practices to maintain NASA’s commitment for full and open discourse on scientific, technical and safety issues. The results of their work was a series of revisions to 14 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations), Section 1213, which guides the agency’s public affairs policies.

More recently, the NASA Office of Inspector General concluded an investigation in response to a Congressional inquiry dating back to 2006, requesting a formal investigation about “political interference” by NASA public affairs officials.

The IG’s investigation found that “. . . during the fall of 2004 through early 2006, the NASA Headquarters Office of Public Affairs managed the topic of climate change in a manner that reduced, marginalized, or mischaracterized climate change science made available to the general public through those particular media over which the Office of Public Affairs had control. We also concluded that the climate change editorial decisions were localized within the NASA Headquarters Office of Public Affairs; we found no credible evidence suggesting that senior NASA or Administration officials directed the NASA Headquarters Office of Public Affairs to minimize information related to climate change. To the contrary, we found that once NASA leadership within the Office of the Administrator were made aware of the scope of the conflict between the Office of Public Affairs and scientists working on climate change, they aggressively implemented new policies with a view toward improved processes in editorial decision-making relating to scientific public affairs matters.”

The IG’s report also stated: “With respect to NASA’s climate change research activities, we found no evidence indicating that NASA blocked or interfered with the actual research activities of its climate change scientists . . . (We) found that NASA systematically distributed its technical climate change research throughout the scientific community and otherwise made

it available through a variety of specialized forums, such as scientific journals, professional conferences, and public appearances by NASA scientists.”

Additionally, a May 2007 GAO report found “that NASA policies are generally clear and should help facilitate the dissemination of research results. For example, NASA’s recently revised media policy clearly defines the roles and responsibilities for managers, researchers, and public affairs staff; details steps in the process for dissemination via press releases and interviews; and describes a process to resolve disputes about agency decisions regarding press releases.”

In closing, while I have no objection to the gentleman’s (Mr. WU) amendment, I don’t want Members to surmise that NASA science findings are being manipulated by agency management. That is not what the NASA IG, or GAO reports found.

Madam Chairman, I don’t specifically object to the language of this amendment, because I think it is consistent with NASA policy and Michael Griffin’s great efforts to explain to the public that he will insist and has insisted on this policy. But I will remind all of us that a May 2007 GAO report found “NASA policies are generally clear and should help facilitate the dissemination of research results. For example, NASA’s recently revised media policy clearly defines the roles and responsibilities for managers, researchers, and public affairs staff, details steps in the process for dissemination of press releases and interviews, and describes a process to resolve disputes about agency decisions regarding press releases.”

In closing, while I do not object to Mr. WU’s amendment, I don’t want Members to surmise that NASA science findings are being manipulated by current agency management. That is not what NASA, IG, or GAO reports found.

Again, we have no objection to the language that Mr. WU offers.

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

Mr. WU. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Space Subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from Oregon for yielding and thank him for his leadership on the committee.

I rise in support of this amendment on scientific integrity and openness at NASA. I want to commend the gentleman from Oregon for his action that we stay vigilant on this matter.

A few years ago, concerns were raised about political interference in the discussion of scientific research and results by NASA scientists. These concerns about scientific openness were and are serious, and we need to ensure that all measures are in place to prevent such interference.

It is true that the NASA Administrator, Dr. Griffin, took swift action in response to the reports of political interference and NASA revised the agen-

cy policy on the release of information of news and media, and I want to commend Dr. Griffin on his clear commitment to scientific openness. That said, we need to continue, Madam Chairman, our oversight on scientific integrity to ensure that Americans continue to have confidence in the important scientific research results that NASA provides to all of us and to our Nation.

So I again want to thank the gentleman from Oregon for his initiative, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1630

Mr. WU. Madam Chairman, I would like to submit a letter from Francesca T. Grifo, Senior Scientist and Director, Scientific Integrity Program, Union of Concerned Scientists into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS,  
June 11, 2008.

HON. David Wu,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WU: The Scientific Integrity Program of the Union of Concerned Scientists supports your amendment to H.R. 6063, the NASA Authorization Act. This amendment will make clear that Congress intends that scientific research developed at NASA be free of political interference, and that NASA scientists are able to disseminate their findings without fear of retaliation.

We know that the problem of political interference in federal science is a widespread and serious one. Indeed, of the nearly 3,400 federal scientists across nine agencies who have responded to questionnaires by the Union of Concerned Scientists, more than 1,100 scientists report that they fear retaliation for openly expressing concerns about their agency’s mission-driven work.

Your amendment will send a signal to this Administration and future Administrations that this state of affairs cannot and should not continue.

Sincerely,

FRANCESCA T. GRIFO,  
Senior Scientist and Director,  
Scientific Integrity Program.

I think that we need to be concerned about scientific integrity at NASA always, and we also need to be concerned about scientific integrity at other agencies, whether it’s the EPA or the FDA, throughout the Federal Government. We intend to work on those agencies across the spectrum to ensure that ideology does not overtake sound science as this government moves forward towards research and the development of sound policy.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. LAMPSON

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 110-707.

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. LAMPSON:

In title XI, add at the end the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 1109. EXCEPTION TO ALTERNATIVE FUEL PROCUREMENT REQUIREMENT.**

Section 526(a) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17142(a)) does not prohibit NASA from entering into a contract to purchase a generally available fuel that is not an alternative or synthetic fuel or predominantly produced from a non-conventional petroleum source, if—

(1) the contract does not specifically require the contractor to provide an alternative or synthetic fuel or fuel from a non-conventional petroleum source;

(2) the purpose of the contract is not to obtain an alternative or synthetic fuel or fuel from a nonconventional petroleum source; and

(3) the contract does not provide incentives for a refinery upgrade or expansion to allow a refinery to use or increase its use of fuel from a nonconventional petroleum source.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1257, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Today I rise in support of my amendment to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2008. This amendment would clarify section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act, which addresses the procurement of fuels by a Federal agency. This amendment seeks to provide guidance for implementation of the provision by establishing conditions by which NASA would be allowed to enter into a contract to purchase a generally available fuel, so long as it is not predominantly an alternative or synthetic fuel.

Because section 526 doesn't define alternative or synthetic fuel or non-conventional petroleum sources, many stakeholders, including refiners in southeast Texas, believe that section 526 could have unintended consequences, preventing refiners from mixing fuel received from nonconventional sources such as oil sands with conventionally derived oil.

Oil sands account for about 5 percent of the total U.S. oil supply, and it's common practice to mix it with fuel that is derived from other sources. It's very difficult for an end user and consumer to determine whether a fuel contains petroleum from oil sands or other nonconventional sources.

With half of Canadian crude produced from these sources, this could have an adverse effect on the relationship that we enjoy with our largest supplier of oil. Additionally, most diesel fuel is mixed with some biodiesel, which could also mean that its procurement could be prohibited under this section. While the intention of this language may not have been to prohibit the purchase of fuel, the small amounts from tar sands or oil shale, section 526 is written so broadly, with no definition provided,

that it could be interpreted either way. That's why a clarification is needed.

I know that our colleague, Congressman GINGREY, made a proposal the other day in committee. I viewed the proposal that we have come up with here as a compromise to that suggestion.

Adoption of this amendment will allow NASA to contract for generally available fuels, as it always, has as long as the fuel is not predominantly comprised of petroleum from non-conventional sources such as Canadian oil sands with a greenhouse gas footprint that is higher than conventional oils and fuels. This allows some wiggle room and recognizes the complexities of the refining process while supporting the original intent of not extending or exceeding current emission levels.

Finally, I would like to note that when the House passed the FY09 defense authorization act last month, a similar amendment was approved by this committee and accepted by voice vote on the floor. While that amendment had a government-wide application, this seeks to clarify section 526 in order to allow NASA to meet present and future energy needs.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Chairman, I have a number of concerns with the amendment offered by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, my colleague on the Science Committee.

Unfortunately, I do not believe that this amendment does anything to alleviate the Draconian problems presented to us by section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007.

Even if this amendment passes, Americans will still not be able to increase the supply of fuels from alternative sources derived from resources available in the United States. Oil shale, with its estimated 1.5 trillion barrels of petroleum in rock, would remain trapped there in our southwestern States, I think five States have a lot of this oil shale that's there for the taking. We, furthermore, will not be able to use clean carbon captured coal-to-liquid fuel.

So the amendment intends to create an exception under section 526 for generally available fuel not predominantly produced from a nonconventional petroleum source, and NASA, under the amendment, will still be able to purchase Canadian fuels that do have traces of oil sands, as the gentleman says, that may create more of a carbon footprint than completely conventional fuel. And this is what basically section 526 is. As the gentleman explained, he is trying to allow an exception so that this fuel that we purchase

from Canada, a lot of people think most of our foreign sources of fuel are from OPEC or Venezuela, but actually, Madam Chairman, they are from Canada. Some of this fuel does have the tar sands footprint in it.

The gentleman, and I have no objection to that, is saying let us continue to purchase this fuel and not be restricted by 526. Yet my opposition is this, the agency won't be able to utilize any of the sources of fuel that may be totally derived from resources we have readily available in the good-old USA, clean domestic alternatives, coal, natural gas, biomass and, as I mentioned, oil shale that is estimated to have 1.5 trillion barrels of petroleum that can be extracted from that in our own country.

At committee markup, Science Committee and at the Rules Committee, I offered amendments that would have removed the handcuffs placed on the NASA administrator by section 526. I would have been happy to work with my good friend from Texas to protect his amendment so that implementation of it would have, indeed, a positive effect for NASA. Unfortunately, I just don't think the amendment does much of anything.

I fear that the amendment does nothing to rectify, as I said, the underlying problem with 526 that prevents the Federal Government, any agency of the Federal Government, not just NASA, but also the Department of Defense, which utilizes something like 380,000 barrels of refined petroleum products every day, every day, and the increased cost to the Department of Defense is \$9 billion. Just the increase in the year 2008, the increased fuel cost to NASA over the last 5 years has been 400 percent. It has gone from \$4.5 million a year to \$18.3 million a year.

Our efforts should be focused on easing the pain felt by American taxpayers, not codifying this misguided policy, 526, that prevents us from future innovation. Again, the gentleman's amendment, in my opinion, does no harm, but it does very little good.

I felt compelled to stand and express my opposition—not strong opposition to the amendment—but rather to make this point that we need to allow the administrator of NASA to have a waiver, at least have a waiver if, in his knowledge of innovation and what they are doing in trying to develop alternative fuels that are available in this country, he would not be bound by the crazy restrictions put on him and other agencies by section 526 of this so-called Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 passed 17 months ago. Since that time the price of a gallon of regular gasoline has gone up by \$1.70, up to over \$4.05 a gallon.

I respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. LAMPSON. I yield myself 1 minute, Madam Chairman.

I agree with much of what Mr. GINGREY has said. I want to point out

that the intent of the law, as passed, the Energy Independence and Security Act, specifies that the lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions, which are higher, oftentimes, in these oil sales, is what was intended to be prohibited.

If we were using, or NASA were purchasing all of their fuel for their operation, then it would not fall within the bounds of this act. But NASA can purchase generally available fuels that may include a blend of fuel from oil sands refined in existing commercial processes. The purpose of the contract can't be to obtain fuels from non-conventional petroleum sources or otherwise promote the expansion of non-conventional fuels with high life-cycle carbon emissions. We believe that the refiners within my district that are making many of the fuels that are actually being purchased by NASA will use some of these nonconventional sources of energy.

As it's blended, it can still be used by NASA so that there is some benefit to them.

Mr. FEENEY. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LAMPSON. I would yield for a few seconds, yes.

Mr. FEENEY. I don't know whether, candidly, I support or oppose the amendment, because it has some very technical effects in its interplay with other portions of Federal statutes and requirements and regulation.

Just one of the many questions I have would be that it seems, as I read the amendment, that it establishes different conditions on contracting fuel versus those established in section 526. So I guess one of my questions, maybe the most important, since we don't have a lot of time, do the conditions in your amendment supplant the greenhouse gas emission criteria found in 526, or do they remain in effect, and are these conditions in addition to the 526 regulations?

Mr. LAMPSON. They remain in effect, but this just clarifies what the intent of the legislation was and is. It's going to allow blends of those fuels to be used by NASA until we can do the research that shows that emissions are going to be reduced below the amount of emissions from traditional fuels.

Mr. FEENEY. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. LAMPSON. Am I within my 1 minute, Madam Chairman? Have I used up my minute yet, and how much time do I have left before I say that I will yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for just 1 minute. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LAMPSON. Would you use your time, please?

Mr. FEENEY. If I have any. I don't know that we have any more time.

Could I ask unanimous consent that each side have an additional 2 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMPSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FEENEY. Actually if I could suggest, rather than taking up your 2 minutes, I would be grateful if you yielded, but I will yield back to you and claim my own 2 minutes so that you can use yours since you were gracious enough not to object.

Mr. LAMPSON. Then I will reserve my time and let the gentleman proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to clarify that it is the gentleman from Georgia who has the 2 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Chairman, thank you very much.

I very graciously at this time will yield to the subcommittee ranking member of the NASA Subcommittee of Science and Technology, my good friend from Florida (Mr. FEENEY).

□ 1645

Mr. FEENEY. I thank the gentleman. This amendment may be very positive. The problem is that it conflicts with other statutes and regulations. It is very complicated as we read it.

What my friend says is a clarifying amendment actually creates a lot more ambiguity in our minds about the interplay of these different standards.

I talked about the interplay with 526, and I still don't know which set of rules will govern, the set of rules in the gentleman's amendment or section 526.

We also seem to cite a section of the Energy Independence and Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 17142. There is currently no section 526(a) nor a 42 U.S.C. 17142(a) in the law, and yet I believe the gentleman's amendment cites these sections, as I read it, that do not exist in current law.

I have a concern about the amendment's intention. Do you want to create an exemption under 526 for generally available fuel that is not predominantly produced from a non-conventional petroleum source, or does it create a broader exemption for all alternative or synthetic fuels as referenced in section 526?

So I guess I have a number of very complex questions. I wish this is something we might have dealt with in committee where we have a number of experts, both members and staff. While I don't know that I object, it is because I just don't understand all of the different regulations and statutes and the interplay, and this seems to be one more additional attempt at dealing with whether NASA can or can't do things, and I really have no idea whether this is in addition to, or whether it is consistent with, or whether it may be mutually exclusive with provisions in other portions of the law, and I wish we could spend some time with technical staff to iron out these difficulties.

With that, having expressed concern and not necessarily opposing the amendment because I don't really understand all of the ways it will be enforced given other statutes and regulations.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEENEY. I would be happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Let me just suggest that this is one more process in getting a law enacted. The Senate will pass a bill, and we will go to conference. I am sure Mr. LAMPSON can answer very well here, but this can be a continuing dialogue as we move forward.

Mr. FEENEY. We appreciate that. Having said that, on a technical issue like this, it sure would have been great to take a more technical look at this at the subcommittee or committee level. Having said that, I appreciate the chairman's gracious offer to help clarify for those of us who think more ambiguity, not less, is being created by this amendment, and what the ultimate impact will be.

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to Chairman UDALL.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to support this amendment.

This amendment is similar to the Boren amendment offered to the defense authorization package recently. That amendment passed with a voice vote on the floor.

This amendment as well seeks to clarify requirements of section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to allow NASA to procure conventional fuels that contain incidental amounts of unconventional fuels.

Section 526, Madam Chairman, is important because it establishes a positive benchmark for future alternative fuels, that their lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions be less than or equal to those emissions from conventional fuels.

The amendment clarifies section 526 while retaining the standard it sets for greenhouse gas emissions.

I want to thank the Member from Texas for bringing this important amendment and urge all Members to support the amendment.

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Chairman, I just recognize in closing that this is not a complicated piece of legislation. It is one that does not stop these fuels from being produced or the research and development on these types of sources of energy. It allows NASA to continue to purchase the kinds of fuels without restrictions and without putting themselves into the jeopardy that is asked for within section 526. So it is a simple amendment that was voice voted in the defense authorization, and we believe it should be here as well as the bill came out of committee.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. ARCURI

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 110-707.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. ARCURI:

In section 407(a), add at the end the following: "As part of the technology plan, the Administrator shall examine the feasibility of having NASA enter into contracts with appropriate public, private sector, and international partners to broadcast electronically, including via the Internet, images and multimedia records delivered from its missions in space to the public and shall identify issues associated with such contracts. In any such contracts, NASA would be required to adhere to a transparent bidding process to award contracts, pursuant to United States law."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1257, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Chair, NASA's accomplishments over the years have led to some of the greatest advances in human history. These scientific discoveries have led to everything from prolonging the average life span to improving the overall quality of life. NASA's research and exploration has also helped to unlock some of the greatest mysteries in the universe. The problem, however, is that too often the American public doesn't have an opportunity to fully experience NASA's accomplishments. It is when these accomplishments are transferred from the Federal sector to the private sector and the general public that the true benefits of what has been achieved can be realized.

Clearly, we don't have the ability or the financial means to shuttle every American into space, but we can do a better job of bringing the space experience into televisions, computers, and classrooms around the world.

The House Science and Technology Committee, under the leadership of Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL and Chairman UDALL, recognize that point. The underlying bill includes language directing the NASA administrator to develop a technology plan that will allow the general public to experience missions to the Moon, Mars and other destinations in our solar system.

