United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 30, 2007 No. 18

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MEEKS of New York).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 30, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GREGORY W. MEEKS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

MEDICARE PART D—WASHINGTON POST'S TAKE

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago the House passed a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate with drug companies on the prices of pharmaceuticals for the part D drug program, H.R. 4 was the bill.

In my district, I have heard overwhelmingly good news about the existing part D program. For a striking example, there was a letter to the editor from one of my constituents on September 21, 2006 in the Gainesville Sun. Mrs. Vernell James wrote this letter. She and her husband, both in their seventies, married for 58 years, wrote, quote, ''Medicare part D has been a great experience for our family. Health insurance is important because it helps us stay well and live a quality life. My husband is on three different medications, so good health insurance is something we need.

''The Medicare Web site made it simple enough to choose a plan and sign up. Now that the November 15th deadline is approaching, seniors need to be thinking about which plan is best for them. We save nearly $250 a month because of Medicare part D on our medications, and we are looking forward to continuing savings next year.''

I have met this lady, and she impressed upon me how this benefit has given them healthy coverage, and more importantly, peace of mind. But don't take my word for it or the word of this lady; I found no more convincing arguments than what was recently in the two editorials in the Washington Post. One appeared November 2, 2006, and one the day after the bill, H.R. 4, passed, January 13, 2007.

Because of the prominence of this newspaper to policymakers around this town, I would like to share these editorials with my colleagues.

On what grounds does the Post disagree with the Democrat bill, H.R. 4, which involves price fixing? First, the same point that many of us may have heard on the House floor during the debate, but unfortunately not in committee because the bill failed to go through regular Democratic order. On comparing Medicare to VA, Veterans Affairs, the VA ''can do this because it is free to deny coverage for drugs whose makers refuse to provide discounts. Fully 3,000 of the 4,300 medicines covered by Medicare are unavailable under the veterans' program. Restricting the list of coverage drugs saves money, but it also reduces the quality of the benefit; 1.5 million veterans are sufficiently unhappy with the result that they opt to buy the more inclusive Medicare coverage.''

Well, they are not the same creatures at all, these two programs. I have the background to know, I have been a member of the Veterans Committee for 15 years; I served on the Health Subcommittee on this Veterans Committee. In fact, I chaired the VA Health Subcommittee in the past.

Next: Why do this at all when the private insurance market is keeping premiums costs low for beneficiaries? As the Post went on to write, quote, ''the Congressional Budget Office estimated this week that savings from direct negotiations would be negligible, the average monthly premium has fallen since the program began a year ago. Private insurers can do this precisely because they are free to establish formularies, but market discipline ensures that these lists are not unappealing narrow. *The insurers need to keep customers*.'' Emphasis added.

Further, the Post wrote, quote, ''The Democrats' stance is troubling because it suggests an excessively government-led view of health care reform. The better approach is to let each insurer offer its own version of the right balance to see whether it attracts customers, and then adapt flexibly.''

I have been extolling the Federal Employee Health Benefit Program as a model for over a decade. FEHBP works well precisely because the Office of Personnel Management administering it does not micromanage the program, does not set prices. It simply sets the terms of allowable plans, and then offers Federal and Legislative branch employees, including Members of Congress and the Executive Branch, the cafeteria of options, and they go forth and they choose what is best for them.

Printed on recycled paper.

On November 2, the Post echoed this endorsement of consumer freedom writing, ''Retirees have a choice of insurance plans with widely varying costs, and some are faced with decisions on how much to spend out of pocket. If they choose to pay top dollar for branded medicines, the incentive to invent new medicines will rise. If they prefer to save money, incentives for innovation will decline a bit. Either way, a balance will be struck that reflects broad social preferences.''

My colleagues, the Democrat bill, H.R. 4, that was passed, not through the democratic process here in Congress, but put on the floor without amendments, will not help the part D Medicare prescription drug program, it will hurt it. If you don't believe it, read these editorials of the Washington Post.

VOTERS MADE A MISTAKE TRUSTING DEMOCRATS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is something awry in this House. You know, we have heard for the last 2 years I have been here in Congress about how if the Democrats were allowed to be in the majority, there was going to be openness, Mr. Speaker, there was going to be transparency, there was going to be bipartisanship; and yet right here the first rattle out of the box we have 3 weeks where the Republicans are not allowed any input whatsoever. Oh, we can come to the floor and fuss about it, but that is not input, there are no amendments, there are no changes that were allowed to be made. But now this week, we are beyond the 100 hours. And of course that was pretty ironic because promises, pledges, I assure you we are going to have openness, we are going to be bipartisan, well, when they saw around election time it was, gee, they had a chance of taking the majority, what did they do? Well, we don't want to keep that bipartisan promise, so let's change that. How can we do that? Oh, we will make a new promise. We will promise we are not going to keep our prior promise and we are just going to ramrod some things through in the opening days of Congress. Then they found out they enjoyed that, they liked that. Don't let them have any input. That is not right to Americans that nearly half of Americans are not allowed input into what goes on.

But this week takes the cake. Unbelievable. We have a bill that has only, as far as we can find out, had input from Congressman OBEY and Senator BYRD, it is the Obey-Byrd $463 billion earmark. Now I have got some folks up here from my district from Lufkin, Texas; the mayor is here, the city manager. In fact, nine of my 12 full counties had never voted for a Republican for Congress before, they are conservative Democratic counties. They don't run their counties and cities this way. They don't say the mayor is going back in the back rooms and is going to put together the budget for the next year. We are not going to have any kind of hearings, we are not going to allow any input. And here in Congress, in the past we have had review by subcommittees, and then the subcommittee hearings and taking testimony, and then we had a voting it out of subcommittee called a markup. Then we had review by the full committee. Then we had input from both Democrats and Republicans. Then we had a voting it out of committee. And then it went to the Rules Committee, and then the Rules Committee considered it. And then it came to the floor. And then there were opportunities for amendment, not on $463 billion of American taxpayer money, no, not here. There is no subcommittee, no committee, no Rules Committee. Well, they may take it to Rules, but I am not sure about that because it won't matter. It is coming to the floor tomorrow for a vote on the $463 billion Obey-Byrd earmark. That is not openness and transparency. I don't care how many new promises you make to break your old promises, that isn't right to the American people of my county, my county seats, Gilmer, Jefferson, Tyler, Longview, Marshall, Carthage, Henderson, Nacogdoches, Center, Hemphill, San Augustine, Lufkin; they would never run their city governments like this, they would never run their county governments like this. People would run them out of office if they tried to do what is going to be done tomorrow with $463.5 billion of America's taxpayer dollars. That is just not right. That is not right.

You know, Democrats had kind of run the budget process in the ground, and people had enough. They saw the way Senator BYRD cost us hundreds of millions or billions of dollars building an FBI facility in West Virginia. They saw the way the earmarks got out of hand under Democrats, so they voted in Republicans in 1994. Republicans did a great job, welfare reform, bringing the budget to where it balanced. And then they got a little complacent, some of my colleagues got long in the tooth and forgot why they were there, and so we got voted out. And the Democrats said, trust us, we have learned our lessons, we are not going to let this happen again. And all I can think about over and over again is that line in Animal House where after the senior fraternity members had wrecked the young freshman pledge's car, the guy put his arm around the young freshman and said, in effect, well, you messed up, you trusted me. Well, voters trusted Democrats with the majority. And now, as we consider $463 billion Obey-Byrd earmark that didn't have input from our friends across the aisle or Republicans, you messed up, you trusted them.

CHARLIE ALLEBACH, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Pennyslvania (Mr. DENT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I come here today not to speak about the great weighty issues of the day, whether it be Iraq or the budget process and procedures of the House, homeland security or any number of issues. No, Mr. Speaker, I come here today to talk about the career of a wonderful individual. You know, it was Tip O'Neill who once said that all politics is local, and I rise today to honor the career of one of our Nation's great local civic leaders, civic officials, Charlie Allebach, Jr.

Charlie has been serving the people of the Borough of Souderton, Pennsylvania, for almost 43 years. Let me say that again. That is for 43 years, he has served the people of Souderton, Pennsylvania. He first became a borough councilman in 1964—by the way, I was 4 years old at that time—he was appointed mayor in 1970, and he has been mayor ever since. But I just want you to know, too, that he has just announced his retirement.

Charlie has presided over the steady growth of a wonderful community, Souderton, Pennsylvania. If you don't know anything about Souderton, it is in the Indian Valley of Pennsylvania, Montgomery County. It has got a great tradition. The Mennonites have had an enormous influence on that area over the years, have deeply influenced the culture and tradition. There is a great sense of family and faith in that area. Souderton is an extraordinary community.

Charlie, also, I want you to know, has performed more than 2,400 marriage ceremonies, lent his time to local service organizations and has been devoted to the borough in every way imaginable.

On behalf of the people of the 15th Congressional District, I wish him the best during his retirement. We would like to keep him around in public office longer, but I understand that 40 years is a long time. We wish him the best in this richly deserved retirement.

I also ask that a copy of my remarks today be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that Charlie Allebach, Jr.'s career as the mayor of Souderton can be memorialized within the annals of Congress for all time and to all the people in the Indian Valley in Souderton, I know that they are perhaps watching today the proceedings of the House and I know they have such a deep affection for this man. We don't spend enough time in our lives as Members of Congress thanking and celebrating people who do things right, who enter public service because they believe in advancing the best interests of their community. They are not doing it for themselves. That is what Charlie Allebach is all about.

So to Charlie, we say once again, thank you for a job well done. We hope to see you around. We know we will, but just want you to know that your contributions to all of us, to our community, are deeply appreciated and will not be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, Tip O'Neill once said that all politics is local, and I rise today to honor the career of one our nation's great local civic officials, Charlie Allebach, Jr.

Charlie has been serving the people of the Borough of Souderton, Pennsylvania, for almost 43—that's 43—years. He first became a borough councilman in 1964, and he was appointed mayor in 1970. He has been the mayor ever since, but he has just announced his retirement.

Charlie has presided over the steady growth of a wonderful community. He has also performed more than 2,400 marriage ceremonies, lent his time to local service organizations, and has been devoted to the Borough in every way.

On behalf of the people of the 15th Congressional District, I wish him the best during his retirement, and I ask that a copy of these remarks be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that Charlie Allebach, Jr.'s career as the mayor of Souderton, Pennsylvania, can be memorialized within the annals of Congress for all time.

Thank you, Charlie, for a job well done.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at noon.

PRAYER

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

Lord our God, ever-faithful throughout the ages and seasons of life, the cold winds of January rob the memory of Washington's heat and stretch our longing for another spring.

And January 30 recalls for us, Lord, another distant memory. On this day in 1948, Mahatma Gandhi was killed by a young religious zealot. The personification of nonviolence was overcome by violence.

Lord, the voice of this ''great soul,'' who spoke out in the midst of politics to end oppression and seek independence seems forgotten by us now, caught up in the war on terrorism.

In this mad spin around the sun, Lord, we cannot help but question whether we are an evolving world about to break upon the brightness of a new day or dissolving into the cold of Dante's darkness.

Raise up, O Lord, a prophetic light and lead us, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KAGEN 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.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to plead for health care reform. In recent weeks, I have received more than 150 letters from my constituents asking for health care reform. No one has written expressing satisfaction over the current health care system. Most seniors feel that their medicine coverage is still costing too much. Others cite fear and losing access to choice of health insurance plans or medicines.

I am in favor of sweeping reforms to the system rather than the piecemeal and ''quick-fix'' methods of the past.

In Dallas, the poor, elderly and disabled are hurting the most when it comes to health care. Texas has the largest number of uninsured in the Nation, and our emergency rooms are bursting.

Madam Speaker, it is time for a new strategy. Let's consider comprehensive health care reform that will improve our health care system and make a real difference for Dallas and for America's citizens.

FEDERAL TIMBER POLICY SHATTERED HARNEY COUNTY'S ECONOMY

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, the failure of Congress to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act is another day with another broken promise.

When the Federal Government abruptly slashed timber harvest, the economy in Harney County, Oregon, population about 7,000, nearly collapsed. Hundreds of family-wage jobs were lost; 78 percent of the land mass in Harney County is controlled by the Federal Government so the government's decision had a dramatic effect on the people who live there.

In 2000, Congress did the right thing by approving the county payments program which in Harney County supports roads, community services, and Burns High School where 60 percent of the student body takes vocational classes.

Take Jim Gibbon, a Burns High graduate and 4-year vocational classes participant. Through that learning, he is now co-owner of Burns Ford and they employ 20 people.

County Judge Steve Grasty says, ''Loss of this program means losing future opportunities for young people here and in rural counties across America.''

This Congress must keep the Federal Government's word to timber communities and pass H.R. 17. Time is running out.

RESTORING FISCAL SANITY

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, it is time we restore fiscal sanity to Washington. In 6 short years, Republican policies turned a $5.6 trillion surplus into a $3 trillion deficit. That is an $8 trillion reversal of fortune.

And last year, congressional Republicans never came to an agreement on the budget and refused to pass nine of the 11 must-pass appropriations bills before adjourning in December. This isn't how the appropriations process is supposed to work, and the American people know it.

Democrats vow we are going to get things done and done on time. This year, Democrats brought much-needed reform to Congress by passing a rules package that require Democrats to pay-as-we-go. This isn't a new idea. From 1990 to 2002, Congresses and administrations of both parties abided by commonsense rules that stated you couldn't cut taxes and increase spending unless you paid for it. Pay-as-you-go was one of the main reasons Washington balanced the books in the 1990s.

This week, since Republicans were unable to do their job last year, Democrats will bring a final bill to the floor that will fund key priorities. This bill will allow us to move forward with fiscal sanity.

OPPOSE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today in objection to the so-called continuing resolution the Democrat leadership is going to bring up tomorrow. This is by no means a typical continuing resolution. A continuing resolution basically requires only a couple of lines saying that the current appropriations are continuing for a set period of time.

This CR has not been scrutinized through the committee process before being brought to the House floor for a vote. This is a $463 omnibus spending bill without any specific guidelines or accountability measures. American taxpayers deserve to know how their hard-earned dollars are being spent.

Madam Speaker, this is not a continuing resolution. A typical 1- or 2-page bill that continues spending at its previous level. Again, it is an omnibus spending bill well over 100 pages long, full of excessive unregulated spending, just another broken promise by the Democrat leadership that shows their true colors.

HEALTH CARE COSTS

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

Mr. KAGEN. Madam Speaker, impossible costs for health care are a major concern for everyone, and the President should be commended for addressing this difficult crisis. But his proposal is really a tax hike for people who cannot afford it: businesses and working families.

We must establish an open and transparent medical marketplace, and it is really not that difficult to do.

We need to, one, openly disclose all prices in health care everywhere; two, give every citizen the same discount; and three, establish a single risk pool, 300 million strong, across the country to leverage down prices and costs for all of us. In other words, if you are a citizen, you are in.

It is past time that the Congress should establish a single basic Federal standard health insurance policy that every insurance company must offer to each and every one of us. In doing so, we will be able to compare insurance companies based on the quality of their service and their price.