My amendment aims to take this effort and expand it in a way that leverages existing technology underway at our universities and high-tech businesses.

Specifically, my amendment tasks NASA to examine the feasibility of entering into contracts with appropriate

public-private sector and international partners to share images and video of space missions with the public. The amendment promotes good government by requiring NASA to engage in a transparent bidding process when awarding contracts as it sees fit.

This new chapter in scientific discovery presents a valuable opportunity to engage public and private sectors in advancing NASA's mission for the 21st century. My upstate New York district is fast becoming a science and technology hub. We have an opening here to work together with colleges and universities, private research facilities, and small and large high-tech businesses to provide NASA with the tools it needs to better educate the public about space.

I would like to highlight that this amendment is intended to provide NASA with an additional resource to meet its goals. This measure would authorize NASA to conduct its own feasibility study to determine if and how it can best use the talents of our independent innovators to support its new international exploration initiative. This requirement would grant NASA the flexibility it needs to create a plan that best fits the ideas of its new program.

This amendment would also require all NASA contract decisions to be awarded following a fair and transparent bidding process.

This amendment has the backing of the State University of New York, the New York State section of the American Physical Society, the American Association of Geographers and the Information Technology Association of America. I respectfully urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment and support the contributions that our public and private universities and businesses make to scientific and technological progress in this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Chairman, I rise, at least for purposes of debate, to be recognized in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEENEY. I appreciate the gentleman's amendment. I think it is very well-intentioned. I do not intend to object to the language. I do believe it is designed to help NASA distribute its space images and multimedia records to the public. I share that goal; but I should say that I think this amendment is superfluous. I think it is already contained in the bill language itself. Now superfluity is not necessarily an awful thing. Sometimes the best thing we do here is just to repeat what we have already done, and it probably does very little harm.

But I would point out that section 407 clearly instructs NASA to develop a plan, to identify opportunities to leverage the very same technologies Mr. ARCURI references in his amendment.

The gentleman's amendment seeks NASA to develop a plan and examine

the feasibility to "broadcast electronically, including via the Internet." The language in the bill talks about already "rapidly delivering the content through extended high bandwidth communications networks."

So I think Mr. ARCURI's concerns are already adequately addressed in the bill. I would simply argue that they are unnecessary. Having said that, I would not object to them being included.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I would just point out what this amendment does is it attempts to get the private sector more engaged by promoting within NASA the push to transfer not from the public sector, not to just have this go from the public sector to the universities, but from the public sector to the private sector, to get the private sector more engaged and more involved in distributing the information. So that is slightly different than what I think the bill has because we do attempt to get the private sector more engaged. After all, that is probably the best way, by using the market system, to get the information out.

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

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Chairman, I appreciate and I don't dispute the intentions that the gentleman has. I agree with that, and I believe that the current language in the bill requires NASA to rapidly deliver this content that you are talking about through high bandwidth communications networks, and I think that includes universities in the private sector, et cetera.

Having said that, because the intent of the language clearly is not something I object to, I will not oppose the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. WU

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 110-707.

Mr. WU. Madam Chairman, I rise on behalf of my friend and colleague, Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon, who has an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. WU:

In title IV, add at the end the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 409. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE REPORT UPDATE.**

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Congressional Budget Office shall update its report from 2004 on the budgetary analysis of NASA's Vision for the Nation's Space Exploration Program, including new estimates for Project Constellation, NASA's new generation of spacecraft designed for human spaceflight that will replace the Space Shuttle program.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1257, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WU. Again, on behalf of my good friend and colleague, Mr. DEFAZIO, I am presenting this amendment.

When the President announced his new vision for the Nation's space exploration program on January 14, 2004, he proposed a new human exploration vehicle to return to the Moon by 2020 and to leverage these lunar efforts to send a human mission to Mars.

After Mr. Bush unveiled his plan in 2004, a congressional subcommittee requested that the Congressional Budget Office perform a budgetary analysis of NASA's New Vision For Space Exploration, as this program was titled. The report was released in September of 2004 and concluded that NASA's long-term projections only included a 2 percent increase for inflation.

NASA's budget has undergone radical changes since the President's vision was announced in 2004. NASA's budget requests for aeronautics has been reduced by over \$200 million. NASA's budget requests for science programs, including climate research, have been reduced by over \$300 million. In stark contrast during the same period, overall funding requests for NASA have increased by over \$2 billion.

Since the President first proposed his new "vision for space exploration," we have spent more than \$600 billion in Iraq, over \$120 billion on Hurricane Katrina, and the Federal deficit has grown by over \$2.4 trillion.

Mr. DEFAZIO's amendment will direct the Congressional Budget Office to update its 2004 budgetary analysis of the President's plan. This makes fiscal sense. It will give us a more complete picture of the budgetary hurdles the project will face and a more accurate assessment of its long-term costs.

□ 1700

Congress needs to continue to analyze the project as it moves forward and be mindful of its effect on other important NASA programs. If anyone claims that they believe that the report will be duplicative of previous GAO reports, the fact is that GAO hasn't done a true cost estimate of the program, but, rather, done risk assessments of the program. Budget and cost estimate analysis is something that the Congressional Budget Office usually handles, not the Government Accountability Office.

The GAO has done some high level budget analysis, but CBO will be able to give a much more detailed report. On Mr. DEFAZIO's behalf, I urge adoption of his amendment, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not necessarily in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FEENEY. I think all of us want to know the cost of every government project. That certainly includes Constellation.

As Mr. WU pointed out, on behalf of Mr. DEFAZIO, the GAO just gave us a very comprehensive report. We had a full hearing on the matter of the progress of the Constellation program.

I can tell you that there are some 56 annual reports that NASA has to give to Congress, and dozens of others that it has to give to other agencies, regulatory agencies and other governmental agencies. This is not a request that NASA add to their 100 or 150 reports an additional report. It's asking CBO to take an outside look. And I'm never opposed to transparency in government, especially cost.

I should point out that the amendment singles out Project Constellation for particular scrutiny. Project Constellation is our follow up to the Space Shuttle Human Space Flight Program which is clearly a top priority for NASA, and has been established in this Congress as a top priority.

The shuttle will be retired roughly at the end of this decade. Without Constellation, NASA will have no choice but to buy assets from other nations if we intend to maintain access to our own international space station.

We're going to be dependent on the Russians right now under a very bad plan, but the only plan we have for 5 years. Without Constellation, all hopes of accessing, through American capabilities, the international space station or venturing the moon or other planets or asteroids will simply disappear.

Not all of our colleagues pay as much attention as those of us that are on the floor here today to space. I think one of our colleagues recently suggested that the first manned lunar outpost in space be named after Neil Armstrong, the great first American ever on the Moon.

My question, in response, was why would the Chinese, who are going to get back to the Moon before us, give us permission to name their lunar outpost after an American? We've got to remind our colleagues that this is now an internationally competitive environment in more ways than one.

Constellation is a technology-driven program that will achieve its initial operational capability roughly in the Year 2015, hopefully earlier. NASA has worked hard to maintain their schedule. They give us reports every day. We had a GAO report.

Having said that, if the gentleman feels compelled to support the DeFazio amendment, and we have one additional report on the budgetary status, I don't have any objection to transparency in government. But at some point you're doing so many reports that it's hard to send people back to the moon if you're doing 150 or 200 reports for Congress and other agencies and spending all your time filling out paperwork.

These are really bright engineers. I want to get into the business of flying rockets and not doing more paperwork.

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

Mr. WU. Well, I certainly hope that Americans return to the Moon before anyone else.

I would point out to my friend and colleague from Florida, that we have named a number of things after Columbus, and well, he wasn't exactly an American. So, you know, you never know how far the generosity of spirit will go.

My good friend and colleague from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) has, with his usual vigor, many reasons why a Congressional Budget Office report is appropriate under these circumstances. I have not delivered some of those more pointed arguments, and join with the gentleman from Florida to urge adoption of this amendment for both purposes of fiscal prudence and in the interest of our space program in which we have such a strong common interest.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. HARMAN

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 110-707.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which you have just identified, and I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Ms. HARMAN: In title XI, add at the end the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 1109. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE NEED FOR A ROBUST WORKFORCE.**

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a robust and highly skilled workforce is critical to the success of NASA's programs;

(2) voluntary attrition, the retirement of many senior workers, and difficulties in recruiting could leave NASA without access to the intellectual capital necessary to compete with its global competitors; and

(3) NASA should work cooperatively with other agencies of the United States Government responsible for programs related to space and the aerospace industry to develop and implement policies, including those with an emphasis on improving science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education at all levels, to sustain and expand the diverse workforce available to NASA.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1257, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Harman-Ehlers amendment and the underlying authorizing legislation.

Madam Chairman, I represent the heart of the aerospace industrial base,

and have long called my district the "satellite center of the universe."

I have always been mindful of the need for a skilled and diverse industrial base. Simply put, rocket scientists don't grow on trees.

Earlier this year, on a visit to a major aerospace firm in my district there was a stark reminder of the crisis facing that industry. Following a briefing on an important satellite program, I asked if any the employees in attendance had anything else to tell me. A 31-year old engineer raised his hand and said, "all my peers are gone." Engineers his age, he explained, are leaving the aerospace industry for other fields, and very few are interested in taking their place.

The problem is twofold. More than 60 percent of the aerospace industry workers are over 45, and 26 percent of them are eligible for retirement in 2008. And, as a Nation, we have failed to inspire our kids, particularly girls, to go into STEM fields, science, technology, engineering and math.

There just isn't a pool of qualified workers for NASA and others to draw from. The result is a looming demographic cliff that leaves NASA and the industry without the intellectual capital necessary to keep pace with global competitors.

But the problem extends beyond NASA. The United States depends on this industrial base to give us the capabilities on the ground, in the air and in space that are essential to the way we wage war, collect intelligence and protect our homeland. This looming workforce shortfall could cripple not only NASA's ability to reach its goals, it could deal a serious blow to our national and our economic security.

The Harman-Ehlers amendment expresses the sense of Congress that a skilled workforce is essential to NASA's success, and that NASA should work cooperatively with other government agencies to sustain and expand a diverse workforce.

Madam Chairman, almost 50 years ago President Kennedy inspired a whole generation of Americans. American talent and ingenuity put a person on the moon in a decade. We need that kind of ambitious goal to inspire the next generation to be scientists, engineers and astronauts.

If we fail to dream big, to ask our kids to imagine a future beyond our humble planet, they will pursue other fields. There will be no one to invent the technologies and programs on which NASA's success and our national security depend. That future, Madam Chairman, is unacceptable.

I urge an "aye" vote for the Harman-Ehlers amendment, and would like to thank my coauthor, VERN EHLERS, a senior member of the Science Committee, who did seminal work in this field, is a true leader in this field, and a valued partner.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, al-

though I am not necessarily in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Chairman, not only am I not in opposition, but I wholeheartedly and enthusiastically endorse the Harman-Ehlers amendment. And I should point out as she mentions the trouble in getting new people into the workforce and an aging and retiring workforce. By the way, one of those young engineers that works in the space field is my wife, and she remains eternally young. But she's the exception.

I've talked extensively about the competition, both civilian and commercial, coming from China. I can tell you that I recently visited CASC, which is the Chinese Civilian and Commercial Space Agency. They have 160,000 employees. About half of those are dedicated to space. And we asked the question, what the average age, because we were startled by the engineering manager that addressed us on their program, what the average age of the managers were in the Engineering Department. The average age of the managers was 40. We were stunned.

We asked, what's the average age of your engineers that are doing space work. And the answer is 30.

Madam Chairman, nothing could be more important to science and technology.

And with that, I want to yield the balance of my time, to, as the gentlelady said, a great advocate for science and space and technology, and for young people getting into these fields, Mr. EHLERS.

Mr. EHLERS. As has been stated, this is a labor of love for me for many years. But a few years ago I began noticing or realizing that we were approaching a major inflection point that we should be worried about.

As you heard from the principal author of this amendment, that it was in the 1960s that John Kennedy asked for us to go to the moon, proposed this advanced and wild notion, and that inspired a whole generation of Americans to become involved in aerospace.

Those individuals are now retiring. And because we hired so many in NASA at one time, they are all retiring at about the same time, which is going to leave us bereft of talent if we don't take action.

Because of this, 2 years I introduced a bill which was passed which established an interagency aerospace revitalization task force within the Federal Government. I would have liked to have it be more broad, but I couldn't persuade my colleagues to make that giant leap at that point.

But since then that task force which involves, I believe, 17 different Government agencies has worked together. The 2008 report of the Interagency Aerospace Revitalization Task Force was released earlier this year. I spoke

at the release. And I was astounded at the number of people in the room. It was a local hotel. The room was overflowing with people concerned about aerospace employment and how we keep the aerospace effort going.

This amendment is intended to reinforce what we've talked about for the past 2 years, but it does something very important. As I mentioned, my bill simply addressed the interagency governmental work. But we also have to involve universities. We have to get students excited about aerospace again, and that's what this amendment will do. It will require that NASA reaches out beyond Government agencies, beyond its own boundaries and work with everyone possible to improve STEM education in America, get the young people of today excited about the opportunities in science, particularly in space.

So I thank the gentlewoman from California for initiating this amendment. I believe it's going to be very, very important to the future of NASA and for the future of our country, because if we don't get our kids back into math and science education, we are going to become a second-rate Nation.

Twenty years ago the nation of China and the nation of India both decided that their economic futures lay in developing highly skilled workers who understood mathematics and science. It worked, and they have gone ahead with leaps and bounds, while our students are still mired where they were 20 years ago.

At all levels, from kindergarten on up, we have to take note of that and we have to do a much better job of teaching our children mathematics and science, not just for the sake of NASA, although that's very important, but for the sake of our Nation if we wish to remain competitive with other countries.

I will reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HARMAN. I am prepared to yield the balance of my time. I'm inquiring whether I'm the last speaker or Mr. EHLERS is the last speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has 2½ minutes.

Mr. EHLERS. I will be pleased to yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Chairman, in closing the debate on this amendment, I would just observe that during my first two terms in Congress, in the last century, I served on the Science Committee. It's a great committee. And I commend the current chairman, Mr. GORDON, for enormous leadership. He is fast and swift, and on his game. And this is probably the most important work we will do for our children and grandchildren. And as a grandmother of three, I want one of those children, like Mr. FEENEY's wife, to want to be an aerospace worker.

□ 1715

I hope that one of them chooses that occupation. I hope it's there for them.

This amendment, the Harman-Ehlers amendment, is our effort to keep this

potential alive, to make sure that our best and brightest kids want to do this work, and then that hopefully our dreams remain big and putting a person on the moon is just a first step to surveying the heavens in ways we can't even imagine.

So on behalf of dreamers, on behalf of an extraordinary industrial base, much of it in California's 36th Congressional District, and on behalf of three little grandchildren whom I love dearly, I urge an "aye" vote for the Harman-Ehlers amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. GORDON OF TENNESSEE

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 110-707.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BRALEY) who was required to return to his district.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. GORDON of Tennessee:

In title II, add at the end the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 208. TORNADOES.**

The Administrator shall ensure that NASA gives high priority to those parts of its existing cooperative activities with NOAA that are related to the study of tornadoes, tornado-force winds, and other factors determined to influence the development of tornadoes, with the goal of improving the Nation's ability to predict tornado events. Further, the Administrator shall examine whether there are additional cooperative activities with NOAA that should be undertaken in the area of tornado research.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1257, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I also support this amendment, and I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for his attention to the important issue of tornado research.

Tornadoes and tornado-force winds present serious hazards to life and property in the United States. We've already had ample and tragic evidence in recent days of the devastation that can be wreaked by these terrible storms. We need to do all that we can to improve our understanding of tornadoes and learn how to better predict them.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has the lead responsibilities for addressing tornado-prediction issues. However, NASA has existing cooperative activities with NOAA that may contribute to greater

progress in this effort. NASA's existing cooperative activities with NOAA on facilitating research and data sharing are important to improving our understanding of tornadoes. I agree with Mr. BRALEY that the work that NOAA and NASA are doing related to tornadoes needs to be given a high priority.

That is the objective of this amendment. It is just common sense that we ensure that any relevant work that NASA and NOAA are collaborating on is given the attention and priority it needs to improve our Nation's ability to predict tornado events.

I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his initiative for this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I'm not necessarily opposed.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FEENEY. This really is an amendment that we're enthusiastic about. NASA currently conducts weather research in cooperation with NOAA, although through the U.S. Weather Research Program, the gentleman's amendment emphasizes the importance of this research as we cope with predicting and dealing with the aftermath of violent weather systems.

It's a terrific amendment, and with that, I would urge its support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, I strongly support this amendment.

Tornadoes cause an average of 54 fatalities and 1,500 injuries in the United States each year. Just last month in my home State of Colorado, tornadoes devastated the town of Windsor in Colorado destroying more than 100 homes and causing one death. Predicting tornado intensity and location is critical to protecting lives and property, and we must do all we can to improve our knowledge in this important area.

I'm proud to say that the research at NOAA's Earth System Research Laboratory in my district, the Second District in Colorado, contributes to this better understanding and improved forecasts of tornadoes. This amendment will further involve NASA scientists and data in this important process.