The President means well, but you cannot use tax hikes to lower health care costs.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION COMES TO FLOOR

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

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, tomorrow this House will take up a massive spending bill that will remove over $400 billion from our Treasury. This huge 150-page ''CRomnibus'' spending bill has not been read by most Democrats or Republicans.

We are told that despite the end of the 100 hours, this large bill cannot be amended. We have had no hearings on this bill. There is no report to accompany the legislation detailing hundreds of billions in spending, and we will not be allowed to offer improvements like taking the savings in canceling Federal earmarks and making sure the deficit is reduced.

In large part, Members of this House may be later embarrassed when enterprising reporters who have the time to read this legislation find out what we have actually done without review or consideration. This bill is not pay-as-you-go. Given the Democratic retreat coming up, it is more like pay-and-then-play.

WHITE HOUSE ESCALATES CONFLICT

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, Iranians and Saudis are uniting to try to avoid a war in Lebanon while the U.S. stays on the sidelines. Meanwhile, the Bush administration is isolating our Nation from Europe and trying to force Europe to block Iranian exports and freeze assets.

The U.S. should be standing for peaceful resolution of conflict. Instead, the White House escalates conflict: escalates with Iran, escalates in Iraq, escalates violence, escalates deaths, and escalates the Federal deficit.

I want the Bush administration to know there will be constitutional consequences for the President and the Vice President if this administration continues to move towards war with Iran.

THE TRUTH SET BORDER AGENT FREE

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, another border agent has been tried for allegedly using too much force in arresting an illegal at the Texas-Mexico border.

Former border agent David Sipe was found guilty in 2001 by a Federal court jury for using excessive force in arresting Jose Guevarra.

According to news sources, the Federal prosecutor hid evidence at that trial that was beneficial to the border agent, such as the Federal Government had made deals and gave benefits to witnesses like Social Security cards, and the prosecutor had not revealed the criminal record of a witness.

Does this sound familiar to anyone? Anyway, Sipe was granted a new trial and last week a second jury, after hearing all of the facts and the truth, found the border agent not guilty.

Why does it seem our Federal Government is so zealous in prosecuting border agents who appear to be doing their job and give those who illegally enter the United States a free pass? Once again, it seems like the Federal Government is on the wrong side of the border war.

And that's just the way it is.

REDEPLOY FROM IRAQ

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

Mr. SESTAK. Madam Speaker, I spent 31 years in the military defending our freedom of speech. I often wondered and hoped during those years, whether in the fury of war or the challenges of peace, what Washington was thinking, debating wisely at length about the use of our national treasure, those men and women who wear the cloth of our Nation overseas.

I am concerned for U.S. security because of Iraq, a tragic misadventure that does not permit us to best address more important security challenges throughout this world.

Don't double down on a bad military bet by using more troops. Have confidence in our diplomatic ability to lead even with Syria and Iran, set a date certain for redeploying out of Iraq this year to serve as the leverage to have the Iraqis accept the reality of the personal consequence of not assuming responsibility for their nation.

That is why I will introduce legislation that sets the end of 2007 for our redeployment from Iraq to serve as the catalyst for the Iraqis to assume responsibility for their country so we can better address our security interests throughout this world.

SPENDING WITHOUT TRANSPARENCY

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, the hold-onto-your-wallet Congress is at it again. Just a week after raising costs to nearly all of America's small businesses, they are spending billions of taxpayer dollars with little or no explanation of where it is going.

After months of campaigning and pledges on open government and more accountability, the Democrats are still behind locked doors spending billions of taxpayer dollars with very little transparency.

Tomorrow, they are going to cram through an omnibus spending package, not a continuing resolution, which basically is going to pay the government's bills; and the price tag is $463 billion, a $463 billion budget. And from what we understand, it has been crafted by a couple of folks, that's all. The Budget Committee didn't hold hearings. It was not reviewed for waste, fraud and abuse.

But from what we are understanding from the reports in the news, we have two Appropriations chairmen who have put it together, and you and I are just supposed to trust their judgment. I think so, Madam Speaker; we need to have accountability, we need to have review.

□ 1215

THE PRESIDENT'S ALLEGIANCE IS TO THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. The insurance industry is exempt from antitrust law. They can and do legally fix prices. They can and do legally discriminate. They can and do legally deny coverage because of a preexisting condition, or for no reason whatsoever. But despite the fact that 60 percent of Americans get their health care through their employers, the President wants Americans to give up that protection of group coverage and throw themselves into the unregulated and cruel world of private insurance under the guise that he cares about the 46.1 million Americans that don't have health insurance, up 6 million on his watch.

And there's one more little cruel joke hidden in here. He doesn't tell them about that tax deduction which would also allow them to take a deduction against their Social Security. For a family or a person earning $30,000 a year, it would cut their Social Security benefits in half. The President will do anything to help his friends in the insurance industry; he doesn't care much about those who are uninsured or who need help with health care.

THANKS TO THE NEW BOLTON CENTER

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, Barbaro, the winner of the Kentucky Derby, died yesterday. Barbaro was not just any horse. This was a horse who never lost a race. This was a horse who won the Kentucky Derby by 6½ lengths. The last time that was done was in 1946. What a shame it was when he hurt himself and cut short one of the greatest careers in horse racing.

And sad as this is, I come to the floor to congratulate the New Bolton Center in Chester County, Pennsylvania, in my congressional district. Dean Richardson and the staff of the New Bolton Center have shown the world what humane and excellent veterinary care looks like. Barbaro and his owners put their trust in the New Bolton Center and hoped for the best over the last 9 months. Sadly, Barbaro didn't make it. But no one doubts that everything that could have been done was done and done well. Our thanks are due to the staff at the New Bolton Center.

DEMOCRATS BRING FISCAL SANITY BACK TO WASHINGTON

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

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, a new report from the Budget and Appropriations Committee says that the new Congress faces a fiscal challenge of historic proportions. The cost of the war in Iraq, coupled with the growing price tag of tax cuts passed over the previous 6 years, have left the Nation deeper in debt than ever before and with one of the largest benefit deficits in the Nation's history.

Last year, Democrats committed to begin the process of restoring fiscal sanity by reinstituting a budget rule that helped Congress create a surplus in the 1990s. It is this fiscal discipline that is so important to House Democrats that we restored a pay-as-you-go budget rule on the second day of this new Congress.

Madam Speaker, historic debts are not good for any of us. They lead to rising interest rates, which cost middle-class families as much as $1,700 a year on credit card and mortgage payments. It also simply is irresponsible of us to continue to pass this debt on to future generations.

Madam Speaker, this week we will pass a final budget for the 2007 fiscal year after Republicans refused to pass these must-pass appropriations bills last year. It's time we get our fiscal house in order.

THE DEATH OF DELIBERATION

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I must admit that I was somewhat encouraged in December when the newly minted Democrat majority announced that they were considering a bill that would simply finish this year's budget work with what is known as a continuing resolution, funding the government at current levels and leaving the debate over the budget for the ordinary process of the constitutional system of the legislature. I was particularly enamored with the idea that they would move this so-named continuing resolution without earmarks, and I am pleased to have supported bipartisan earmark reform.

But what will come to the floor tomorrow, to my disappointment, is not a bill that simply continues the funding of the government. It is a new Federal budget: $463 billion in spending, 137 pages. Madam Speaker, it will take 300 pages to read the CBO score. What we see is not a continuation of government spending. We see, rather, the death of deliberation. The Congress is witnessing in the first hours of this new session the death of a long-term process whereby our budgets and our legislation are considered. It is the death of deliberation that must be put to an end.