I would urge Members to support this amendment just like the chairman did.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of Congressman BRALEY's amendment and to express my deepest sympathies to all my fellow Iowans affected by the tornados that recently tore through Iowa. It is my hope the intense grief felt by those suffering from the sudden loss of a loved one will be lifted, even for a moment, by the prayers of hope from strangers.

For those of us who have the privilege of living in America's heartland, severe weather is nothing new. Tornados are a seasonal reality we all live with. But, when disaster strikes and takes the lives of our friends and neighbors—we are never prepared to witness the power of Mother Nature and the tragedies she can leave in her wake.

Through the tears and sense of disbelief, Iowans again have pulled together to help friends, family and strangers in need. Over the years, I have had the misfortune of viewing many communities damaged by storms. Earlier this week I toured the flood ravaged parts of my district. The scenes painted by wind and water are heartbreaking, but it never ceases to amaze me how quickly Iowans show their true mettle by bringing hope and strength to their towns.

I know for many Members of Congress, tornados rarely, if ever, affect your communities. When you see the astonishing videos of storms and the aftermath, I ask that you take a moment and think about our first responders and the people who find themselves in need. We must take every step possible to prevent and prepare for disasters like the State of Iowa has experienced in recent weeks. This amendment will go a long way towards that important goal.

Our thoughts and prayers are with Iowa and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I am in strong support of my amendment that will help improve our ability to forecast deadly tornadoes. I regret my absence today to speak and vote in favor of this amendment. However, I have had to return to Iowa due to major flooding in my district. I would like to thank Chairman GORDON for offering this amendment today in my absence.

In the last three weeks, 12 people have lost their lives in Iowa due to tornadoes. On May 25, parts of my district in northeastern Iowa were hit by an EF-5 tornado with winds of up to 205 miles per hour. Eight people died, and over 70 people were injured due to this tornado, which was the strongest to hit Iowa in 32 years. Just yesterday, a tornado ripped through a Boy Scout camp in Harrison County killing 4 Boy Scouts and injuring 48 people. My thoughts and prayers go out to the Boy Scouts, their family members, friends and all those affected by this devastating tornado in western Iowa. I hope that all of those injured in the western Iowa tornado make a speedy recovery so that they can continue on with their lives.

It is clear that the destruction caused by this tornado would have resulted in more injuries and lives lost had it not been for the warning sirens that went off before the tornado hit. Those warning sirens gave most people the time needed to evacuate and take shelter. However, this warning was, unfortunately, not enough to ensure the safety of every person in the path of these deadly storms.

I'm offering this amendment today to ensure that NASA is actively pursuing research opportunities to accurately predict and forecast tornadoes. My amendment would require NASA to cooperatively work with the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, on tornado research. NOAA is actively involved in tornado research at its Storm Prediction Center in Norman, Oklahoma, and coordination between these agencies could

prove very beneficial. At the Prediction Center, NOAA is studying ways to improve the prediction and location of tornadoes.

I believe that NASA has a lot of valuable technology and input to offer on the study of tornadoes. However, it seems that NASA has done very little work with NOAA on this important life saving research. My amendment will give NASA and NOAA the opportunity to find ways to work cooperatively on tornado research which will help us accurately predict these deadly storms.

My amendment would also require NASA to make any existing cooperatives with NOAA on tornado research a high priority. In the past, NASA has proven that they have a lot to offer with tornado research. Their past work with NOAA on the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission satellite has shown us that sudden increases in lightning in strong super-cell thunderstorms can increase the chances of a tornado touchdown. NASA must commit more resources to this program and other programs dealing with tornado research. Committing more resources to already existing programs will help us accurately forecast tornado touchdown locations.

I urge the House to adopt this amendment to give NASA a better opportunity to offer its technology and expertise in the area of tornado research, and to improve and provide additional resources to its already existing tornado research programs.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YARMUTH) assumed the chair.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Ms. Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3179. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to authorize the use of Federal supply schedules for the acquisition of law enforcement, security, and certain other related items by State and local governments.

H.R. 3913. An act to amend the International Center Act to authorize the lease or sublease of certain property described in such Act to an entity other than a foreign government or international organization if certain conditions are met.

H.R. 6124. An act to provide for the continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. HODES

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 110-707.

Mr. HODES. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. HODES:

In title XI, add at the end the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

#### SEC. 1109. CHRISTA MCAULIFFE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM FOR FIELDS RELATED TO THE MISSION OF NASA.

The Administrator shall establish a scholarship program in honor of Christa McAuliffe, who died in the 1986 Challenger Space Shuttle Disaster. The scholarship fund would provide scholarships each year of \$10,000 each to three women who are going to college to study in fields related to the mission of NASA, with the goal of seeking careers in space science, aeronautics, and other fields related to NASA.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1257, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. HODES. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

This amendment will honor a fallen hero from New Hampshire who was beloved by the Nation. Christa McAuliffe was a teacher from Concord, New Hampshire, who achieved national fame for being the first educator selected to go into space. To those who knew her at home and loved her, she was a social studies teacher who touched the lives of hundreds of New Hampshire's children.

When she was selected by NASA to join the 1986 Challenger Crew, she touched a chord with all of the American people. They saw her dedication to teaching and learning. She believed in helping our children succeed. She often said, I touch the future. I teach.

Even though her life was cut tragically short when the Challenger exploded, her message about shaping our Nation's future through education and exploration is the reason we are here today to consider this important measure.

This amendment will provide three scholarships for women to pursue degrees in science and other fields related to NASA's mission. Christa always dreamed of going into space, and today we can create the opportunity for more women to fulfill their dream of one day being able to journey into space and pursue careers in science, mathematics, and other science-related fields.

These scholarships honor Christa McAuliffe, they honor her dream and are a fitting tribute to her great sacrifice.

Madam Chairman, I urge passage of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I'm not necessarily opposed.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FEENEY. Again, this is an amendment we enthusiastically support. NASA does a great deal to incentivize education programs for women engineers and scientists, but a lot of us Americans remember exactly where we were the moment that Ms. McAuliffe and her colleagues perished. It reminds all of us that human space flight is an inherently risky venture and especially for teachers throughout America and school children who were contemporaries of the Challenger disaster.

I think the gentleman's amendment makes a really good point and with that, I would support the amendment and urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HODES. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his kind and heartfelt remarks.

At this time, Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New Hampshire for yielding to me.

I'm pleased to support this amendment as co-chair of the STEM Education Caucus along with my colleague, Dr. EHLERS, from Michigan. We've long worked to create emphasis on science and math education programs. These areas of study are critical to our future economic competitiveness as well as to the future of our space program.

It is very appropriate to honor the life of educator and astronaut Christa McAuliffe with this scholarship program.

I'm proud to support this amendment and urge all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HODES. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HODES. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 110-707.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. YARMUTH:

In title II, add at the end the following new section (and amendment the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 209. SHARING WEATHER RESEARCH.**

The Administrator shall work to ensure that NASA's policies on the sharing of climate related data respond to the recommendations of the Government Accountability Office's report on climate change research and data-sharing policies and to the recommendations on the processing, distribution, and archiving of data by the National Academies Earth Science Decadal Survey, Earth Science and Applications from Space, and other relevant National Academies reports, to enhance and facilitate their availability and widest possible use to ensure public access to accurate and current data on global warming.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1257, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Before I begin, I want to thank Chairman GORDON, Chairman UDALL, and Ranking Member HALL for their leadership and their hard work that has gone into the NASA Authorization Act.

The amendment I have offered today to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2008 will make sure that the American public has access to the best and most up-to-date taxpayer-funded Federal research.

In the transparent government we wish to provide to the American people, the suppression of nonsensitive information has no place. Yet last year, I took part in two Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearings where we investigated instances in which critical data on the causes and long-term effects of global warming were withheld from the American public.

The taxpayers are funding government studies every day, and they should fully benefit from the results. To proceed otherwise is a disservice to science and the American people.

In order to protect the integrity of scientific discoveries and to ensure the widespread availability of the research being conducted by government scientists, the Government Accountability Office and the National Academy of Sciences made a series of recommendations. Those recommendations include making available the information that supports published results to other researchers creating an infrastructure in which data can be easily accessed, and releasing research in an affordable and timely fashion.

The amendment I'm proposing would simply require NASA to develop a response to these recommendations. These provisions would further scientific progress by enabling data sharing between government agencies, colleges, universities, and grant recipients. It's also my understanding that

NASA agrees with the recommendations of the GAO.

The United States has the advantage of being home to some of the greatest scientific minds of the world, and by providing these scientists with the most up-to-date research information, we can help ensure that American innovation stays on the cutting edge.

At this crucial time when America strives to end its addiction to oil, it could not be more important to ensure that our Nation's scientists have every possible advantage in working towards the next generation of discoveries, inventions, cures, and energy solutions.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment which will ensure that the American people have unfettered access to reliable information that their tax dollars help to uncover while giving American ingenuity another edge in revolutionizing the world.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I'm not necessarily opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

□ 1730

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Chairman, I will not necessarily oppose this amendment. I will point out that I think the amendment provides some confusing requirements on NASA.

On the one hand, for example, it says, "The administrator shall work to ensure that NASA's policies on the sharing of climate-related data respond to the recommendations of the Government Accountability Office report on climate change research and data-sharing policies."

But then the amendment goes on to direct the administrator to also align the agency's policies to recommendations contained in a National Academy report on Earth Science Applications and "other relevant National Academy reports."

It doesn't seem to provide any discretion at NASA to determine amongst a whole bevy or multitude of academy reports from all over the place as to which ones are meritorious or more meritorious than others. There seems to be some confusion here in terms of what NASA ought to determine.

Most importantly, I think we want NASA to make determinations based on good science. That's what they've been charged with. NASA has long been a leader in promoting both domestically and internationally the full and open access to science data to all.

I would also point out that NASA data and information are accessible to the public, on the Web through the NASA Web site.

And finally, we've already discussed the fact that NASA has a set of policies about data and information sharing that I think are comprehensive and are working today quite well.

With that, I would indicate again that I have no objection to the language; although I do think it creates some ambiguity and confusion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate the point made by my colleague.

The intent of the amendment is that, since the Government Accountability Office has set a broad range of actions that they recommend in a very general sense, we wanted to provide the flexibility to NASA and to the other agencies—although this amendment only covers NASA—to develop guidelines for the sharing of data that comply broadly with those guidelines set down by the GAO.

So, with that, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 110-707.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

In section 1108—

(1) in subsection (a), strike "small businesses" and insert "small, minority-owned, and women-owned businesses"; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), insert "giving preference to socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and HUBZone small business concerns. This paragraph shall not apply to any contracting actions entered into or taken by the Agency" after "to small businesses".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1257, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, let me thank the committee, both the ranking member, Mr. HALL, and the chairman of the full committee, as well as the subcommittee chairs and ranking members.

It is a pleasure to have had the honor and privilege of serving on the Science Committee for a number of years and to congratulate them for its very important work. I believe the Science Committee, as I've indicated, creates the work of the 21st century: science and technology and research.

My amendment has a very simple premise, and it is an amendment to the program of which Mr. LAMPSON of Texas has created that is part of the Innovative Partnerships Program that NASA's had for a very long time.

The amendment clarifies that the NASA Outreach and Technology Assistance Program will include small, minority-owned and women-owned businesses. But as well, it specifically focuses on small business concerns owned and controlled, which is part of the existing law, by service-disabled veterans and HUBZone small business concerns. So this will be added to small businesses. What better way to ensure diversity than to ensure that our returning veterans, service-disabled, have the further opportunity of participating in this program.

And Madam Chairman, let me share with you how vital small businesses are, no matter where they are. First of all, small firms represent 99.7 percent of all employer firms. They employ about half of all private sector employees. They pay more than 45 percent of the total U.S. payroll, and in 2006, we believe there were 26.8 million businesses.

When you speak to veterans, it seems that it's their cup of tea. They're independent, they're resilient, and yes, they've fought a war. And so, there's given emphasis in selection of the businesses to participate in this technology and outreach program to socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, and as I indicated, to service-disabled veterans and HUBZone small businesses.

The interesting part of this effort, of course, is the very backbone of our economy will get the opportunity to benefit from the strength of this great NASA program.

And the full committee has been very fair in the dollars that they've put in science and research and the space exploration program, and this, of course, would provide an opportunity for our small businesses to be right in the middle.

I believe that science and technology creates the work of the 21st century, and for that reason, this program and its ability to reach out to these small businesses is a plus for us. They will include the opportunity to hire people who have that technology training. They will reach out to various universities, Hispanic-serving and historically black colleges and other colleges around the Nation, to get the employees that will work in these small firms, and they'll have the technological training that is so important.

I hope my colleagues will support this and continue to support the opportunity for outreach, particularly as it creates jobs and interests and commitment to the NASA mentality and the NASA technology, and it puts America on the cutting edge.

I reserve my time.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition; although I'm not certain I oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEENEY. I guess at the outset, I'd like, if she would yield, to ask my

friend a question because, as I understand the amendment, what it does is to require NASA to contract with a company or companies that have a demonstrated ability to do business and to work with certain companies. Right now, the language gives essentially a requirement that we find small businesses that we can cooperate and work with. I think all of us support that.

I don't understand the language in her amendment. It will substitute for small business, substitute the language in quotes, small, minority-owned and women-owned businesses, end of quote; is that conjunctive or disjunctive? If a company has a great record, for example, in its area of working with minority-owned businesses or women-owned businesses or small businesses or, for example, if a contractor has one subcontractor, do they have to demonstrate that they will be able to have three different contractors, one that's a small business, one that's a minority-owned, and one that's a women-owned business?

If it's a disjunctive, if they can demonstrate ability really to reach out to smaller companies or minority or women, that's terrific, but it may present a real host of problems if it is conjunctive.

I would be happy to yield to my friend to explain whether it's disjunctive or conjunctive.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I'm glad the gentleman asked the question, and the gentleman is right in terms of the positive and not the negative. It is "and," it is including. It is to indicate that if these businesses are around, reach out to them.

And again, this does not impact any contracts of NASA. It only impacts the access to this outreach program, and to have small businesses, if a small business is there, they're there. But to ensure that others are aware of the program and can participate in it.

And of course, it just adds that those who will be part of the outreach will be women-owned, will be HUBZone businesses, and will also be disabled veterans, many of whom are returning back to the country.

Mr. FEENEY. Reclaiming my time, I should point out that the minority happily worked on a manager's amendment, where we enthusiastically endorsed the concept that the administrator ought to contract with external organizations to facilitate new technologies for NASA to new businesses.

And we were sort of provided this at the last moment. We don't really have a chance to examine what the effects are. There may be a contractor out there that only has one subcontractor. There may not be specific types of the businesses.

Though I don't necessarily oppose the amendment, I would suggest that there may be practical problems depending on how this becomes interpreted, and suddenly, we're adding additional requirements.

I think all of us want to help women-owned businesses. We've already done a scholarship today. I think minority-owned businesses are part of Federal contracting law. I think this specific language was designed to help all small businesses, without regard to what specific gender or ethnicity or background they had. We certainly support assistance in helping recently returned or long-standing veterans organizations.

We don't object to the intent of the gentlelady's amendment. I guess we have some real concerns as a practical matter. Small contractors, we're trying to encourage, by the way, NASA not just to pick the Goliaths that then get to divvy out the work. We're trying to encourage NASA to get down and help do business directly with small contractors that are capable.

This may become impossible for small businesses to comply with if they only had one or two contracts and one or two subs.

So, with that, I will not oppose the amendment. I will be happy to yield to my friend to respond.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I want to again reaffirm to the gentleman that this does not impact contracts. This only impacts the ability to participate in getting technical assistance and accessing the wisdom and the expertise of NASA.

In addition, the language is small, comma, and then it goes on. So no one is replaced. It is simply adding a list and saying, don't forget this list as well. It will not replace anyone, and it will not replace anyone or require a small contractor to replace or be replaced, if you will. It is all about technical training and assistance.

Mr. FEENEY. Reclaiming my time, I understand the gentlelady's intent, and actually, I agree with her, given the explanation.

I mean, we've got a NASA Web site. NASA does data sharing. Hopefully, they don't exclude anybody that the gentlelady's talking about. I'm not sure what requirements that contractors that have access to NASA data, that may not be publicly shared, have now got to do that they're not doing. But with that, sometimes we just hope that the details get worked out later in the process, as Chairman GORDON has already reminded me earlier today.

With that, I will not oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If I might simply close and thank the distinguished gentleman, Mr. FEENEY, for his inquiries and, as well, his clarification.

And with that, I would indicate that this is a reemphasis of how important small businesses are, accessing technical assistance, and I would ask my colleagues to support the Jackson-Lee amendment dealing with expanding opportunities to socially and disadvantaged businesses and, of course, returning veterans and other HUBZones.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment for technical assistance.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 6063, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2008. My amendment modifies section 1108, and it states:

(1) in subsection (a), strike “small businesses” and insert “small, minority-owned, and women-owned businesses”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), insert “, giving preference to socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and HUBZone small business concerns” after “to small businesses.”

My amendment clarifies that the NASA Outreach and Technology Assistance Program will include small, minority-owned, and women-owned businesses. It would also give preference, in selection of businesses to participate in the program, to socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and HUBZone small business concerns.

Madam Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague and fellow Texan, Congressman LAMPSON, for his leadership in authoring the important section describing the NASA Outreach and Technology Assistance Program. As set forth in this legislation, this program is intended to support the mission of NASA's Innovative Partnerships Program to provide technical assistance through joint partnerships with industry, academia, government agencies, and national laboratories. It will facilitate technology transfer to the private sector, create a network of academic institutions, aerospace contractors, and NASA centers that will commit to donating technical assistance to small businesses, and create a network of economic development organizations to increase the awareness and enhance the effectiveness of the program nationwide.

My amendment would clarify that the NASA Outreach and Technology Assistance Program will include small, minority-owned, and women-owned businesses. It would also give preference, in the selection of businesses to participate in this program, to socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and HUBZone small business concerns.

Small businesses represent more than the American dream—they represent the American economy. Small businesses account for 95 percent of all employers, create half of our gross domestic product, and provide three out of four new jobs in this country. Minority businesses are also crucial to our communities and our country. Black entrepreneurs owned 9.7 percent of all such businesses in the United States. Statistics gathered between 1997 and 2002 show substantial increases in the number of black-owned firms with receipts of \$1 million or more, as well as the number of black-owned firms with 100 employees or more. Black-owned firms accounted for 5 percent of all non-farm business in the United States in 2002.

In my home city of Houston, small businesses are vital to our economy. In 2002, Harris County ranked 6th in the nation for counties with the largest number of black-owned firms, with 27,770 firms with receipts totaling \$1,817 million. I have worked to introduce minority, women, and small business owners to

contracting officials at NASA to help promote and develop Houston small businesses.

Madam Chairman, the NASA Office of Small Business Programs sets forth, as its mission, “to promote and integrate all small businesses into the competitive base of contractors that pioneer the future of space exploration, scientific discovery, and aeronautics research.” Today's legislation makes important strides toward working to realize this important goal, and I believe that my amendment would strengthen this objective. The legislation we are considering today reinforces the fundamental fact that the benefits of NASA's programming and innovation are felt far beyond scientific and academic spheres. Space technologies provide practical, tangible benefits to society, and NASA provides valuable opportunities to businesses in our community.

My amendment would help to ensure that the important program authorized by this legislation to develop technical partnerships with private industry will be readily accessible to these vital, but disadvantaged, enterprises. I would like to thank Congressman LAMPSON for his support of my amendment. I ask that my amendment be ruled in order, and that my colleagues join me in working to bring the benefits of this important legislation to all members of our community.

Madam Chairman, I would also like to thank my colleague Congressman UDALL for introducing this important legislation. After the *Columbia* disaster, NASA stands at a pivotal moment in its history. It is the responsibility of this Congress to ensure that the future of NASA is one of continued progress. Space exploration remains a part of our national destiny. It inspires our children to look to the stars and dream of what they too, one day, may achieve. Space exploration allows us to push the bounds of our scientific knowledge, as we carry out research projects not possible within the constraints of the planet Earth.

SUPPORT STEM DIVERSITY RELATED  
AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 6063

DIVERSITY AND INNOVATION CAUCUS,

June 11, 2008.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We write to bring your attention to several amendments that may be offered during consideration of H.R. 6063, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2008. Amendments presented by Representatives HODES and JACKSON-LEE are aimed at creating greater diversity in the science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) workforce through opportunity and access. As Co-chairs of the Diversity and Innovation Caucus, we have worked to expand the participation of under-represented groups in the STEM fields to help bolster U.S. competitiveness. The amendments that will help us accomplish this goal in H.R. 6063 include:

Hodes (NH)—VOTE YES: Establishes a scholarship program in honor of Christa McAuliffe, a teacher from Concord, New Hampshire who died in the 1986 Challenger Space Shuttle disaster. The scholarship would go to women pursuing degrees in mathematics, science, and engineering.

Jackson-Lee (TX)—VOTE YES: Clarifies that the NASA Outreach and Technology Assistance Program includes small, minority-owned, and women-owned businesses. It would also give preference, in selection for the program, to socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and HUBZone small business concerns.

If America is to achieve its strategic objectives in STEM, then the enormous potential

of groups that are currently under-represented in the STEM fields must be utilized. STEM policies which encourage diversity help strengthen American innovation and competitiveness by expanding the STEM pipeline. We strongly urge you to support the amendments to HR 6063 listed above.

Thank you for our careful consideration of these important amendments.

I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORDON. Madam Chairman, I want to thank everyone for this constructive and civil debate that we've had today.

I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Ms. BORDALLO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6063) to authorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1745

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 California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

GET YOUR FACTS STRAIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, Special Orders, such as I am now entered into, are a time when Members can fairly freely say things without fear of contradiction because generally no one is here. And as you listen to many of the Special Orders, there is a very good reason why no one is here: No one ought to want to pay any attention to them. And we have a certain amount of tolerance when it comes to Special Orders, but sometimes the stupidity level, it seems to me, is exceeded.

In a Special Order yesterday, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) said the following. He was denouncing the notion of financing public transportation from the gasoline tax. It does

seem to me that having public transportation available is one of the good ways to reduce the use of oil. High prices have driven more people to use public transportation, but that's a legitimate subject for debate. What is not a legitimate subject is to make things up.

The gentleman said yesterday, and I quote from the RECORD, "And if you go to Barney Frank's district and you jump on—I don't know what they call it, the subway, the "Big Dig," the major multibillion dollar boondoggle—and you buy a ticket to ride along on that thing, you get a cheap ticket because it's subsidized by H5321." Well, you can't buy a ticket to ride on the Big Dig, but if you could, it should be cheap because there's nothing to ride on.

In fact, quite contrary to what the gentleman from Iowa made up yesterday, the Big Dig is not a subway, the Big Dig is a highway. Now, it did cost a lot of money, but it was money that was spent on a highway. So when the gentleman says, "I don't know what they call it, the subway, the Big Dig, the major multibillion dollar boondoggle"—and by the way, it's not in my district. But that is such a small error compared to the major errors the gentleman made that I mention it only in passing. But I am baffled by why the gentleman would get up and purport to talk about something in Massachusetts and so mis-describe it.

So let me be very clear: The Big Dig is a highway, it is not a subway. A subway is a mass transit conveyor that goes underground. A highway is something on which cars go. So you can't buy a ticket on the Big Dig, and it is not a subway.

He said further, by the way, that you get a cheap ticket because it's subsidized by H5321. I don't know what H5321 is. There is a bill, H.R. 5321, which has absolutely nothing to do with public transportation, but accuracy does not appear to have been the governing principle in that conversation.

I do note that the gentleman from Iowa singled out three districts to discuss: San Francisco, represented by the Speaker, New York City—and he imputed all New York City to the gentleman from New York, Mr. RANGEL—and myself. Why we three districts were singled out—myself, San Francisco, the gentleman from New York, Mr. RANGEL—I don't know what emotions the gentleman from Iowa was seeking to evoke by, out of all of the public transportation districts, picking the three of us. Again, that's something he is entitled to do, but he is really not entitled to call a highway a subway and denounce us for that.

So, as I said, I understand that when you are here under Special Orders, you can generally get away with a great deal because there is no one to point things out. And I actually felt sufficiently concerned about the accuracy of what's said in the House that I wait-

ed around for a while. And I learned many interesting things about NASA, more than I had planned to, but that was an educational experience. But I would hope that Members in the future, when they want to go and attack things, would put a little effort into trying to know what they are talking about. It might elevate the debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SARBANES). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### BORDER PATROL AGENTS RAMOS AND COMPEAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today is the 512th day since a great injustice took place in this country. On January 17, 2007, two U.S. Border Patrol agents entered Federal prison to begin serving 11 and 12 years, respectively. Agents Compean and Ramos were convicted in March of 2006 for wounding a Mexican drug smuggler who brought 743 pounds of marijuana across our border into Texas.

These agents never should have been prosecuted, yet the U.S. Attorney's Office prosecuted the agents and granted immunity to the drug smuggler. I want to repeat that, Mr. Speaker, yet, the U.S. Attorney's Office prosecuted the agents and granted immunity to the drug smuggler, who claimed he was unarmed. The illegal drug smuggler received full medical care in El Paso, Texas and was permitted to return to Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, today I would especially like to thank House Judiciary Chairman JOHN CONYERS and his staff for their interest in investigating this case. Last week, I spoke to Chairman CONYERS about this case, and I was so grateful to learn that the chairman is seriously considering holding hearings to thoroughly examine the prosecution of these two Border agents. The American people have not forgotten Agents Ramos and Compean, who should have been commended instead of indicted. The hundreds of thousands of Americans who have supported these two heroes will greatly appreciate a decision by Chairman CONYERS to hold hearings on this injustice.

These two agents have given years of their life in service to this Nation, yet they have been unjustly punished for doing their job to protect our homeland. Those of us—and there have been many on both sides of the political aisle—who have spoken out on behalf of these agents for more than a year are waiting on the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans to render its decision in this case.

When those who bravely defend our borders are prosecuted, it sends a confusing message to law enforcement, who are trying to protect the American people. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope and prayer that one day soon this injustice will be corrected and these two heroes will be home with their families.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saying that we have called on the President of the United States to pardon these two agents, and yet nothing has happened. The last hope for this Congress is in the hands of Chairman CONYERS. And I have great respect for Chairman CONYERS, he is a man of integrity and honor.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I will ask God to continue to bless these two Border agents and their families. And I will also ask God to continue to bless our men and women in uniform, and ask God to continue to bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### NASA REAUTHORIZATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we just finished a historic debate for historic legislation, H.R. 6063, and I look forward to my colleagues enthusiastically supporting the NASA Reauthorization Bill.

Let me highlight what this bill will generate for science in America. Funding for science will be some \$4.932 billion. Aeronautics will be \$853 million. Space exploration will be \$3.886 billion. Education will be \$128 million. Space operations will be some \$6 billion. Cross-Agency Support Programs, some \$3 billion. And Inspector General, which is very important to ensure the integrity of the program, some \$35 million. This is an investment not for this Congress, but for America, and that is why this debate is so important.

As we move this bill forward, I am very pleased that this body supported my amendment. And I wanted to ensure that we had record clarity to know that this amendment was worked on by the Science Committee and the Small Business Administration Committee, and was timely submitted to the Rules Committee and, as well, was, if you will, approved by the Rules Committee. And I was very pleased to have this listed as an approved amendment in the structured rule process.

And so all is well now that this amendment has been passed and that this bill now has been passed, if you will, out of this body. And of course there will be votes to finalize the passage of the bill.

Let me move now, just very briefly, to add my deep sympathy to Americans who have experienced the tragedy of untimely and precipitous weather. This, I think, will be the most remarkable weather season that we may have experienced in a couple of years. Tornados are hitting Americans and floods all over the Nation. Many of our colleagues are absent because of the tragedy occurring in their respective districts. This further emphasizes, of course, the work that we do here, but nothing can give solace to those who have lost family members.

As a member of the Board of the Sam Houston Area Council Boy Scouts of America, I offer my deepest sympathy to the Boy Scouts who lost their lives in Iowa, and to their Member of Congress and to the families there. Let me also cite the brave young men who were involved in protecting others and providing first aid. It shows what kind of character and integrity is built for those who are in the Boy Scouts. And we offer to them our deepest sympathy. We know that the national Boy Scouts are mourning, and Boy Scouts across America. But as they mourn, let us also pay tribute to those who rose and showed themselves well as they sought to help those who could not help themselves.

Again, our sympathy to the Boy Scouts of America, to the Boy Scouts of Iowa, and certainly to the families of those who lost their lives in the last 24 to 48 hours, and those Americans who are also in the face of these tragic, terrible natural disasters, and who have suffered personal loss, property loss, and certainly the loss of loved ones.

---

#### ENERGY CRISIS

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. Mr. Speaker, I don't think I'll take the whole 5 minutes tonight because I'm going to join Mr. WESTMORELAND of Georgia in a special 1 hour order on energy in just a few minutes. But I would like to say, during the 5 minutes that I have, that another week has gone by in the Congress of the United States and we have taken no action in dealing with the energy crisis that faces America today.

The price of gasoline is well over \$4 in most areas, and in some areas it's up closer to \$4.50. Diesel fuel is over \$4.50 a gallon, and the truckers across this country are suffering, and they've even demonstrated here in Washington, D.C.

And it's not just the energy problem that we have to deal with, it's the effect that the energy problem has on other commodities, such as food and other equipment that we need to keep this economy moving forward.

The price of food is going to go up. It's going to have tremendous inflationary pressure on every family in this country if we don't address this

problem and address it quickly. I know some of my colleagues say, well, you know, if we started drilling for oil in the ANWR today, it would take 10 years before we would get that oil to market. Well, I disagree; I think it would be a lot sooner than that. But the sooner we start, the quicker we will have that oil at our refineries.

We also could drill off the Continental Shelf and get another couple million barrels of oil a day. And that may take a little bit of time, but the sooner we start, the better.

The other thing we have to consider is we need more refineries to refine that oil. We haven't built a refinery, I think, in this country for the past, what, 30 years? And we need that capacity in order to get this oil transitioned into gasoline and diesel fuel for the people to use in this country.

□ 1800

To sit back like we have and not do anything over the past weeks and months, watching the gas prices go up and watching people suffering, in my opinion, is just unconscionable. Yet, my colleagues, we really haven't done a thing.

I reach out to my colleagues on the Democrats' side of the aisle. You're in the majority and we're in the minority, but we all understand we have a crisis facing this country. We need to work together to explore, to get the oil that we have in our country to market as quickly as possible. We also have as much as a 500-year supply of natural gas, a clean-burning fuel that we could get to market if we could get it out of the ground, and we can do it in an environmentally safe way, and we can extract the oil in an environmentally safe way.

If we were talking to Americans all across the country tonight and if we said, "do you think gas prices are too high?" they would all say, "Yes." If we said, "would you mind if we drilled in this country and in an environmentally safe way to get oil out of the ground to lower your gas prices?" you'd get 80-90 percent to say, "Yes." If you asked them "what about the ANWR?" they'd say, "Where's the ANWR?" Most people aren't aware that it's a very small part of Alaska which is three times the size of Texas.

We need to move toward energy independence. We have the ability to be completely energy-independent from Saudi Arabia, from Venezuela, from Mexico, from Canada, from any country in the world. We can be independent if we work together, but we haven't done that.

Many of my colleagues are saying, "Well, we're concerned about the environment." We all want to transition to new technologies, to new ways of getting energy so that people can have clean-burning fuel, but in the meantime, while we're doing that, we must realize that we're having a terrible, devastating impact on our economy by not taking action.

So I would just like to say to my colleagues, before I get together with Mr. WESTMORELAND for this 1-hour special order, let's work together. The American people are begging us. If you don't believe it, go to any gas pump in the morning or tonight and ask them. They're begging us to do something about the exorbitant fuel prices which are not only affecting their getting to and from work but that are also affecting their ability to buy groceries at the supermarket and that are affecting every other commodity. It's going to severely hamper and hurt this economy if we don't work together very quickly to get the job done.

Now, I believe that if we listen to the American people that Democrats and Republicans can work together, and we can come up with a plan to extract these vital, essential minerals so that we can lower our gas prices and can lower the energy prices in this country, but if we don't and if we continue to fight with each other and if we're recalcitrant and if we don't do something, then the problem is going to get worse and worse and worse.

So I would just like to say to my colleagues and to plead with them one more time tonight: Let's not let another week, month or year go by of our not having done anything to explore or to drill for our own natural resources that can give us energy independence. We've been talking about it since the Carter years back in the 1970s. It is time we did something. Americans are suffering, and we're not doing anything. Democrats and Republicans must work together to solve this problem.

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

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF 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, I stand once again before this House with yet another sunset memorial.

It is June 12, 2008 in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and before the sun set today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children were killed by abortion on demand. That's just today, Madam Speaker. That's more than the number of innocent lives lost on September 11 in this country, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 12,925 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, died and screamed as they did so, but because it was amniotic fluid passing over the vocal cords instead of air, no one could hear them.

And all of them had at least four things in common. First, they were each just little babies who had done nothing wrong to anyone, and each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each one of their mothers, whether she realizes it or not, will never be quite the same. And all the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever. Yet even in the glare of such tragedy, this generation still clings to a blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims, those yet unborn.

Madam Speaker, perhaps it's time for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves of why we are really all here. Thomas Jefferson said, "The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government." The phrase in the 14th Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution; it says, "No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." 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 the clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core, self-evident truth.

It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world. Madam Speaker, it is who we are.

And yet today another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We have failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American babies who died today without the protection we should have given them.

Madam Speaker, let me conclude in the hope that perhaps someone new who heard this sunset memorial tonight will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies; that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express; and that 12,925 days spent killing nearly 50 million unborn children in America is enough; and that the America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust is still courageous and compassionate enough to find a better way for mothers and their unborn babies than abortion on demand.

So tonight, Madam Speaker, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are also numbered and that all too soon each one of us will walk from these Chambers for the very last time.

And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day to come, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries of innocent unborn children. May that be the day when we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our

human and our constitutional duty to protect these, the least of our tiny, little American brothers and sisters from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

It is June 12, 2008, 12,925 days since *Roe versus Wade* first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children, this in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. REICHERT 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 Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS 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 Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FORTENBERRY 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 Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCOTT of Virginia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

### 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be on the floor of the House of Representatives here in the United States of America to talk about issues that are pressing, representing the 30-Something Working Group. I will be joined shortly by my friend, Congressman MEEK of Florida, who will join us through this discussion.