MIDDLE-CLASS TAX INCREASE IS THE WRONG APPROACH

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

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, Health and Human Services Secretary Mike Leavitt is about to begin a 100-day public relations effort to build support for the President's health care proposal. Democrats here in Washington in Congress want to work towards reducing the number of uninsured. Unfortunately, the tax deduction proposal will do very little to assist the 47 million Americans who are now living without health insurance.

The President touts his plan as a way to give low-income uninsured Americans more money in their pockets to help them buy their own health insurance. It sounds good, but the President ignores two facts.

First, the President's plan does not provide enough of a benefit for low-income Americans. A tax deduction is of little value to low-income workers, who in many cases will receive little more than $1,200 a year back from the Federal Government. That might sound like a lot, but health insurance costs the average family almost $11,000 a year. This small deduction will continue to make health care out of reach.

Madam Speaker, unfortunately, the President's proposal is not the right approach.

DON'T RAISE THE TOLLS

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my great concern with the proposal pending before the Virginia State Corporation Commission to raise the tolls on the Dulles Greenway. Many of my constituents from the eastern panhandle of West Virginia use this roadway to commute into Northern Virginia and the District of Columbia.

The growth of the Washington metropolitan area has extended into the eastern panhandle of West Virginia as many families move into the towns and communities of my district seeking a lower cost of living and the wonderful environment for raising a family we have in West Virginia. Some have chosen to change professions and remain there with their jobs, but many others still commute into Northern Virginia and the District of Columbia every day, and they rely on many forms of transportation, one of which is the Dulles Greenway.

The proposed increase represents a 56 percent increase over the next 5 years. The per-mile rate for the increased toll is drastically higher than other toll roads in the area, costing commuters approximately 34 cents per mile. For many families this will be an undue burden.

Thankfully, there is a hearing today in Northern Virginia so local citizens can express their concern with this proposal. I hope that the Virginia State Corporation Commission will see the shortsightedness of this proposal

and call for a reasonable toll level for the commuters utilizing the Dulles Greenway.

A HISTORIC MOMENT

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

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, moments before we opened this session, I had the privilege of witnessing a historic moment. Our distinguished Speaker, a lady who has just returned from a bipartisan visit to Kuwait, Iraq, Pakistan and Afghanistan, met the distinguished Speaker, another lady, another statesman, another political leader of outstanding qualities, the Speaker of the Hungarian Parliament.

When these two women met, NANCY PELOSI and Katalin Szili, history was made. We saw two great democratic republics, with parliaments headed by outstanding women, exchange views and plan the future of stronger and even better relations between the Republic of Hungary and the United States of America.

I salute Speaker PELOSI and Speaker of Parliament Katalin Szili and wish both of them the very best.

LET'S WORK TOGETHER

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I think that there is a good part to the Democrat takeover of the House and the Senate, and that is that now the Democrats are at the table when we talk about Iraq. And there are many in this town who say failure is not an option. I think failure is an option. I think there would be disastrous consequences to that. The third largest oil-producing nation in the world would belong to terrorists. What would happen to the existing and fledgling Iraqi Government if you suddenly pulled our troops out of there? What kind of genocide would that bring? Those are things that have to be dealt with.

But I think that it is good that now we can have a bipartisan approach that the critics of the administration and the policy are now inside the room actually making policy. With that spirit, I think that it is time to tone down the rhetoric and work on a solution that will be best for Iraq, for America, and for the international community. And I say this with sincerity now because I think there is a good opportunity, and we only will have it, I think, for a few short months because the Presidential elections are kicking in, lots of rhetoric is floating around, but I think we can work together and come up with some good policy.

PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE PROPOSAL IS A BAD PLAN

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, in the President's State of the Union address last week, he made proposals for what is essentially a tax increase on more than 30 million Americans. That's right, if Congress were to pass the President's health care plan, more than 30 million Americans, many of whom are middle-class workers who have fought hard to negotiate comprehensive health care plans with their employers, would be taxed by the Federal Government. Good health insurance, for those lucky enough to have it, would be jeopardized as many Americans would be pushed into the individual insurance market where insurers can refuse coverage to workers based on their health.

That brings me to the least of these, those without insurance, a number which will grow under the President's plan. The Regional Medical Center at Memphis, the Med, a hospital that provides a disproportionate amount of service to the poor, could lose as much as $30 million a year. Tennessee could see Federal revenue to support hospitals, nursing homes and other health providers by as much as $300 million, and that would be an increase of taxes at the local level.

The Med plays a critical role in delivering health care to the poor. Losing the specialty services of the Med would leave serious gaps in our health care system that serves the entire region around Memphis, including Mississippi and Arkansas.

PRESIDENT'S TROOP ESCALATION PLAN IS NOT A PLAN FOR SUCCESS IN IRAQ

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, just how many people need to tell the President that his troop escalation plan is a terrible idea before he actually begins to listen? The American people sent the President a strong message last November that they no longer want our troops involved in what has become a civil war in Iraq.

The President's own generals have told him that they didn't need more troops in Iraq; but rather than listening to his generals, as he has always suggested that he has done, he has now turned around and replaced them with generals who are more friendly to the idea of sending more troops.

The bipartisan Iraq Study Group told the President that more troops were not needed. Instead, they concluded that a strategic redeployment should be initiated in the coming months and that the administration should reach out to the neighbors in the region, ideas the administration has rejected. If this were not enough, an overwhelming number of Democrats, and Republicans I might say, here on Capitol Hill have expressed opposition to the plan.

Madam Speaker, how many people have to tell him ''no'' before he listens?

□ 1230

SUPPORT OUR TROOPS BUT OPPOSE THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of our troops, and I want to underscore that. But I also want to make clear that I am opposed to the war in Iraq. Our service men and women are proudly serving our country. More than 3,063 of our sons and daughters, including 13 from the 32nd Congressional District that I represent, have given their lives.

This war, as you know, has cost taxpayers $387 billion so far, and an additional $100 billion to $130 billion is going to be requested by this President. There is no plan to secure the peace. There is no accountability for companies like Halliburton that have been found to make more than $1.4 billion in unreasonable and unsupported billing charges, and our veterans lack the support needed and deserved.

We need a plan that ensures that there are no permanent U.S. military bases in Iraq, and not a plan to increase the buildup. We need a plan which investigates and punishes companies engaged in war profiteering and fraud and a plan to redeploy our servicemen and women. We need to find a political solution.

AMERICANS OPPOSE TROOP ESCALATION IN IRAQ

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, President Bush's dangerous plan to escalate the war in Iraq will not make Americans more secure. In fact, it will only lead to more bloodshed and violence. The plan faces significant bipartisan opposition in both Chambers of Congress and is opposed by a vast majority of people in this country.

Some Republicans are belatedly calling for benchmarks to measure progress in Iraq, even as they stand by the President's plan to escalate the war. Democrats were calling for benchmarks for success in Iraq years ago, but our pleas fell on deaf ears.

As an early and staunch opponent to this war, I have watched as every single prediction this administration has made has been proven wrong, from the duration of the war, the reception we would receive, the costs, the number of casualties and the existence of weapons of mass destruction, all wrong.

The loss of more young men and women is too high a price to pay for

this gamble. Let's support our troops by bringing them home and letting Iraqis shoulder responsibilities which should be theirs.

HONORING ARMENIAN EDITOR HRANT DINK

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

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mourn the loss of the Armenian Turkish newspaper editor, Hrant Dink. On January 19, the legacy of the Armenian genocide continued. Hrant Dink, who was tried and convicted of ''insulting Turkishness'' by recognizing the Armenian genocide, unfortunately, was shot dead over a week ago.