I want to talk about a couple of issues that are pertinent to what has been going on in our country. I think the most pressing issue that we've been dealing with in this Congress and that, I think, most of our constituents are

dealing with every single day is what is going on with our energy policy here in the United States of America.

We have heard, as Democrats have come into office with Speaker PELOSI's leading this House of Representatives, is that one of the key issues that we're trying to deal with is to make sure that our country is energy-independent and to reduce our dependency not only on oil but especially on foreign oil and to move off of oil in general, into renewable energy, into biodiesel, into solar, into wind, into nuclear, into a lot of these other areas that will allow us to be energy-independent, that will provide for renewable energy and that will provide a stable supply of energy here in the United States.

One of the issues that keeps coming up is: Why don't we keep drilling? Why don't we drill in ANWR? That will solve our problem. I'm sure, in the next special order, the folks who are paying attention to this debate will get the other side of this. But from our perspective and from what the analysts are telling us, if you begin drilling in ANWR and if you start the process today, it will be 10 years from now before you get one drop of oil out of ANWR. If you continue, in 10 years, you will get 40,000 barrels of oil a day in a market that has 80 million barrels of oil. In 20 years, you will get yourself up to about 800,000 barrels of oil a day, and you will reduce the cost of a gallon of gas by 1.8 cents per gallon. Now, that is 20 years from now. So, if we start today, in 20 years, we will have a savings of 1.8 cents per gallon of gas. From our perspective, that is not a long-term strategy.

One of the reasons that it is not a long-term strategy is that we have now currently 68 million acres of land on the continental shelf, onshore, that is eligible to be drilled upon. There are 8,000 leases for drilling on these acres of land, 8,000. Of these 8,000 leases, there are only about a quarter of them that are actually being used or that are being pursued.

What we are saying is, if you have 68 million acres of land and if you have 8,000 leases already to drill on those acres of land, why do we need to go somewhere else up in ANWR—up in Alaska—when we're not even drilling in the areas that we have now in which the oil companies have permission to go and drill? That is the question.

So we have this available to us now, and if we got into the 68 million acres of land, that would produce 4.8 million barrels a day.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Would the gentleman yield.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I'd be happy to yield.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The geologists with whom we've talked say that they know that there is oil in the ANWR and that they know where the oil is off the continental shelf. I don't know about these other 8,000 leases in the spots that we're talking about, but I would be happy to talk to them about

exploring those if we could work together to get the oil out of the ground and get it to market.

I'd just like to say to my colleague that I know that you want to move toward energy independence. We have a different view on how it has to be done. You'd like to do it in an environmentally safe way, and so would we, but we aren't starting. So I'd just like to say to my colleague:

When are we going to start? In your opinion, how are we going to start, and how long will it take?

The transition to hybrids and to everything else and to get everybody in this country working on these things is a laudable objective, and I agree with you that we should be doing that, but in the interim, we've been just sitting around, waiting for 30 years. The American people, I don't think, can wait much longer.

So I'm sorry to interrupt you, but I'd just like to ask you: Where do we start? When do we start? How do we start if we don't drill?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time.

I have a great deal of respect for my friend from Indiana. I wanted to give him an opportunity to speak his peace.

It's not up to us, and that is the point I was going to make. This is already available. It's the oil companies that are not pursuing this. They have the leases. They have the space. They have the okay, but they're the ones that aren't doing the drilling, and that's the point.

One of the reasons is that there is a difference between the certifications. When you have to mine for coal and you get one of these permits and you get the ability to lease, there's a 20-year lease for coal companies, but you have to show that you're diligently developing your mining with coal. Under oil and gas, it's only a 10-year lease that is renewable, but you don't have to show that you're diligently developing the leases and that you're diligently developing the mining in trying to get the oil and the gas out.

So the oil companies have the leases—they have the ability to do it—but the law does not require them to show a diligent developing of a particular resource. That is the problem. So they're holding the leases and are, in our minds, driving up the cost. Now, I think there are some other things going on, too, with commodity markets and whatnot, but this is the gist.

There is a bill that is coming out of Mr. RAHALL's office from the Natural Resources Committee, the Responsible Federal Oil and Gas Lease Act of 2008. I will be happy to share with my colleague and have my staff get to your staff the proper information here because there is no reason why they're not developing it, and that's the problem that we have here.

So look at what is going on in the commodities market. We have passed a bill out of this House of Representatives to try to address that problem. If

we soon pass Mr. RAHALL's bill that will deal with the lease issue and the oil companies' being able to hold onto these leases, I think then we can force these folks to either get rid of the leases and get them in the hands of somebody who will actually do the drilling or they will have to drill it themselves, but you have to show diligence in developing that particular resource that you're going after.

So that's really the main issue here, and I appreciate the opportunity to bring that up and to further expound on that point because it puts the ball right back in the court of the oil companies'.

So, on all of these prongs, whether it's futures or whether it's the leases or whether it's the \$14 billion in subsidies that the taxpayers have given the oil companies, on each of these issues, we're trying to change the policy, and we want to join with the Republicans to help us to do that because a lot of this oil and gas is available to be developed, to be explored, to be used here in the United States of America.

Not only that, there is a bill that we passed, I think, in 2005 that would allow a 50 percent tax credit to build refineries. That is one of the other points that has been made, which is of the refineries. Why aren't there more refineries? Refineries now are only working at 85 percent capacity.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Would the gentleman yield.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would be happy to yield. I'm going to yield to you because you're my friend, but I'm going to have to leave, so I'm not going to get a chance to rebut you guys, but go ahead, because Mr. WESTMORELAND and I are going to be on Fox later, so we'll be glad to take that up over there.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The reason I wanted to talk to you really briefly before Mr. WESTMORELAND and I take this hour is that we're going to have to work together to solve this problem. On its face, for us to say that the oil companies with these leases really don't want to exercise the ability they have to drill doesn't make sense.

The problem we have with energy right now is that China is buying an awful lot of the oil, and India is buying a lot of the oil. The appetite for energy is growing at a very rapid rate, even here in the United States, and we're not keeping up with the production necessary to keep the prices down. The oil companies want to drill. They want to make this money. They want more refineries.

You and I don't know each other really well, but what I'd like to say to you is that I'd like to sit down with you and with some of the oil companies executives and talk to them about the drilling problem and about the lease problem. Maybe there's something we can do by talking to them to get this thing off dead center. But to sit around and say they're not drilling where they should when the world needs more energy doesn't make any sense. We need more refineries. Everybody knows that.

As you were talking a minute ago, we want to move toward energy independence, but that's going to take time as well. So I would like to work with you and with other Democratic leaders—Mr. RAHALL and others—and see if we can't get some of the oil execs in without beating them over the head about, you know, taxes on them and just say, "What do we need to do to get you to do exploration in a clean way and to get this energy to market as quickly as possible?" I'd like to talk to you about it and see about that.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time.

I'd like to chat with you about it. I think it would be important to have Mr. RAHALL involved in that conversation.

□ 1815

Our argument on this side, and I think it is not a prima facie case here, these are the facts that have been explored. They have the leases, they have the land, there is nothing preventing them from doing it. You have a 50 percent tax cut on refineries. They still haven't done that. And we are giving them \$14 billion to help develop this stuff. I mean, how much more do you need? And you are the most profitable industry in the country.

So it leaves folks like us to say, you know, you are obviously not doing things properly, because the price of oil is going up.

And I agree, obviously China and India are a major component of this. No one is saying it will be \$20 a barrel if we implement this stuff. But if you talk about it, most people are saying anything between a 10 and 100 percent increase because of the commodity trading, which probably puts it somewhere in the middle at 40 percent, which would be 40 or 50 bucks a barrel. That alone would reduce it to about 90 bucks a barrel.

Now, drilling has increased by 66 percent since 2000, so there is more drilling going on to try to keep pace with that. But the prices have increased. Last Friday a barrel of oil increased more in one day than it cost 10 years ago. That is a significant increase, and you can't say there are some shenanigans going on here.

All we are asking is, I think if we pass something like the Responsible Federal Oil and Gas Relief Act of 2008, if we say that you have to diligently develop those leases that you have, I think that would be a piece of this argument, to say you got the lease, you are not allowed to sit on it. Either develop it or give it to someone else.

No one here is saying we are going to be off oil tomorrow. What we are saying is we don't want to be in the same situation a decade from now or two decades from now because we opened up ANWR and saved 2 cents a gallon. That is not going to get us where we want to be. And the sooner we take the brain power here in the United States of America and put it to work to develop some of these alternative energies, the better off we are going to be.

So, 68 million acres, 4.8 million barrels a day, 44.7 billion cubic feet of natural gas, this is the direction we need to be going in. This is the direction that I think Americans want us to go in, Mr. Speaker. This is the direction that the Speaker and the Democrats want to lead this country in.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are happy to. You guys are going to have more time on my Special Order than I am.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I just want to ask you one question and give you time to rebut it, and I will leave.

To my friend Mr. RYAN, you mentioned not being able to use our technology. In the energy bill that we passed in January of 2007, section 526 really limits the government agencies' ability to use fuels that could come from our technology. It says we cannot use these fuels, such as oil from shale, fuel made from that, for NASA, our military or other government agencies.

Could you kind of rectify that and how that relates to what you are saying? Because I agree with you, we have some of the smartest people in the world here that can look at some of the technology that has been in place in Europe for years of coal-to-liquid. But how does that translate in your energy policy, compared to what you are saying about the technology? Because I certainly agree with you about the technology, but I don't necessarily agree with the energy policy.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, regardless of how we develop it, I think this is what we have done. We put billions of dollars into research and development, and we will continue to put more into research and development, maybe even over the protests of some of the folks on your side of the aisle.

But you could talk about oil shale and you could talk about all of these the other issues. We have 68 million acres right now, there are 8,000 leases, and you folks keep talking, Mr. Speaker, the other side keeps talking about going up to ANWR, when we have 68 million acres already to be tapped, 8,000 leases ready to develop this. They are only using a quarter of them. Go ahead and drill. But why do we have to go up to ANWR, when we already have the ability to do it now? That is all we are saying.

So, yeah, we should use technology to figure out other ways to develop oil and the coal-to-liquid. As long as you are sequestering the CO<sub>2</sub>, speaking on behalf of myself now, I don't have any problem with it. You have nuclear plants that are going on and permits and leases for moving that process forward.

So this is going to be a comprehensive bill and a comprehensive approach to all this. But when you have the oil companies getting \$14 billion, you have the commodities problem that you have, and you have them buying leases and holding them because they don't have to diligently develop, like they

have to do for coal, you get skyrocketing gas costs, and that is what we are trying to fix here.

The oil companies have more incentives than they could ever possibly need. They have been getting \$14 billion in basically corporate welfare. They get a 50 percent tax credit to develop a refinery, and they still haven't done that. So these issues are hanging around here, and we are trying to change it and the rhetoric from the other side is we got to go to ANWR, when we already have the ability to address these problems here.

So I think we have a comprehensive approach on how to fix this problem. It is much different. And, again, to just say, you know, Mr. Speaker, it was the other side. They were in charge for 6 years, had the House, had the Senate, had the White House, and we are currently living under their energy policy and the Bush economy.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield for just one second, I know you have to leave and I just want to say one thing real quickly, if you don't mind.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. You know, you can blame us, we can blame you. We can go all the way back to the Carter administration when we had lines. You are a fairly young man, you probably don't remember, but there were lines around the block and people coming with five gallon cans to get gas because we didn't have any. There is probably enough blame to go around.

The problem is we are in an economic crisis right now that is not going to get any better until we work together. I have been down here railing against you and the Democrats for the last three or four or five weeks saying you guys are the reason that gas has gone up a buck-and-a-half in the last 2 years. You can blame us if you want to. But the people who are watching on television and the people around this country right now are paying 4 bucks-plus a gallon and they want us to work together. I would like to sit down with you and others like you and try to figure out a way to get this problem solved.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, you are exactly right. We could sit here, Mr. Speaker, and blame each other about whose fault it is. I say that as a point of clarification, because one is now you have solutions that you didn't implement while you were in, they didn't implement while they were in, Mr. Speaker. So I think that is an important point to make.

But the discussion here today is look at what the Democrats have done. We are trying to repeal the \$14 billion in corporate welfare. We are trying to crack down on the commodities futures trading. We are trying to make sure that oil companies can't just hold leases and not develop them, and not develop them and diligently pursue the natural resources that are there. That

is what we are saying. The other side is saying, go to ANWR. Now, that is not a solution.

So the discussion that we are having here is that your side is saying, go to ANWR and drill, and we are saying there is 68 million acres, 8,000 leases, and they are only using a quarter of them. The oil companies are holding them. They could get 4.2 billion barrels a day, and they are not doing it. That only leaves one conclusion.

I guess we are kind of blaming each other. But if you put up drilling in ANWR or drill in what we have now and focus billions of dollars on an alternative energy policy and strip the \$14 billion from the oil companies and make sure that if they get leases they got to use them and make sure that there is not all kinds of monkey business going on in the commodities market, that is our solution, which your side votes against.

We are going to have an election. You guys are going to say drill in ANWR, we are going to say alternative energy, and the people are going to decide. So we can blame each other all we want, but the people are going to hear our position, they are going to hear your position, and they are going to hear the presidential candidates' positions, and they are going to decide who they want to vote for.

I believe and our caucus believes that when we get the message out that there are already 68 million acres to be developed, there are 8,000 leases being held by the oil companies, that they are only using a quarter of them, that it will look like our friends on the other side are standing shoulder-to-shoulder with the oil companies. And we are going to have a vote at some point on Mr. RAHALL's bill that will allow and force the oil companies that if they have leases to use them, that you may fall on the one side of that and we may fall on the other, and then the people will have that vote to decide on.

I am getting a bit redundant, but we want to make sure our friends who are just kind of passing through the debate catch both sides.

The gentleman from Indiana, I know he is a busy man, but if you have time tonight, me and your partner in crime there will be on Fox TV, on Hannity & Colmes, to further this discussion, and I very much look forward to it.

I think my partner in crime, Mr. MEEK, is not here, will not be here, and I will take your thank-you's later, because you had more of my special order than I had.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield just real quickly, I would like to say this to you as you leave. I would like to see a number of you—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield just for a second?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, you are going to get the next hour.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I know, but I would like to talk to you before you leave.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman want to yield, or yield back?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield back the balance of my time. I will wait and listen to you.

#### ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am glad Mr. RYAN was here, and we will continue this discussion, I am sure.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield just for one second?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I will.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Before you leave, let me say I think what would be very illuminating for the American people is for you and three or four of your colleagues who have some expertise in this area to come down with three or four of our colleagues and sit down and discuss in logical way these issues you are talking about, because we all want the same thing. So I would like to talk to you about that after we are through here, and maybe we can work something out in the next week or two.

Thank you, Mr. WESTMORELAND.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Thank you.

As we continued listening to my friend and colleague Mr. RYAN talk about the amount of land that is open for drilling, it is only 3 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf. That is only 3 percent of it. There are only 6 percent of the Federal lands on shore that are open to drilling. Now, these oil companies may hold some of these leases, but why would you want to drill on something that did not have oil? I don't think that makes good sense.

He is talking about the \$14 billion tax. Well, you know, I am not the smartest guy in the world, but I had an economics teacher, Colonel Walford, in high school, who made it very clear to me that taxing a producer or manufacturer did not lower the price to the consumer. You don't have to be an economist to understand that if you raise taxes on somebody, it is not going to lower the price to the consumer.

Now, the other thing is that the majority has been in control for 17 months. When they took over, the price of a gallon of gas was \$2.26. Right now it is up over \$4. I believe it was in April of 2006 that then Minority Leader PELOSI, now Speaker PELOSI, made the statement that the Democrats had a commonsense plan to bring down the skyrocketing price of gas. Now, it was probably \$2.08 then, right at \$2. So I don't know where this plan is.

They passed an energy bill in about January of 2007 that Mr. RYAN referred

to, and in that energy bill they had specific language that said our government could not use certain alternative fuels. So they are saying one thing and then doing something else, and it is real confusing to the American people.

But I have something I want to unveil tonight, Mr. Speaker, for the American people. We have got some of it up here. What this is, Mr. Speaker, there have been all kind of petitions on the Internet. I went into a service station in my district and there was a petition there on the counter about the price of gas. There are petitions all over. Our constituents have an opportunity to go on the Internet and sign these petitions or go into their local grocery store or gas station and sign a petition for drilling, against drilling, for any variety of things as far as what the energy costs are that are affecting the average person.

So as I thought about this I said, you know, we need to make this simple. We need to make it so we have a petition for the House of Representatives. We have 435 Members here, and the American people need to know how their Representative would vote.

□ 1830

What would they be voting on? American energy solutions for lower gas prices, the things that we can control, our resources.

You know, China and Cuba are fixing to start drilling 45 miles off the coast of Florida. That's our natural resource, we could be drilling there, but we are not. So we have got 97 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf that we control we are not drilling on, 94 percent of the Federal lands that we have in this country, we are not drilling on. So we have got a real simple thing, bring onshore oil on line, bring deepwater oil on line and bring new refineries on line.

You might realize or might not realize that we haven't built a refinery since the late 1970s. We import, right now—this is probably going to surprise some people—we import 6.9 billion gallons of refined crude oil that's gasoline into this country every year, because we do not have the refining capabilities.

We had a motion to recommit, I believe, on May 22 that Mr. CONAWAY offered that said, within the 90 days, that the government would identify three locations on some of our military bases that have environmental problems, maybe, that the BRAC has closed immediately and in 90 days identify three of those to build new refineries. The majority voted against it. They stand and say one thing, but their actions do something else.

We need to build and expand our refineries, and we need to make this to where our oil companies are willing to invest. But when you import 6.9 billion gallons of gasoline and probably about the same amount of diesel fuel, that we come in.

What we have got is a petition here, and this petition starts out with Alas-

ka at large, it goes out through Alabama and goes all the way through every State in this Union, and we have got everybody a district line.

Now, we just kind of, we had it back here in the corner today and some people came by and said hey, what you got, and I told them it's a petition. What the petition says, "I will vote to increase U.S. oil production to lower gas prices for Americans."

That's pretty simple. It's not convoluted, it doesn't have anything to do with anything other than Americans providing their own resources for our energy. Now, what's wrong with that? We are a country that is known for our resourcefulness.

Mr. RYAN mentioned the technology. Germany, back in the late 1920s, had technology that converted coal to fuel. That was back in the late 1920s. Surely technology has come to where it's better. We have got over a trillion, that is a trillion with a "T", barrels of shale oil out west, a trillion, a trillion, and we are not doing anything with it.

In fact, not only are we not doing anything with it, but Mr. UDALL from Colorado last year passed an amendment that said we couldn't do anything with it, that we couldn't drill, and it passed this House 219 to 215. You might remember, I believe that was the stolen vote. But those are circumstances that we have got, and so we want the American people to know where their Congressman is at.

We have got this petition, we are going to update it, every day we are going to have it back on the floor. I have got two pencils with me today, two markers. If anybody is listening that's still in town, wants to come down, they can certainly come down. I will give them some time to speak and they can tell their constituency why they want us to support us using our natural resources, our resources to provide energy for our people.

I will yield some time to Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. First of all, let me compliment my colleague from Georgia, because I really appreciate you taking the initiative to actually lay before the American people those who support energy independence, true energy independence and those who don't. I think this will do it. I hope this is publicized across the country so every single constituent of yours, mine, everybody in this country who is paying \$4-plus a gallon for gasoline will know how their representative feels about this issue.

One of the things we were talking about just a few moments ago before our colleague left, which was very troubling, was that he indicated that oil companies were protecting leases, and he didn't want to drill in those places. It's very—it's almost a ludicrous argument.

Because with the demand for oil growing like it has around the world, the need for more oil or energy is apparent. The more oil companies, the

more they drill and the more they refine, the more they are going to be able to sell. What my colleagues have said in the other side of the Senate and over here is they want to raise taxes on the oil producers.

That's okay if they want to tax those people, but oil companies don't pay taxes. This is what people need to understand. Those taxes are passed on to the consumer when they buy the gasoline, because they raise the price of the gasoline.

When you buy a car, if you raise the taxes on the production of a car, it's passed on with the price increase on the car. So companies, corporations aren't paying these taxes, the consumer is. That's what we really need to explain to the American people.

The thing that troubles me the most—and this is why I appreciate you doing this and taking this initiative, Representative WESTMORELAND, is because the American people are confused. Right now they read in the paper, see on television, well, the Republicans killed a bill in the other body that would have really put the hammer to the oil companies.

The fact is that it was raising taxes on the oil companies, which would have passed on to consumers in a price increase that would have made gas prices even higher. What we need to do, as you said, and what you are doing tonight, as my colleague from Georgia, your buddy here is going to talk about in a few minutes, is we need to get more energy out of the ground and we have the ability to be energy independent.

My colleagues say, well, it's going to take 10 years it may take 5 years, it may take 2 years. I don't know. But we have been talking about this since the Carter years in the 1970s, and we haven't done anything.

So I want congratulate you one more time, I am happy to be here with you tonight. I will stay with you for the whole hour if you want me to. But I hope that we will get across to the American people this, we don't want this to be political, we want to work together with them, and they are not willing to do it at this point.

We need to work with the Democrats to get a program, to become energy independent, to get our oil and natural gas and coal shale out of the ground so we don't have to depend on Saudi Arabia or OPEC or Venezuela and Mr. Chavez down there who may pull our string any day.

We need to become energy independent and quit talking about it. We need to work together to get that job done because the American people, if you look at the polling results, I think Congress is worth, what, 18 percent in popularity right now, a pox on all of our houses. We better get together, or they will throw us all out.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Let me say this, the American people sometimes get confused, just as you spoke about,

the bill that was in the Senate. They don't hear all of the things that were in that bill. That's one of the reasons I wanted to make this as simple as I could. It is not confusing. This is not confusing.

If anybody calls their Congressman and asks them if they signed this petition—and, by the way, the one petition I found online, I think, was American Solutions had over 500 now people, I think it has been up for less than 2 weeks, have already sent in and said we want to drill. There is a radio station in Tampa, Florida, that has started sending drill bits to Members of Congress and Members of the Senate to show their support for drilling.

This is a radio station in Florida that's doing this, and I imagine it would probably catch on all over the United States, and we will probably have more drill bits. I hope they will send a whole set that we will have to remind these people that we need to rely on our own resources.

That's the reason that we made it as simple as we could. All it says is, "I will vote to increase U.S. oil production." Ninety-plus percent of the Republicans in this House have consistently voted for more domestic oil production. Eighty-six percent of the now majority party have consistently voted against more domestic production. This is going to put everybody on equal footing.

Everybody has an opportunity to sign it. I hope we get 435 Members to sign it and then, Mr. BURTON, we can get on with what you offered to Mr. RYAN that we could come together, because we really don't have an opportunity to come to the floor in front of the American people. We only have a certain time where we can do it.

Maybe we ought to get a 2-hour thing where we could all come down here and talk and see if we can't straighten some of these facts out, because the facts are totally different from what I am getting from land management and evidently what somebody else has gotten from land management.

Right now I am proud to yield as much time as he might take to my good friend from Georgia, Dr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank you, Congressman WESTMORELAND, for your leadership on this issue and that is really a great idea, and that is a petition that has a spot for every Member of the United States House of Representatives to sign that will say, "I will vote to increase U.S. oil production to lower gas prices for Americans."

As you said, it doesn't get any more simple than that. It's just as straightforward as it could be.

I am sorry I couldn't join you at the beginning. I was listening in my office to our friend from Ohio who had some comments, that I thought it was important to set the record straight a little bit. I know my good friend from Indiana has done so, but I thought I would mention a couple of things.

It's true, we do need to work together. We do need to work together, Democrats and Republicans on behalf of the American people. But as my mama used to say, it takes two to tango, and it's tough to dance by yourselves when the folks who are setting the agenda and setting the bills that come to the floor of the House, that will allow the bills that come to the floor of the House, when they won't tango, when they aren't interested, apparently, in solving this problem when the American people are crying out for a solution.

My good friend, Mr. RYAN from Ohio, talked about the issue of the oil companies, domestic oil companies, American oil companies who are trying to bring as much product out of the ground as possible. At these prices, one would think that they would. He talks about the fact that only a quarter of the lands are being used that are currently being leased to the oil companies.

He says, well, why don't they use the other 75 percent?

Well, that reminds me of the question that Willy Loman got, you know, Willy Loman was a bank robber. And they asked him, Willy, why do you rob banks? He thought a little bit and said, because that's where the money is, the money is there.

These oil companies don't drill on the other 75 percent of that land, not because they don't want to, it's because there are tests, remarkably efficient tests, that allow the domestic oil producers to tell whether or not there is oil down there. If they do those tests and they find that there is not any oil down there, then should we expect them to waste money and drill in those areas?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I just wanted to say that in relation to that, between 2002 and 2007, 52 percent of all the exploration wells were dry, 52 percent of them, of all of them that they drill. So it's not all there.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Will my friend yield?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Yes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. That's an important figure. Over half of the time that the oil companies put a drill down to find oil, they didn't find anything, and this is on that leased land. That's on that leased land.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Would the gentleman yield, I would just like to interject something here.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Sure.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Our colleague from Ohio was talking about these leases. And the reason they want to drill in ANWR is because geologists found there is a huge supply of oil there. That makes your point. That's where the oil is.

As Willy said, that's where the money is. So why would you drill, as you said, in leases where there aren't any, when you know, you know that there's oil in the ANWR.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate my friend's comment. I could let them

drill in my backyard, but they are not going to find any oil there, so it's a waste of time to drill in my backyard. It's a waste of time for them to drill where there is no oil.

To underscore the point that my friend from Indiana made about Alaska, the proven reserves, the proven reserves that are there are more than twice as much as the oil reserves in all of Texas, more than twice as much as the oil reserves in all of Texas. That's where the oil is, that's why it's important to allow them to go there.

This would represent, the Alaska exploration, would represent a 50-percent increase in the total U.S. proven reserves. I would say that's a remarkable amount, incredible amount. You talk about something that would drive down the cost of gasoline, just the announcement that we would allow it to occur would drive down the price of oil across the world.

But I think it's extremely important.

□ 1845

We have a group called the Truth Squad that gets together to try to shed light on things because facts are stubborn things. Facts are stubborn things. Our motto is everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts.

When the American people look at the facts on this issue, they understand that we need to conserve more. Without a doubt. And they understand that we need to have a transition to alternative fuel, that we need to find that non-fossil fuel that will drive our economy and our Nation for centuries to come, hopefully.

But they also understand that it is foolish for a Nation that has incredible resources, like the United States, to let them just sit fallow and not take advantage of them and make it so that we are more reliant on foreign oil than ever before, and that we are buying oil from folks that frankly don't like us very much. They understand what this is about.

I believe that over the coming months as we see gas prices continue to increase, that they will pay more attention to what is going on in this room and in this building. And as they pay more attention, they will appreciate that there are a group of individuals who are interested in increasing supply. And then there are a group that have proven over and over and over that they are not interested in increasing supply. I hope as we work together, we will be able to increase those numbers of people who want to increase supply to more than 218 so we can move forward.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Absolutely.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I just want to say one thing about what you are doing here tonight. I know that we can't talk to the American people, we have to talk to each other. But if I were talking to the American people tonight, I would say, like you are saying, you ought to call your congress-

man and tell him to sign this thing. I can't say that to the American people because I'm only allowed to talk to you. But if I were talking to the American people, I would say Mr. WESTMORELAND has the right idea, let every Congressman know how you feel, and if you do, then they will change their mind and they will support exploration that will give us energy independence.

So I congratulate you on doing this. This is a great idea.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Thank you, and it is real simple, too. It can't be confused with anything else. American energy solutions for lower gas prices simply reads, "I will vote to increase U.S. oil production to lower gas prices for Americans." It is real simple.

And what you were talking about, Dr. PRICE, is we are not going to drill in these leases that don't have oil. And when you've got I think it is 1.76 billion acres in the Outer Continental Shelf, and we have only opened up 3 percent of that. We have got 700 million on shore of Federal land that we have only opened up 6 percent to.

And let's look at this. Let's remember back because Mr. RYAN made a statement that it would be 10 or 15 years before we get any oil, and then it would be only 40,000 barrels a day. Let me remind the American people of this. In 1995, this Congress passed drilling in ANWR. Then President Clinton vetoed that bill in 1995, 13 years ago. Today, by conservative estimates, we would be getting 1 million barrels a day out of ANWR. Today.

Now Senator SCHUMER on the other side of the hall made a statement last week that if we could get Saudi Arabia or OPEC to increase production of a million barrels a day, it would reduce the price of gas 50 cents a gallon. Well, isn't that swell. That we are going to go to some people that haven't always been our friends, and we are going to say to the OPEC nations that we want them to drill. We want to use their natural resources, but we don't want to use ours. That doesn't make good sense. So just remember if President Clinton had not vetoed that bill in 1995, we would be getting a million barrels a day.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I think it is important that we discuss a little bit about Saudi Arabia and the issue that Senator SCHUMER brought up in the context of our President going to the Middle East. And the way my constituents saw it, why is our President going to the Middle East and begging for the production or for them to sell us more oil. That is just not befitting of what we ought to do for our Nation which has incredible reserves, incredible reserves.

And the facts will bear out what you said, and that is that the increase of oil that could come from Alaska is remarkable and would significantly lower the price. I am reminded of the Jay Leno line. Jay Leno said to his audience a couple of weeks ago, "The Democrats say if we allow for drilling

in Alaska, it will take 10 years before we see any gas."

He said, "That's just what they said 10 years ago." So it hasn't changed. It's the same old excuse.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I think one of the things that ought to be put into the equation that we don't discuss a lot, and that is that we are depending on the Middle East for what, 40, 50 percent of our energy. Right now we know there is a lot of conflict in that part of the world. When Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, he burned a lot of the oil wells. And had he taken over, we would all have been buying or trying to buy oil from Saddam Hussein.

The reason I bring this up is we don't know what is going to happen 5 or 10 years from now. There could be a terrible conflagration over there and we might not be able to get oil out of that area for our country. They might sink a couple of ships in the Persian Gulf and block the tankers from even getting out of there, and we won't be able to get energy. So what do we do then? Do we let the lights go out and let the cars stop on the streets because we don't have energy? That is another reason, for national security purposes, that we have an energy supply here and become independent of the other countries in the world.

As you said, both men from Georgia, we have the ability to do it. Even if it took 10 years, and I don't think it would, but even if it did, we ought to be looking down the road and asking, Do we want to keep depending our security on the Middle East where something could go wrong tomorrow when we could be independent, as far as energy is concerned, right here in America and protect ourselves, as well as getting the energy that we need, from a conflagration that might take place halfway around the world.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. This might be a long-term plan, but you have to start some time. There has been a proposal by Senator MCCAIN to give some temporary relief with a gas tax holiday during the summer to allow some people some extra spending money. It is not a great amount, but it is something.

We could also take off-road diesel and let people burn it on road. If you remember after Hurricane Katrina, there was a shortage of diesel. They didn't have any diesel and the EPA and the IRS got together and said all right, let's start burning this off road and let them use it for 30 days, and then I believe we extended it for another 30 days until we got the supply of diesel back.

So there are some commonsense things that we can do immediately. And Dr. PRICE hit on this. The day I believe that we pass some type of bill in this body that said we are going to look after our own solutions for energy from within our own natural resources, this oil speculation would come down. You wouldn't even have to put the first drill bit in the ground. Right now they understand that the majority that is in

control of this Congress are being held hostage by the radical environmentalists and that we are not going to do anything such as this with long-term planning about our energy future. And while we all want to conserve, we cannot conserve ourselves out of the dilemma that we are in right now. And so we have got to do something. We have to have some initiative to go forward. And right now, we are laying around in the fetal position talking about a commonsense plan that we had 2 years ago that we have not done anything about. So it is time for action.

You know, I have seen a knee-jerk reaction to everything up here. You let the least little thing happen, and we will have a knee-jerk reaction to it. And that is something. We have had tragedies that we have had. We put \$140 billion down after Katrina, \$62 billion in 2 weeks that we addressed down there, and it wasn't that we responded fast enough. So we have a habit of throwing money at things but not providing the boots on the ground or the substance to back it up.

Well, this is something that we just can't throw money at. This is something that calls for action. We, as the duly elected people by our constituents, we are the representatives of this country, and they sent us here to do something, not just lay here in a fetal position. And I yield to Dr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my friend from Indiana for bringing up the issue of national security because energy security is national security. There is no doubt about it. People at home understand this better than the folks in this room, apparently, as a whole. Energy security is national security.

I would suggest that it is irresponsible of us, it is an abrogation of our duty and our oath not to fulfill the requirements that would allow for us to be self-sufficient in energy. And we can with the resources that we have. There is no doubt about it.

The dirty little secret is 30 years ago when we had the challenge, the oil crisis where we all waited in lines to fill our gas tanks, all of us at the time said, all of us said we will never be this reliant on foreign oil again. The dirty little secret is at that time we were about 25 percent relying on foreign oil. And now we buy over 60 percent of our oil, not from ourselves, not from domestic producers. So the dirty little secret is that we have gone a long way in the wrong direction. We can turn it around. We can move it in the right direction in an environmentally sensitive and sound way, in a technologically sound way that will not have the kind of catastrophes that many on the other side say are a certainty.

I am pleased that you brought up Hurricane Katrina in a little different light. During Katrina, the thousands of rigs in the gulf, not one of them had a leak from Hurricane Katrina. In fact, there is more seepage naturally of oil out of the ground every day into the

Gulf of Mexico than occurred during Hurricane Katrina because of a problem with the technology, the equipment.

We have come so far in this Nation over the last 30 years in terms of technology and being able to do energy production, oil production, getting it out of the ground, in an environmentally sensitive and sound way. There is no reason, no reason not to move forward.

In fact, the issue of Alaska and whether or not we ought to explore there, President Carter knew that we ought to. As my friends know, he signed a bill that provided for the 1002 area. That was in 1980. It is not a wildlife or a refuge at all, it is an area that was specifically designated for future exploration for oil. And our friends on the other side of the aisle won't allow that to happen.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Yes, closed it down.