Dink was a voice for freedom of the press, for democracy and for Armenian genocide recognition. Between 1915 and 1923, the Ottoman Empire led a genocide on its Armenian population, killing over 1.5 million people. Over 90 years later, the Turkish Government still refuses to acknowledge it occurred.

I told the Turkish foreign minister last year that to move forward with democratic reform, Turkey must first comes to grips with its past, just as our country had during the civil rights movement. Yesterday, I sent a letter to President Bush urging the withdrawal of the nomination of Richard Hoagland to be Ambassador to Armenia. Given the assassination of Dink, we cannot have an ambassador who refuses to acknowledge the Armenian genocide happened. It would send the wrong message.

PRESIDENT'S ESCALATION PLAN IS NOT NEW—IT'S BEEN TRIED BEFORE AND FAILED

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

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, in June of 2006, the Bush administration announced a new plan for securing Baghdad by increasing the presence of Iraq security forces. That plan failed.

In July, additional U.S. troops are moved in. By October, the Pentagon was admitting that the plan to secure Baghdad had failed. In the fall of 2005, the Bush administration increased troop levels by 22,000 around the time of the elections, and the escalation had little long-term impact on quelling sectarian violence.

The New York Times had a story by a young troop member in Baghdad yesterday. You need to read it, because it talked about how the snipers killed one of their buddies and how they went in to get his body out and to get his helmet, and the blood spilled down the clothing of the rescuers.

This is happening every day because we are fighting a war with an unknown enemy in the middle of sectarian violence. It must stop.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY). Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. GILLMOR, Ohio
Mr. REGULA, Ohio
Mr. BOOZMAN, Arkansas
Mr. SHIMKUS, Illinois

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

ESTABLISHING THE HOUSE DEMOCRACY ASSISTANCE COMMISSION FOR THE 110TH CONGRESS

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 24) establishing the House Democracy Assistance Commission for the One Hundred Tenth Congress, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 24

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

There is established in the House of Representatives a commission to be known as the House Democracy Assistance Commission (hereafter in this resolution referred to as the ''Commission'').

SEC. 2. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMISSION.

(a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of 20 Members of the House of Representatives, of whom 11 shall represent the majority party and be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and 9 shall represent the minority party and be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(b) TERMS OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—Each member of the Commission shall be appointed for a term that is concurrent with the Congress in which the appointment is made. Such a member may be reappointed for one or more subsequent terms in accordance with the preceding sentence.

(c) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the Commission shall be designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives from among the members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives under subsection (a).

SEC. 3. DUTIES.

(a) ACTIVITIES.—The Commission shall work with the legislatures of partner countries, as determined pursuant to paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b), on a frequent and regular basis in order to—

(1) enable Members, officers, and staff of the House of Representatives and congressional support agencies to provide expert advice and consultation to members and staff of the legislatures of partner countries;

(2) enable members and staff of legislatures of partner countries to study the operations of the House of Representatives and its support agencies; and

(3) provide recommendations to the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development regarding the provision of material assistance, such as modern automation and office systems, information technology, and library supplies, as the Commission determines to be needed by a legislature of a partner country in order to improve the efficiency and transparency of its work, and to oversee the provision of such assistance.

(b) SELECTION OF PARTNER LEGISLATURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to carry out the activities described in subsection (a), the Commission may conduct, as needed, studies on the feasibility of programs of assistance for legislatures of countries described in paragraph (2) for the purpose of strengthening the legislative infrastructure of such countries. Such studies shall assess—

(A) the independent and substantive role that each legislature plays, or could reasonably be expected to play, in the legislative process and government oversight;

(B) the potential benefit to each legislature of expert advice from and consultation with Members and staff of the House of Representatives in areas such as the development of research services and legislative information systems, legislative procedure, committee operations, budget process, government oversight, and constituent services; and

(C) the need in each legislature for material assistance, such as modern automation and office systems, information technology, and research materials, in order to improve efficiency and transparency.

(2) COUNTRIES DESCRIBED.—The countries referred to in paragraph (1) are countries that have established, have re-established, or are developing democratic legislatures which would benefit from the assistance described in this resolution.

(3) ADDITIONAL PARTNER LEGISLATURES.—From any countries studied in accordance with paragraph (1), the Commission may select one or more legislatures to receive assistance under the provisions of this resolution, subject to a written expression of interest from the highest ranking office within the legislature of a selected country.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2007, and each December 31 thereafter, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, appropriate House committees, the Office of Interparliamentary Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, an annual report on the Commission's activities, including a review of the activities of the Commission in the current year and a proposal for the activities of the Commission in the upcoming year, as described in subsection (a).

(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate House committees'' means the following committees of the House of Representatives:

(A) The Committee on Foreign Affairs.

(B) The Committee on Appropriations.

(C) The Committee on House Administration.

(D) The Committee on Rules.

SEC. 4. ROLE OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall carry out the duties described in section 3

using the staff and resources of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, including the use of consultants or temporary employees, such as individuals with expertise in development of democratic parliaments, legislative systems management, legislative research, parliamentary procedure, related legislative matters, and technology systems management, as appropriate.

(b) PARTICIPATION OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH EMPLOYEES.—At the request of the Commission, the head of any office of the House of Representatives or any congressional support agency may assist the work of the Commission by—

(1) detailing personnel to the staff of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or another standing committee of the House of Representatives; or

(2) authorizing personnel to participate in activities of the Commission.

SEC. 5. TRANSITION FROM FORMER COMMISSION.

(a) CONTINUATION OF EXISTING PROGRAMS.—The Commission may continue programs of assistance with legislatures of partner countries which were initiated by the former Commission.

(b) TRANSFER OF AUTHORITIES AND RESOURCES.—Any authorities and resources of the former Commission which remain available as of the day before the date of the adoption of this resolution, including unobligated funds, shall be transferred and made available to the Commission.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the ''former Commission'' means the House Democracy Assistance Commission established under the House Democracy Assistance Commission Resolution (House Resolution 135, One Hundred Ninth Congress, agreed to March 14, 2005).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

When the Berlin Wall fell, I was there with other congressional colleagues. We experienced firsthand the exuberance of the people of East Germany and across the newly liberated region.

But to sustain the momentum of that unique instant in history to commitment on both sides of the Atlantic, commitment not just to elections, but to the development of permanent, democratic institutions that permeate society. Madam Speaker, I vividly recall how excited we in Congress were when we first provided assistance to our new colleagues in democratically elected parliaments across Central and Eastern Europe.

That is why I strongly support the resolution before the House today, which reestablishes the House Democracy Assistance Commission. This important body plays a critical role in ensuring that the new generation of emerging democratic institutions get desperately needed assistance.

In the 109th Congress, the House created this commission to enable members and staff to assist their counterparts in the parliaments of new democracies around the globe. With our help, they will build strong, independent legislatures.

The commission has been led by two steadfast and consistent supporters of democracy promotion, DAVID PRICE, our colleague from North Carolina, and DAVID DREIER, my fellow Californian. I want to offer my sincere gratitude to both of them for their efforts.

Under their leadership, the commission took congressional delegations to six new or reemerging democracies and hosted six visiting parliamentary delegations here in Washington.

The commission also offered material assistance to several legislatures through USAID, most notably a project to furnish and equip and train staff of the parliamentary library of East Timor with the invaluable assistance of our own Library of Congress.

Pending the passage of this resolution by the full House, the commission in 2007 plans to assist the legislatures of Afghanistan, Colombia, East Timor, Georgia—not our own Georgia, but the former Soviet Republic of Georgia—Haiti, Indonesia, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Macedonia, Mongolia and Ukraine.

Madam Speaker, in 1918, President Woodrow Wilson expressed the idea that it is in our national interest to encourage free and open and democratic governments. Over the past nine decades, the United States has sustained and expanded this important commitment. The Price-Dreier Commission is an important part of this tradition, and it deserves our continued support.

I urge all of our colleagues to participate in the House Democracy Assistance Commission and to support this most important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I also rise in strong support of House Resolution 24, reestablishing the House Democracy Assistance Commission for this 110th Congress. I was an enthusiastic cosponsor of the legislation creating the commission in the year 2005, and I am proud of what it has accomplished during these years.

Our colleagues, as Mr. LANTOS mentioned, Mr. DREIER and Mr. PRICE, deserve our thanks for their hard work and identifying candidate legislatures in emerging democracies to receive commission assistance. The 12 partner countries selected so far include nations of strategic importance to all of us, such as Afghanistan and Lebanon. They include the largest Muslim majority nation on Earth, Indonesia, which has emerged from authoritarian dictatorship to become the world's third largest democracy.

It includes countries that have overcome Soviet-era communism such as Georgia, Mongolia and Ukraine. They include one of the world's newest nations, East Timor. It also includes important neighbors in the hemisphere such as Colombia and Haiti and friends in Africa, among many others. To these nations, the commission provides not only technical support, but moral support as well.

Many of us have heard of how much democratic reformers and parliamentarians overseas appreciate the formal relationships with the House provided by this commission. All of us here know democracy is more than just about holding an election. It is also about building responsive institutions that can earn the public trust and the public's allegiance.

To be effective in a democratic context, legislatures must have the independent capacity for research, for analysis and for legal drafting. So the expanding programming that the commission plans to undertake during this Congress is vitally important, Madam Speaker.

I have no doubt that the commission will continue to do great things with the limited resources that it shares with our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

It represents a modest investment in sharing with the people of the world one of our most treasured legacies, government of the people, by the people, for the people. For these reasons, Madam Speaker, this resolution before us deserves our unanimous support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to my good friend and our distinguished colleague from California (Mrs. CAPPS), a member of the commission for the 109th Congress.

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this bipartisan resolution to continue that good work of the House Democracy Assistance Commission. As a member of the commission, I want to thank our cochairs, Representatives DAVID PRICE and DAVID DREIER, for the excellent job that they have done in leading us.

I want to thank our current and former staff, John Lis, Tommy Ross, Lara Alameh and Robert Lawrence, who have worked very hard to make the commission successful with its work.

Madam Speaker, the House Democracy Assistance Commission was established in the last Congress as an instrument for this House to share some of

the lessons we have learned over 200 years about making democratic government work.

The commission has tried to impart these lessons to countries around the world now embarking on this hopeful path. Members of the commission have visited a number of countries struggling to find their way in a more open system of government, eager to have our partnership with them in this endeavor. We have hosted representatives from many of these same countries here in Washington and in some of our congressional districts.

For example, I hosted members of the Indonesian delegation in my district, and I have traveled there, and to East Timor, to Macedonia, to Afghanistan. During these visits, we discussed with our counterparts the basic workings of government, everything from the importance of constituent relations to the value of setting budgets, from the roles of minority and majority parties to the importance of public health programs.

□ 1245

We don't tell them how they should make their governments work, but we do try to explain how we have made it work in this country; and we have done so in a bipartisan and really even nonpartisan manner.

Madam Speaker, this year the House will have before it many important tasks. I believe very few are as important to the well-being and future of our country as helping to establish stable democracies around the world. The House Democracy Assistance Commission will try in its small way to advance that goal, to bring us a more peaceful and just, well-governed world.

I urge the House to pass this legislation and let us continue our work.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), one of the coauthors and co-creators of this commission.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to my very good friend from Miami (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN); and of course my great pal from California (Mr. LANTOS), my classmate and neighbor, who, as soon as I took the well, decided to walk off the floor, but he is still here for a moment. And I do appreciate the fact that in a bipartisan way we have taken on what is one of the most interesting and fulfilling challenges that I have faced in the many years that I have been privileged to serve here in the Congress.

And, of course, as I look around the Chamber and see colleagues like LOIS CAPPS and, of course, the man with whom I served as a partner in a bipartisan way on this, DAVID PRICE from North Carolina; on our side of the aisle, JEFF FORTENBERRY and JOHN BOOZMAN, who are among the Members to serve on this commission, it is very, very important today that we reauthorize this effort.

As we look at our quest to prosecute the global war on terror, it is obvious that many things need to be done. We obviously need to have the military wherewithal to do everything necessary to make sure that as we face terror attacks and other military conflicts that we are able to successfully take that on. But, similarly, it is important for us to look at other ways in which we can do everything possible to help people who are struggling.

And I forgot to mention Ms. SCHWARTZ, who I had not seen because my peripheral vision wasn't that great; so I am happy that she is here, another very able and hardworking member of our commission.

But, Madam Speaker, as I was saying, as we look at this challenge not only dealing with the military challenge, it is important for us to work to build democracies and those institutions that relate to it and the rule of law and political pluralism and self-determination, as I like to always say, those things that we have a tendency to take for granted here in the United States but are so important.

And this commission was specifically built on something that we did about 15 years ago following the crumbling of the Berlin Wall and the demise of the Soviet Union, that being our effort to let Eastern and Central Europe know that as they work to claw their way from totalitarianism that we would do all that we could to help build their parliaments. And, Madam Speaker, that is exactly what we have now been able to do so far in six countries and we have six other countries with which we are working very closely, assuming that we reauthorize this effort here.

And we are going to be doing so, I know, under the very able leadership of my colleague Mr. PRICE, and I am going to be working on our Republican side with members. And, again, I was very privileged to serve as chairman that we did this as a partnership. It was not only a partnership in a bipartisan way between Democrats and Republicans here, but it also has been a very important partnership in working with nongovernment organizations, with the Department of State, with the National Endowment for Democracy, with the International Republic Institute, with the National Democratic Institute, and a wide range of other entities out there that recognize that building these parliaments that will have the ability to engage in oversight of their executive branch, to put into place a budget process to make sure that they have the kind of constituent service that is very important for them, these are the kinds of things that this commission has worked on so effectively.

A couple of quick examples from the missions that we have been on so far: one of the things that we found in Kenya when we visited there was that it was essential for us to help them build up their budget process and their committee process there as well, and we were able to provide through our commission great benefits for them. And, frankly, when we were on our mission there in Nairobi, Kenya last July, we went to the site of the former U.S. embassy. And we all know back in 1998 that our embassies in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania and Nairobi, Kenya were attacked by al Qaeda, and now for us to see the role that we are playing in helping to build this democracy in and the fledgling parliament in Kenya has been a very important thing, especially in the light of the fact that most recently we have seen an effort supported by the Kenyan Government and the Ethiopian Government in liberating the Somalians from the hold of those Islamic extremists. So we are seeing a real tangible benefit in this war on terror from the work of this commission.

Similarly, in the Balkans, in Macedonia, on our mission there most recently just over the Thanksgiving break, we were able to do a great deal in helping with the building of their committee process there, and our commission has worked long and hard on that.

So, Madam Speaker, I am going to quote my friend DAVID PRICE because my feeling is virtually identical to that. When we think about the important work that we do with the privilege that we have of serving as Members of the United States Congress, there is nothing that is more fulfilling and rewarding and tangible for us to see than the opportunity to participate in this very important work on the commission.

So I express my appreciation again to Chairman LANTOS and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and all of the members of this commission, and we look forward to reporting back to our colleagues here in the House of Representatives, Madam Speaker, on the very important success that we are going to be having in the months and years to come.