Going back to Hurricane Katrina and the fact that a large number of our refineries are on that gulf coast which is subject to hurricanes, it seems like we would take some proactive decisions and look at other places where we could put some of these refineries where they would not be as subject to hurricanes.

Once again, the people in New Orleans could not spend as much money as we sent down there as fast as they could. They needed action. They needed boots on the ground. They needed physical people down there helping them.

So we have an opportunity now to do something physical. We can put 435 pairs of boots on the ground right now and let the American people know that we are here to help. And what we are going to do, we are going to be at the forefront for making sure that we give the ability to extract oil and natural gas and clean-burning coal and any type of energy that we can from our own natural resources.

Now the Republican plan that Leader BOEHNER and others have put out talks about the on shore, on land and that is estimated, and that is the shale and ANWR, that would save anywhere from 70 to \$1.60 a gallon.

□ 1900

And if you look at the deepwater drilling, the OCS, that would be between 90 and \$2.50 a gallon. And then the new refineries. And Dr. PRICE, before you got here, I made a statement that we import 6.9 billion gallons of gas every year, plus probably just as much diesel. But if we built a new refinery, it would save us 15 to 45 cents. So taking just a conservative estimate, that's about \$2 a gallon that that would save us.

Now, if you look at the Democratic plan that they had, sue OPEC. Well, I don't think that's going to bring us in anything to reduce the price of gas.

They want to launch their seventh investigation into price gouging, their seventh. They've already had six investigations of price gouging.

They want to launch their fourth investigation into speculators, the fourth one. And they want \$20 billion in new taxes on oil producers.

Now, here again, I've looked at all those things and I've kind of weighed both sides, and their savings is zero. Nada. Ours would be about \$2 a gallon.

Is it going to happen immediately? No. Is it going to start happening immediately? Yes.

And so, what I wanted the American people to do with this, Mr. Speaker, is to allow them to see who's on their team for bringing down the price of gas, and who's on their team for using our own resources, rather than sending our President into foreign lands begging for other people to increase their oil production.

Dr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate that. And this idea, the idea you came up with is so wonderful because what it's going to allow every Member of this House to see is who signs on the petition. You're going to come down here with some frequency, I suspect, and we'll review the individuals that are—

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Well, we got about 20 signatures today just by showing it to people walking out the door.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Absolutely. Within 5 or 6 minutes they walked by and said well, I'll sign up on that. But our colleagues here are going to be able to look on that petition and see who's interested in voting to increase U.S. oil production to lower gas prices for Americans. And so that's why your leadership on this is wonderful.

I'm reminded of the individual who said that every other nation on the face of this earth looks at their natural resources and views them as an economic asset. They view them as an economic asset, something that can help their nation.

The problem that we seem to have is that the majority leadership, at least, in this body, looks at our natural resources and views them as an environmental hazard, which doesn't make any sense. It certainly doesn't make any sense to the folks in my district, and I suspect it doesn't make any sense to the folks in your districts.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Sure.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. One of the things that we haven't really discussed a great deal tonight is if they didn't want to drill for oil, for instance, we have a several hundred-year supply of natural gas, and there could be an entire new industry creating conversion units for automobiles that would be much less than a brand new car, that could convert gas-powered cars to natural gas power, which is a clean burning fuel.

But once again, the opposition will not allow us to drill for natural gas, which is a clean burning fuel which would help the environment. So it's not just the oil issue; it's the entire energy issue that you're talking about.

And that's why I think that the American people, I hope that they're paying attention to this. I know that they're getting their attention because the price of gasoline is so high. But we have the ability to use natural gas. We have the ability to use oil. We have the ability to get it out of the ground, to use shale and we're being blocked again and again and again.

And I appreciate you and the other gentleman from Georgia saying tonight that we'd like to work with the Democrats on the other side of the aisle to solve this problem. But, as you said before, it takes two to dance. Well, I guess I could dance by myself, but that wouldn't be very becoming. But it takes two to tango, and I would just say that if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are listening to my colleagues from Georgia, let's get together and see if we can come up with a way to get this problem solved.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Absolutely. Let's get together. And I appreciate you bringing up some of the other ways to increase our domestic resources or utilization of our resources. Offshore drilling, offshore oil, deep sea exploration, 85 percent of the lower 48 States, Outer Continental Shelf, energy resources remain under lock and key by the Federal Government. You can't go there. 85 percent.

In fact, as I mentioned, the United States is the only nation that has shoreline in the world that doesn't allow for exploration offshore to the degree that would allow for utilizing those resources that are available.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. And keep in mind, we only use 3 percent of those offshore resources. Only 3 percent. Out of 101.76 billion acres, we only use 3 percent of it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. That lets you know how much of the shoreline of the United States is in Alaska, because that's what bumps that number way up.

I want to make just one brief comment about the oil shale that we've got available to us in the United States because I was astounded when I learned these figures. And again, these are facts. This isn't my opinion. This is a fact.

The Department of Energy estimates that the United States is endowed with more than 2 trillion, 2 trillion, that's T-R, 2 trillion barrels of oil from oil shale if we were allowed to move forward with that clean technology, environmentally sound way, 2 trillion barrels.

To put this figure in perspective, the world has used 1 trillion barrels of oil since the first oil well was drilled in Pennsylvania in 1859. So twice as much oil as the world has used in the past 150 years is available through environmentally sound technology, through the use of oil shale. To not take advantage of those resources is astounding to me.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Well, those resources, that shale that you're talk-

ing about, Mr. UDALL from Colorado, if you'll remember, had an amendment on the bill that we passed in this House that said that was off, can't use it. Can't get it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. That's exactly right. It wasn't well maybe we ought to give it a try in a little area and see how it works.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. 219-215.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Yeah. We ought to, you know, at least try a little bit. Maybe we ought to see if it works, see if we can't make certain that the technologically sound and environmentally sensitive way to gain these resources is true. Shouldn't we just try a little bit? At \$4 a gallon, doesn't that make sense? Or does it have to get to \$5 a gallon, or is it \$6?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. And Senator ALLARD, from Colorado I believe, had an amendment in the Senate Appropriations Committee to overturn the Udall amendment, and it was defeated 15-14, along party lines.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Isn't that amazing. And it really begs the question, how high does the price of gas have to get before we use American resources? How high does it have to get?

Maybe that's the question we ought to be asking our friends on the other side. We'd love to work with you. At what price will you begin to work? Is it \$10 a gallon that you'll begin to work with us?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. But Dr. PRICE, that's the problem that the majority has because a lot of their base is the radical environmentalists don't care if gas goes to \$10 a gallon. They don't want us driving SUVs. They really don't want us driving cars. They want us riding bicycles or motor scooters like you would see in China or somewhere in an Asian country. They don't want us driving. And they don't care how high gas gets. That doesn't matter to them.

And so that's a problem that the majority is facing. And I think one of the reasons they have not been quick to act is the fact that that has been a large part of their base.

But hopefully, the American people are going to realize that they can have a voice in this. They can have a voice, and that they can see, on a chart, how their person stands; are they for U.S. energy independence or not?

And so that's what we have given, a plain visual of them to be able to see. I yield to you.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. And I thank you. And I know that you mentioned about the certain folks in the environmental community who do not want any exploration and do not want any greater production. But I can't believe that a significant number of folks on the other side don't believe in their heart, and their constituents certainly, that we ought to be able to solve this problem with our own resources and with our own ingenuity and our own spirit and genius and American entrepreneurship and American energy for

Americans. I just have to believe that a significant number on the other side of the aisle believe that.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. And I think you're right. And Mr. BURTON's been here a lot longer than you and I have. But we have seen what complete authority is in this body, and really one person controls any legislation that comes on to this floor. So it wouldn't matter.

And we saw an example of that when we had the votes to pass the FISA bill, the national security bill. We had the votes to pass that in a letter that the Blue Dogs had sent to the Speaker. And our side we had enough to pass a good FISA bill that would have protected America, but we couldn't get it to the floor.

And so I think you're right, Dr. PRICE. I think there are many Members on the other side of the aisle that realize that we need to be looking at our own natural resources that would vote with us for a good plan, for a good energy program. But they'll never have the opportunity to do it.

And so that's the reason I felt the need to have this chart, so at least they can tell their constituents, hey, look, if leadership would bring this up, I'd be with you. But they won't bring it up.

Mr. BURTON.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

You know, the truckers across this country that drive these big diesel rigs that bring food to the market and all these other commodities, they were so upset when diesel fuel got to over \$4 a gallon, now it's over \$4.50 a gallon, that they came, hundreds of them, maybe even thousands of them, drove here into Washington, DC to protest. And they're very concerned about that. And the people who buy those products are concerned.

You even see now where people are stealing cooking oil from McDonald restaurants in the back so they can augment their fuel so they can get more mileage with their diesel trucks.

And I would say, if I were talking to those truckers across the country, and I know we can't because we're just talking among ourselves, that the truckers, I'm sure, would want their Congressman and the people they serve to contact their Congressman to say sign this petition because we can't afford to bring across the country the food and the commodities necessary to keep your standard of living where it is today. So it's not just the guy driving his car to and from work.

I had a young man, I won't tell you who it is because he might get fired. But he's a young man who works here in the Capitol. And he was talking to one of his friends, and I walked out, and I said, what about this drilling in the ANWR and in the United States to get oil? He says, I don't care where you drill. He says, I live 45 minutes from the Capitol. I can't afford to drive to and from work anymore, and I'm going

to buy an air mattress and pump it up someplace so I can spend half of my time here because I can't afford to go home.

So they're upset, the people driving these cars, because they can't afford to live like they did in the past. It's hurting people with home mortgages, their food and everything else, those on limited incomes.

But as I was saying before, the truckers have already demonstrated. And I'll bet you if they knew tonight that these petitions that you've come up with were here on the floor, I'll bet you every one of them would call everybody they know and tell them, call your Congressman. Tell him to sign that petition so we can get the fuel down so we can transport the goods and services you need across this country so you can live again.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. And we can get out of the fetal position and start some action. And that's what we need to be doing.

And you brought up a great point. Cooking oil, the fat, the grease pots that are there that people are actually going and robbing these things and making a biodiesel fuel out of it.

We've got some companies up in northeast Georgia that are making biodiesel out of chicken parts. The ingenuity is out there. We have just got to feed that and make these people have some ideas to come up with it. And we're not doing that. And that is an immediate thing that we could do.

The other thing we could do is propane. You talk about natural gas. You know, propane conversion was going very well in this country. And it's clean burning. It was going great. And then the EPA said no, you've got to do these specific tests on every different type of engine, on every different make of car.

And rather than going to the people that are making these propane conversion engines, these natural gas conversion engines, the hydrogen cell, we need to be putting every dime we've got towards technology and the hydrogen cell, because this is something that is very real that would really solve a whole bunch of our energy problems. But, rather than the government going to them and saying, how can we best help you develop a conversion energy from gasoline to natural gas, or from gasoline to propane, gasoline to a hydrogen cell, what can we do to help you? We don't do that. We put regulations on them and taxes that burden them from doing anything.

□ 1915

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. And all of those activities that burden our own American oil producers, all of them provide greater incentives for foreign oil producers and increase our reliance on foreign oil.

And I appreciate my friend from Indiana talking about the truckers, and if we were able to contact them and say, You ought to contact your Member of

Congress because this petition is so simple, American energy solutions for lower gas. What could be more simple? And so you're talking about onshore oil, bringing more onshore oil on line, bringing deepwater oil on line, bringing new refineries on line.

One thing that I learned just recently is that on the north shore of Lake Erie, the north shore of Lake Erie is not the United States. It's Canada. Good friend, neighbor to the north. They've got—they are drilling on land and then under Lake Erie to get oil. Our good friends, the Canadians to the north. And what are they doing with that oil? They're selling it to us.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. The slant drilling.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. My folks at home, when I tell them these sorts of things, they shake their head. They say, You gotta be kidding me. And we won't allow our oil companies, American oil producers, to do the same sorts of things in environmentally sensitive and technologically sound ways.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. These are top exporters of gasoline into the United States in millions of barrels. Now these are exporters to us in gas, not crude oil, in gas.

United Kingdom, 147 million barrels a year. That's about a billion gallons; the U.S. Virgin Islands import 990 million gallons of gasoline to us; France, 470 million gallons; Canada, 445 million gallons; the Netherlands, 441 million gallons; Norway, 353 million gallons.

And let me say this, 20 years ago, Norway—it may have been a little bit longer ago than that—Norway was kind of dependent on foreign oil. And Norway, they're basically a tourist, fishing, snow skiing country. They are now the second largest exporter of crude oil in the world because they said we're going to drill and use our own natural resources.

Germany. We import 250 million gallons of gas every year from Germany; 310 from Russia; 410 million from Italy, and 231 million gallons of gasoline we import from OPEC countries.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. You know, a number of us—I'm on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I do some traveling to meet with leaders in other countries around the world. And one of the things that I have found is the Pound Sterling and the Euro, their currency has gone from where it was about 70 cents to the dollar to where the Euro is almost one and a half times what the dollar is as far as value's concerned.

And one of the reasons why you have seen the currency of the United States go down is because we're buying more and exporting less, and one of the main reasons for that is what you just mentioned a moment ago: we're importing all of this energy when we could be producing it ourselves keeping more of our money here, which would not only help us energy-wise, but which would strengthen the dollar and help the entire economy of the United States.

There are so many ancillary reasons, so many ancillary reasons why we should be drilling for our own energy that it doesn't make—that it isn't funny. And yet I can't understand why many of our colleagues don't understand that. It's not just energy, it's economic security, it's national security, it's a whole host of things; and we ought to get on with it. We really ought to get on with it.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Think about this. Think about the number of jobs that would come here, that we would have ourselves bringing new refineries, expanding them, drilling, taking this shale out of the ground. These would create good-paying American jobs. We have a lot of people from this country that are in OPEC countries and in other nations that are working on these rigs, they're making big money. They could be doing the same thing right here in this country.

And we've got about 5 minutes left and so I want to just—I will end my part, and I will let everybody have a little bit of time.

I want to end my part in saying that I have tried to come up with as simple a way of getting information to the people of this country, Mr. Speaker, as I knew how on drilling. Because like I said, I have heard and gotten e-mails from this petition on this site, this petition on that site, and the one most people are doing is the American Solutions site, which I think has over 500,000 signatures now about drilling. You have got radio stations in Florida sending drill bits. And then I listen to all of the talk down here, and it is so confusing for people to understand exactly what we have voted on, what got enacted, what didn't get enacted.

So I wanted to come up with the simplest thing I could, and I came up with this petition: American energy solutions for lower gas prices. Brings onshore oil on line, bring deepwater oil on line, bring new refineries on line. And then it's simply asking 435 Members—we're giving 435 Members an opportunity to sign a petition, this is our energy petition, that says, I will vote to increase U.S. oil production to lower gas prices for Americans. And that's about as simple as we can get.

Dr. PRICE, would you like to close?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Let me thank my friend and colleague from Georgia for his leadership on this.

As you say, it's as simple as it gets. American energy solutions for lower gas prices. Either you believe and will vote for allowing an increase in U.S. oil production to lower gas prices or you won't. It's as simple as that.

So I want to commend you for focusing this issue and making it very crystal clear for all of our colleagues who sign, who support increasing U.S. oil production to lower gas prices.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. And I would just like to say thank you very much, Representative WESTMORELAND, for taking the leadership. Once again,

Georgia, my two colleagues from Georgia are leading the way, and I really appreciate it very much.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I yield back the balance of the time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KIND (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of flooding in his district.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, June 19.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 19.

Mr. REICHERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, June 17, 18 and 19.