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

Before yielding to my good friend from North Carolina, let me pay tribute to the two DAVIDs who have done an extraordinary job in the last session and, in fact, should be called two Goliaths of legislative accomplishment across the globe.

I could not think of a person more qualified than my friend DAVID PRICE of North Carolina to chair the House Democracy Assistance Commission. DAVID PRICE is a legislator's legislator. His understanding of the legislative process as a distinguished academic political scientist and his practice as one of the most outstanding legislators in the history of the Congress uniquely qualify DAVID PRICE to chair the House Democracy Assistance Commission.

Under his leadership, this body will take to many parts of the world not

only the principle but the practice of the democratic process.

Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure and pride I yield such time as he may consume to my friend DAVID PRICE.

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend from California for those very generous and indeed extravagant words. Coming from him, they mean more than I can say.

Mr. LANTOS. It was an understatement.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Thank you.

And we do thank the chairman and the ranking member, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for scheduling this resolution so promptly, so that the House could act on this and our commission could get on with its work.

I also want to acknowledge the previous speaker, Mr. DREIER, the previous chairman of the House Democracy Assistance Commission, who did a wonderful job in getting this commission launched in its first 2 years. As he said, we have operated every step of the way on an open and bipartisan basis; and so as we swap roles, with my assuming the chairmanship and his being the ranking member, I am very hopeful that this will be a seamless transition, and that this cooperative way of operating will continue. Indeed it should, as we work together in this body to take the message and the practice of democracy to our partner legislatures around the world.

House Resolution 24 would reauthorize the work of the commission. This is a body that was inspired by the work of the Frost-Solomon Task Force back in the early 1990s. We worked then with states in Central and Eastern Europe as they were emerging from communism.

Our commission has undertaken this same kind of work. We are building the institutional capacities of legislatures in emerging democracies. We are working with them to develop their research and budget analysis, oversight, legislative drafting, and other capabilities.

There is a difference, though. In contrast to the Frost-Solomon effort, our scope is not just Central and Eastern Europe, although some of our partner countries are still in that region. We are undertaking around the world to work with partner legislatures. In the commission's first 2 years, we have worked with legislatures in 12 nations. Many of these countries are of key strategic import for our own Nation, and all are enthusiastic, worthy, and willing partners: Afghanistan, Colombia, East Timor, Georgia, Haiti, Indonesia, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Macedonia, Mongolia, and Ukraine.

Madam Speaker, we view our work as a small but important niche in the United States's mission to spread democracy around the world. We do this not in the sense that we have all the answers about how to promote democratic rights and governance. The commission's work is rooted in the fundamental realization that the heart of democracy is not found just in elections but between elections. Between elections, that is when a nation's ability to govern itself in a way that is responsive to its citizens and representative of its citizens is established. What happens between elections, establishing representative institutions of governance, is just as important as the nation's free determination of who will govern.

Our commission works with partner legislatures to support development of the tools legislators need to establish responsive, effective government. We carry on our work in the sure realization that we do not have all the answers. We know that our own democracy is a work in progress. We do think we have an important story to tell. But we approach each of these legislatures in a true spirit of partnership, learning from them as they learn from us.

We also don't have a corner on the market of democracy promotion, and we coordinate closely with USAID, with the State Department, with other actors in the field to ensure that our efforts complement and enhance theirs.

We have high expectations for the program which we hope to implement in 2007 with the support of this body. During the last 2 years, our focus has been on assessing candidate legislatures and seeking to establish partnerships. Now we plan to move toward consolidating these relationships by expanding and focusing our programming. We plan to conduct advanced seminars on critical legislative capabilities, to enable sustained communications between members and staff of our legislatures, to identify and support pro-democracy reformers in partner legislatures, and to provide small-scale material assistance in cases of significant need.

So, Madam Speaker, let me close by again thanking my colleague Representative DAVID DREIER, the founding chairman of the House Democracy Assistance Commission, thanking him for his leadership. He has led us with vision and with an inclusive spirit. I also want to thank Speaker PELOSI, past Speaker HASTERT, Majority Leader HOYER, Chairman LANTOS, Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN, and many others who have supported the commission and helped bring forward quickly this resolution to get our work going.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution, which offers Members of this body a promising opportunity to directly contribute to the important work of championing democracy around the world.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), one of the founding members of the commission and who is staying on to make sure that we have a successful commission once again this year.

□ 1300

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her leadership on the Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as our chairman, Mr. LANTOS, for your support of the resolution today.

Madam Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those who have commented on the leadership of Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. DREIER of California, as well as the excellent service that the dedicated staff has provided in the formation of the House Democracy Assistance Commission.

Madam Speaker, I was very pleased to receive an appointment to the commission during the last Congress, because I recognized its potential to help legislators around the world who are struggling to give representative democracy a chance. By supporting this program we can provide direct help to build effective legislative institutions worldwide. Through the work of the House Democracy Assistance Commission we bring the best of our practical experience in running this Congress to emerging democratic societies, where people are longing to experience robust institutional systems that value the just principles of self-determination.

Last Congress, the commission selected 12 parliaments from Afghanistan to East Timor for participation in its technical assistance program. Logistical challenges notwithstanding, the commission's dedicated professionals and committed members reached out to help replicate this institution's success stories in legislatures throughout the world.

In reauthorizing the House Democracy Assistance Commission, we can continue to help other countries place their people's aspirations within reach. In helping them to succeed, we can play a direct role in laying the foundations for a more stable and peaceful world.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution today.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Pennsylvania, Congresswoman ALLYSON SCHWARTZ, a distinguished member of the commission.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Thank you, Mr. LANTOS. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on the floor this afternoon.

Madam Speaker, I was honored to serve on the House Democracy Assistance Commission during the 109th Congress, and I was privileged to travel on the commission's first trip to Indonesia and East Timor in February of 2006. I too want to thank the commission's chairman, Congressman DAVID PRICE, and the ranking member, former chairman, Congressman DAVID DREIER, for their hard work and their leadership on this important initiative.

I also want to acknowledge the commission's staff, John Lis, in particular,

the director, and the rest of the staff who worked hard in advance of our trips and continued to work hard in preparing for the designation of certain emerging democracies and our trips abroad as well to bring some of those members here.

The last few years have borne witness to a number of encouraging events in emerging democracies around the world, as well as a number of discouraging setbacks. One thing that has become clear is that to help advance democracy, transparency and the rule of law abroad, the United States can and must do more than just support elections. We must support the establishment of strong, independent democratic institutions, which provide the backbone of viable democracy. So in addition to elected executives, we must, and indeed it means, help legislative and judicial branches of government have the authority, the autonomy and the continuity that they need.

As Members of Congress, Members of the oldest directly representative democratic institution in the world, we are in a unique position to reach out to our counterparts in fragile democracies to held build relationships and to learn from each other.

The House Democracy Assistance Commission has conducted legislative strengthening programs with our counterparts in Indonesia, East Timor, Georgia, Macedonia, Kenya and Afghanistan; and these legislators face enormous challenges. For instance, in East Timor, where I traveled, only two of their legislators had legislative experience prior to serving in their parliament. They have almost no support staff and few resources.

Their constitution provides for a substantive parliamentary role; however, lack of experience and lack of infrastructure have severely limited their role, leaving the executive to control most of their legislation. Nonetheless, the members that we met with are deeply committed to their role as representatives and to their role in maintaining and building democratic institutions.

They are keenly aware of the challenges that they face as one of the poorest nations in the world, where basic services from electricity to schools are just being initiated. It is in our Nation's interest to work with nations like East Timor, nations struggling on the road to democracy and stability to establish effective legislative bodies.