(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. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 13, 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:

7100. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Hexythiazox; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0309; FRL-8365-2] received May 27, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7101. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluopicolide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0339; FRL-8363-7] received May 27, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7102. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-Oxepanone, homopolymer; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0096; FRL-8362-8] received May 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7103. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Boscalid; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0145; FRL-8354-4] received April 30, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7104. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Myclobutanil; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0107; FRL-8356-2] received April 30, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7105. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on the Community Food and Nutrition Program for Fiscal Years 2004 and 2005; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7106. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report for Calendar Year 2007 on the country of origin and the sellers of uranium and uranium enrichment services purchased by owners and operators of U.S. civilian nuclear power reactors, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2297g-4; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7107. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2007 annual report pursuant to Section 712(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7108. A letter from the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Interim Report on Study Commitment Regarding Inclusion of Toll-Free Adverse Event Reporting Number by FDA, pursuant to Public Law 110-85, section 906; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7109. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report for fiscal years 2003-2005 on the effectiveness of programs assisted under the Lead Contamination Control Act of 1988, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247b-1(j); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7110. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on the use of funds appropriated to carry out the Medicaid Integrity Program for Fiscal Year 2007, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1396; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7111. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2007 annual report as required by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986, as amended, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 9620; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7112. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Method 207 — Pre-Survey

Procedure for Corn Wet-Milling Facility Emission Sources [EPA-HQ-OAR-2007-0844, FRL-8572-1] (RIN: 2060-A039) received May 27, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7113. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Expedited Approval of Alternative Test Procedures for the Analysis of Contaminants Under the Safe Drinking Water Act; Analysis and Sampling Procedures [EPA-HQ-OW-2006-0958; FRL-8573-7] received May 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7114. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; South Carolina; Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Nonattainment New Source Review Rules [EPA-R04-OAR-2005-SC-0004-200809; FRL-8573-2] received May 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7115. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota; Maintenance Plan Update for Dakota County Lead Area [EPA-R05-OAR-2007-1097; FRL-8572-6] received May 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7116. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota; Interstate Transport of Pollution [EPA-R05-OAR-2007-1132; FRL-8573-3] received May 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7117. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Nonattainment and Reclassification of the Memphis, Tennessee/Crittenden County, Arkansas 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2007-0959-200804; FRL-8547-8] received April 30, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7118. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Interstate Transport of Pollution and Other Revisions [EPA-R08-OAR-2007-0647; FRL-8546-3] received April 30, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7119. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Diesel Anti-Idling Regulation [EPA-R01-OAR-2007-1176; A-1-FRL-8546-9] received April 30, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7120. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Amendments to National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Area Sources; Acrylic and Modacrylic Fibers Production, Carbon Black Production, Chemical Manufacturing; Chromium Compounds, Flexible Polyurethane Foam Production and Fabrication, Lead

Acid Battery Manufacturing, and Wood Preserving [EPA-HQ-OAR-2006-0897; FRL-8547-1] (RIN: 2060-AN44) received April 30, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7121. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determinations of Attainment of the Eight-Hour Ozone Standard for Various Ozone Nonattainment Areas in Upstate New York State [EPA-R02-OAR-2008-0078; FRL-8546-2] received April 30, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7122. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's report entitled, "Report to Congress on Abnormal Occurrences: Fiscal Year 2007," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5848; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7123. A letter from the President & CEO, Federal Home Loan Bank Seattle, transmitting the 2007 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7124. A letter from the President, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, transmitting the 2007 management report and statements on system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7125. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7126. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the 2008 Annual Report of the Supplemental Security Income Program, pursuant to Public Law 104-193, section 231; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7127. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting a copy of draft bill to make amendments to the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (OASDI) program and the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7128. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's latest version of Social Security and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Statistics by Congressional District as of December 2007; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7129. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting consistent with Title I of the Trade and Development Act of 2000, the "2008 Comprehensive Report on U.S. Trade and Investment Policy Toward Sub-Saharan Africa and Implementation of the African Growth and Opportunity Act"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7130. A letter from the Director, Financial Management and Assurance, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report entitled, "Congressional Award Foundation's Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007 Financial Statements," pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 807(a); jointly to the Committees on Education and Labor and Oversight and Government Reform.

7131. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's FY 2005 report on the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 8629(b); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and Labor.

7132. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Final Report to Congress on the Evaluation

of Medicare Disease Management Programs," pursuant to Public Law 106-554, section 121; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

7133. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Finalizing Medicare Regulations under Section 902 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 for Calendar Year 2007"; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

#### 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. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1333. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Secretary to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of the Air Force to use Civil Air Patrol personnel and resources to support homeland security missions: with amendments (Rept. 110-691 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 5912. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to make cigarettes and certain other tobacco products nonmailable, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110-711). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KUHLMANN of New York:

H.R. 6249. A bill to establish a direct loan program for providing energy efficiency improvements for single family housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 6250. A bill to revise the short title of the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. EMANUEL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. HALL of New York):

H.R. 6251. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from issuing new Federal oil and gas leases to holders of existing leases who do not diligently develop the lands subject to such existing leases or relinquish such leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PORTER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 6252. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to delay and reform the Medicare competitive acquisition program for purchase of durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. SALI (for himself, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GOODE, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 6253. A bill to ban the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives from purchasing, using, or distributing hand tools or tool kits on which any reminder about forfeiture appears; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. BACA):

H.R. 6254. A bill to authorize the temporary participation of mortgage brokers and lenders under the FHA single-family housing mortgage insurance program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WATSON, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 6255. A bill to provide for professional exchanges with Haiti, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HINCHAY, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OLVER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HODES, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 6256. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish an annual production incentive fee with respect to Federal onshore and offshore lands that are subject to a lease for production of oil or natural gas under which production is not occurring, to authorize use of amounts received as such fee for energy efficiency and renewable energy projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Science and Technology, Energy and Commerce, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 6257. A bill to reinstate the Public Safety and Recreational Firearms Use Protection Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BARTON of

Texas, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. HILL, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 6258. A bill to accelerate the development and early deployment of systems for the capture and storage of carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuel electric generation facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 6259. A bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical criteria for evaluating disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 6260. A bill to ensure the energy independence of the United States by promoting research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of technologies through a system of grants and prizes on the scale of the original Manhattan Project; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 6261. A bill to increase the maximum amount of financial assistance that an individual or household is eligible to receive under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act in connection with recent storm damage and flooding in the Midwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. HOLT:

H.R. 6262. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to include workforce investment programs on the Internet; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 6263. A bill to increase awareness of the existence of and to overcome gender bias in academic science and engineering through research and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. WU, Mr. HILL, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont):

H.R. 6264. A bill to prevent excessive speculation in over-the-counter derivatives markets for certain energy commodities by limiting participation in those markets to persons who are capable of producing, manufacturing, or taking physical delivery of the commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BISHOP of New York,

Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 6265. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 41 Purdy Avenue in Rye, New York, as the "Caroline O'Day Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 6266. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the Secretary of the Treasury to waive the penalties for failure to disclose reportable transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 6267. A bill to make the Davis-Bacon Act applicable to rural development loan and loan guarantee programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR):

H.R. 6268. A bill to improve and enhance the mental health care benefits available to members of the Armed Forces and veterans, to enhance counseling and other benefits available to survivors of members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Ways and Means, 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. WALBERG (for himself and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 6269. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the use of ethanol in tetra ethyl ortho silicate (TEOS) production; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WATSON (for herself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LATHAM, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 6270. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to create a new conditional approval system for drugs, biological products, and devices that is responsive to the needs of seriously ill patients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. WEINER:

H.R. 6271. A bill to provide for a green building certification program as part of the Energy Star program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH of Vermont (for himself and Mr. HALL of New York):

H.R. 6272. A bill to authorize discretionary appropriations to carry out the Service Members Occupational Conversion and Training Act of 1992; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia:

H.R. 6273. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the obligation of the Secretary of the Treasury to invest the balance of the Highway Trust Fund in inter-

est-bearing obligations of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KILPATRICK (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. WATT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. CORBINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. JEFFERSON of Ohio, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia):

H. Con. Res. 372. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Black Music Month and to honor the outstanding contributions that African American singers and musicians have made to the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H. Res. 1269. A resolution honoring the 110th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Philippines; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. FORTUÑO):

H. Res. 1270. A resolution commending the efforts of those who sought to block an international arms transfer destined for Zimbabwe, where the government has unleashed a campaign of violence and intimidation against members of the political opposition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. WATT, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H. Res. 1271. A resolution recognizing National Homeownership Month and the importance of homeownership in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. FALLIN (for herself, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. FOX, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. BOREN):

H. Res. 1272. A resolution honoring and recognizing Alice Mary Robertson who, while a Member of Congress, became the first woman to preside over the floor of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. ROHR-ABACHER):

H. Res. 1273. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the human rights crisis of Laotian and Hmong people in Laos and Thailand; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 1274. A resolution commending Sonora Smart Dodd for her contribution in recognizing the importance of Father's Day and recognizing the important role fathers play in our families; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

312. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to House Resolution No. 100 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the Community Cancer Care Prevention Act of 2007, H.R. 1190 and S. 1750, to reform the Medicare reimbursement methodology for cancer drugs and their administration; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 96: Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 154: Mr. SRES.  
 H.R. 195: Mrs. BACHMANN.  
 H.R. 368: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H.R. 551: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 643: Mr. SHULER.  
 H.R. 748: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mrs. LOWEY.  
 H.R. 749: Mrs. BACHMANN.  
 H.R. 821: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.  
 H.R. 854: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 891: Mr. SESTAK.  
 H.R. 1014: Mr. KAGEN and Mr. FOSTER.  
 H.R. 1038: Ms. BORDALLO.  
 H.R. 1060: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.  
 H.R. 1070: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 1078: Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
 H.R. 1134: Mr. PAYNE.  
 H.R. 1142: Mr. STUPAK.  
 H.R. 1185: Mr. ACKERMAN.  
 H.R. 1190: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.  
 H.R. 1193: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota and Mr. WU.  
 H.R. 1264: Mr. ADERHOLT.  
 H.R. 1268: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 1279: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
 H.R. 1307: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 1322: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 1428: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 1431: Mr. RENZI.  
 H.R. 1459: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 1474: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. SCALISE.  
 H.R. 1532: Mr. LAMPSON.  
 H.R. 1589: Mrs. EMERSON.  
 H.R. 1606: Ms. RICHARDSON.  
 H.R. 1647: Ms. KILPATRICK and Mrs. LOWEY.  
 H.R. 1776: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.  
 H.R. 1783: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 1845: Mr. TIAHRT.  
 H.R. 1866: Mr. GORDON and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.  
 H.R. 1921: Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 1929: Mr. CHILDERS.  
 H.R. 1932: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 1952: Mr. LAMPSON.  
 H.R. 2032: Mr. CLAY.  
 H.R. 2053: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. ISSA.  
 H.R. 2092: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.  
 H.R. 2188: Ms. CASTOR and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.  
 H.R. 2210: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 2231: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
 H.R. 2266: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 2331: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 2332: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. GOODE.  
 H.R. 2341: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 2343: Mr. WAMP, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. HOLT.  
 H.R. 2371: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 2380: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.  
 H.R. 2471: Mr. FORBES.  
 H.R. 2493: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 2495: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 2606: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 2676: Mr. PICKERING.  
 H.R. 2762: Mr. ELLSWORTH.  
 H.R. 2792: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
 H.R. 2802: Mr. McNULTY.  
 H.R. 2805: Ms. WATERS and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.  
 H.R. 2842: Mr. HINOJOSA.  
 H.R. 2864: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H.R. 2880: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.  
 H.R. 2891: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 2926: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. MEEK of Florida.  
 H.R. 2941: Mr. BURGESS.  
 H.R. 2994: Mr. FARR.  
 H.R. 3014: Ms. RICHARDSON.  
 H.R. 3024: Mr. DOYLE.  
 H.R. 3089: Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. UPTON.  
 H.R. 3119: Mr. ALLEN.  
 H.R. 3140: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 3187: Mr. LOEBACK.  
 H.R. 3202: Mr. FORTUÑO.  
 H.R. 3267: Mr. DOYLE.  
 H.R. 3289: Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACA, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REYES, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SOLIS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. WATSON.  
 H.R. 3329: Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 3457: Mr. LUCAS.  
 H.R. 3543: Mr. COURTNEY.  
 H.R. 3622: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. BONNER.  
 H.R. 3679: Mr. SIMPSON.  
 H.R. 3747: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 3822: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 3834: Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. DOOLITTLE.  
 H.R. 3892: Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
 H.R. 3929: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 3995: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 4026: Mr. HINOJOSA.  
 H.R. 4048: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
 H.R. 4091: Mr. MATHESON.  
 H.R. 4141: Mr. BOREN.  
 H.R. 4248: Mr. EHLERS.  
 H.R. 4255: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. UPTON.  
 H.R. 4296: Mr. HALL of New York and Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H.R. 4321: Ms. SPEIER and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
 H.R. 4450: Ms. LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. BERMAN.  
 H.R. 4833: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. WU, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.  
 H.R. 4900: Mr. TANNER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. CHILDERS.  
 H.R. 4930: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 4987: Mr. DENT.  
 H.R. 5057: Mr. HELLER.  
 H.R. 5132: Mr. SESTAK.  
 H.R. 5244: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. MURTHA.  
 H.R. 5265: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. ROSS.  
 H.R. 5268: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.  
 H.R. 5315: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. FARR.  
 H.R. 5404: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.  
 H.R. 5435: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
 H.R. 5437: Mr. DONNELLY and Mr. MCHUGH.  
 H.R. 5498: Mr. LOBIONDO.  
 H.R. 5510: Mr. FARR and Mr. DEFazio.  
 H.R. 5546: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
 H.R. 5575: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
 H.R. 5606: Mr. LAMPSON.  
 H.R. 5615: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 5629: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. PENCE.  
 H.R. 5656: Mr. BOEHRER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, and Mr. BONNER.  
 H.R. 5674: Mr. COHEN and Ms. FALLIN.  
 H.R. 5713: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
 H.R. 5731: Mr. McCOTTER.  
 H.R. 5734: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.  
 H.R. 5760: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.  
 H.R. 5772: Mr. MEEKS of New York.  
 H.R. 5793: Mr. BACA, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.  
 H.R. 5802: Mr. HINOJOSA.  
 H.R. 5814: Mr. WOLF.  
 H.R. 5816: Mrs. CUBIN.  
 H.R. 5846: Ms. LEE.  
 H.R. 5852: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 5854: Mr. COURTNEY and Ms. HIRONO.  
 H.R. 5901: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
 H.R. 5914: Mr. LATHAM.  
 H.R. 5924: Mr. KELLER.  
 H.R. 5935: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. BERRY.  
 H.R. 5936: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
 H.R. 5942: Mr. BOYD of Florida and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.  
 H.R. 5949: Mr. FARR and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 5950: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
 H.R. 5971: Mrs. CUBIN.  
 H.R. 5974: Mr. WALBERG.  
 H.R. 5979: Mr. LATHAM.  
 H.R. 5984: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PUTNAM, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. WALSH of New York.  
 H.R. 5989: Mr. WOLF and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
 H.R. 5996: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
 H.R. 5998: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. SUTTON.  
 H.R. 6005: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 6029: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. WEXLER.  
 H.R. 6034: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. MEEKS of New York.  
 H.R. 6057: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 6062: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 6076: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. WEXLER.  
 H.R. 6091: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. PLATTS.  
 H.R. 6100: Ms. LEE.  
 H.R. 6106: Mr. STEARNS.  
 H.R. 6107: Mr. LATTI, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HELLER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOKSTRA, Mr. KELLER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.  
 H.R. 6108: Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. THORNBERY.  
 H.R. 6122: Mr. MARSHALL.  
 H.R. 6127: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Ms. SUTTON.  
 H.R. 6139: Mr. HENSARLING.  
 H.R. 6140: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.  
 H.R. 6141: Ms. CLARKE.  
 H.R. 6168: Mr. CARNAHAN.  
 H.R. 6169: Mr. CARNAHAN.  
 H.R. 6171: Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 6192: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. DENT.  
 H.R. 6199: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. HALL of New York.  
 H.R. 6207: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.  
 H.R. 6208: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 6209: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
 H.R. 6210: Mr. DENT and Mr. MANZULLO.  
 H.R. 6211: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. ISSA.  
 H.R. 6220: Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. BURGESS.  
 H.R. 6233: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.  
 H.J. Res. 12: Mrs. BIGGERT and Mr. MCINTYRE.  
 H.J. Res. 40: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.J. Res. 89: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mr. SULLIVAN.  
 H.J. Res. 93: Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. OLVER.  
 H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. WEXLER.  
 H. Con. Res. 223: Mr. KING of New York.  
 H. Con. Res. 244: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. BURGESS.  
 H. Con. Res. 276: Mr. BOUSTANY.  
 H. Con. Res. 321: Mr. ALLEN.  
 H. Con. Res. 338: Mr. SKELTON.  
 H. Con. Res. 344: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. PAYNE.  
 H. Con. Res. 350: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
 H. Con. Res. 356: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.  
 H. Con. Res. 357: Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, Mr. HELLER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. SOUDER.  
 H. Con. Res. 360: Mr. HINOJOSA.  
 H. Con. Res. 361: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. SUTTON.  
 H. Con. Res. 362: Mr. GORDON, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CAZAYOUX, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Con. Res. 371: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Ms. WATSON.  
 H. Res. 37: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Res. 353: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ROSS, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. WATT.  
 H. Res. 672: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Res. 679: Mr. MCHUGH.  
 H. Res. 937: Mr. STEARNS.  
 H. Res. 939: Mrs. BACHMANN.  
 H. Res. 959: Mr. ELLSWORTH.  
 H. Res. 1037: Ms. ESHOO.  
 H. Res. 1127: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.  
 H. Res. 1143: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Res. 1146: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Res. 1161: Mr. CHANDLER.  
 H. Res. 1179: Mr. FOSTER.  
 H. Res. 1182: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
 H. Res. 1204: Mr. MEEKS of New York.  
 H. Res. 1217: Mr. CHANDLER and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
 H. Res. 1229: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.  
 H. Res. 1230: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.  
 H. Res. 1242: Mr. SERRANO.  
 H. Res. 1245: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WATSON.  
 H. Res. 1246: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. CLAY.  
 H. Res. 1249: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. KIRK.  
 H. Res. 1254: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.  
 H. Res. 1266: Mr. FORTUÑO AND MR. TANNER.

#### 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 DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois or a designee to H.R. 5781, the Federal Employee Paid Parental Leave 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.

The amendment to be offered by Representative GEORGE MILLER of California or a designee to H.R. 5876, the Stop Child Abuse in Residential Programs for Teens 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.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

269. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Ms. Josette Lee, a citizen of Rhinebeck, New York, relative to petitioning the Congress of the United States for action regarding proposed cuts in Medicare payments for physicians and other health care professionals; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.