The commission enables Members of this body, Democrats and Republicans alike, to do just that, to share our knowledge, expertise and passion for the legislative branch with our counterparts in these emerging democracies.

We have worked with parliamentarians from these countries in their home countries, in State capitals across this country and here in Washington, focusing on the establishment of legislative information and research services, on providing advice on legislative procedures and committee operations, and on constituent services.

The commission has also provided these parliaments with some needed material support, such as office equipment and computers and library resources. So as we confront the global security challenges of the 21st century, initiatives that strengthen democratic institutions abroad and help provide a positive image of the United States are of utmost importance. That is why this commission is so worthy of our continued support. That is why I urge a ''yes'' vote on House Resolution 24.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to Mr. BOOZMAN of Arkansas, our last speaker, who has made incredible contributions to the House Democracy Assistance Commission as a founding member of that body.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 24 to reauthorize the House Democracy Assistance Commission. This type of parliamentary development program was initially seen as a tool to help 12 emerging democracies rise from the grasp of communism in Central and Eastern Europe in the mid-1990s.

The Solomon-Frost Task Force assumed that successful democratic transitions in former Communist countries depended on direct involvement and at a modest cost were able to help these parliaments become effective legislatures and play a crucial part in a democratic system.

One of the most evident impacts of the program was the goodwill it generated towards the U.S. Congress and the American people among these East European countries under the Iron Curtain.

As the need has continued to grow and our world continues to evolve, former Speaker HASTERT recognized the necessity of having this program once again. The House Democracy Assistance Commission has given the U.S. Congress the ability to guide fledgling democracies into strong, stable institutions of government by creating relationships between members of both bodies.

Madam Speaker, I had the opportunity to travel to Lebanon, Kenya and Liberia on a trip not too long ago. And we were greeted in Kenya by a big guy. I am a pretty big guy myself; I am not used to looking up to people. But this individual was probably 6–5, 6–6. He was the staffer that was in charge of taking us around the capital making sure that we got where we were supposed to be.

And then we had the opportunity to journey outside of the capital out into the countryside. We flew out, and this same individual greeted us in his Masai warrior outfit. And we had the opportunity to visit with the Masai, see how they ran things. But, Madam Speaker, that is how you change the world, with the relationships, helping others build the institutions that underpin democracy. That is how you change the world.

Again, I want to thank Congressmen PRICE and DREIER for their leadership, for the tremendous job that they have done, to Speaker PELOSI for going forward and agreeing to getting things along as far as they have on this, former Speaker HASTERT for his vision, and then most importantly, to the staff that does such a tremendous job of helping out and making all of those things possible.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield such time as he might consume to the distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my good friend from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I would like to say a word or two about the Democracy Assistance Act. Let me commend the chairman and the ranking member for bringing this very important legislation up for reenactment.

I had the opportunity to travel with the Democracy Assistance Commission, and was very impressed with the work that they were doing. I traveled to Lebanon with them, and I think we were the last group there before the war broke out. And we saw glimmers of hope with the parliament at that time. And so there was great interest in moving democracy forward.

Our leaders at that time, Chairman DREIER and Cochairman PRICE did an outstanding job meeting with all party leaders. We then had the opportunity to visit South Africa and Liberia.

In all of the countries we attended there was a tremendous amount of interest in our leadership of the Congress being there. I understand that there are possibilities for Haiti and perhaps Colombia and other countries throughout the world to be assisted by this very important commission.

And so I would just like to add my voice to the importance of the Congress, the parliament, legislator-to-legislator, in attempting to bring democracy throughout the world.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Madam Speaker, before concluding, let me just say this is the ideal way this body works. We have set ourselves an important task: Teaching new democracies how a parliamentary body should work. And with some of our finest colleagues from the Republican and the Democratic side, we have succeeded during the last session of Congress; and under the leadership of DAVID PRICE, we shall move ahead, teaching the practice of democracy across the globe from a practical point of view.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 24, to reestablish the House Democracy Assistance Commission in the 110th Congress. In the 109th Congress, the House of Representatives created this Commission to enable the

Members and staff of the House of Representatives to personally assist their counterparts in the parliaments of new democracies around the world to build strong, independent legislatures. I thank my colleagues, Mr. DAVID PRICE, the gentleman from North Carolina, and Mr. DREIER, the gentleman from California, for leading the Commission and supporting the promotion of democracy.

Under their leadership, the Commission has accomplished a great deal. It undertook congressional delegations to six new or re-emerging democracies and hosted six visiting parliamentary delegations here in Congress. It also offered material assistance to several legislatures through USAID. One highly successful project furnished, equipped, and trained staff of the parliamentary library of East Timor, with the invaluable assistance of our own Library of Congress.

In the aftermath of September 11, it has been too easy to view some nations more aggressively, as we undertook the obvious course of attempting to dismantle terrorist networks, end the support they received from states, and strengthen domestic and international defense capabilities. But in addition to responding to the immediate security threat, it is also necessary to help democracy take root in those countries of the Middle East, Africa, South and Central Asia, and other regions that now breed or support terrorists. It is in these Muslim countries or regions, more than anywhere else, that terrorism feeds off tyranny, finding recruits among the politically repressed and sanctuary from states that use terror against their own people. Building effective political institutions is the surest way to sever the link between terror and tyranny and to advance the values of democracy, individual rights, and cultural pluralism in the Middle East and elsewhere in the Muslim world.

Promoting democratic institutions and values in the Muslim world is thus one of our most urgent challenges. But it is not the only one. Meeting the challenge of democratization in the Muslim world should not warrant a retreat from a global approach; on the contrary, it constitutes a powerful new argument for maintaining and strengthening this approach. As September 11 made clear, any seam of dysfunction in the international system, however marginal to the main centers of political and economic interest, can become a source of exposure and threat. In a globalized world, the cancer of breakdown in any country can metastasize to other parts of the global body politic and thus constitutes a danger to international peace and security. In promoting the antidote of democratic institution-building, therefore, it is unwise to write off any country as insignificant or beyond hope.

The global defense of democracy is the appropriate and most effective response to the threat posed by Islamic extremists. As has already been suggested, these extremists do not represent a religion or a civilization but espouse an ideology of hatred and violence as their means to power. Though it is a particularist and corrupted Islamic ideology, to its zealous adherents it is a universal system of truth and thus a fitting rival to democratic civilization, which they falsely describe as decadent and narrowly Western. Since democracy is a genuinely universal value based on the belief that people everywhere, regardless of their religion or culture, can achieve self-government under the rule of law, it is the natural organizing principle in the struggle to defeat terrorism and to create a stable and peaceful world.

Pending the passage of this resolution by the full House, in 2007 the House Democracy Assistance Commission plans to assist the legislatures of Afghanistan, Colombia, East Timor, Georgia, Haiti, Indonesia, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Macedonia, Mongolia and Ukraine. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to participate in this important project.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 24, which will reestablish the House Democracy Assistance Commission for the 110th Congress.

I was honored to be appointed by Speaker PELOSI to serve as a member of the House Democracy Assistance Commission during the last Congress, and I am proud of the accomplishments that were made by the Commission. I want to commend Representative DAVID DREIER and Representative DAVID PRICE who worked tirelessly during the 109th Congress to fulfill the mission of the Commission, and John Lis who worked tirelessly as the Commissions Staff Director.

The HDAC built upon Congress's long history of helping emerging democracies around the globe. Many of my colleagues will remember the informal Frost-Solomon Task Force which worked during the early 1990's to provide invaluable technical assistance and equipment to Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Poland and Russia. When the HDAC was created, former Congressman Frost commented that the work of the Commission, "means a great deal to members of foreign parliaments because it demonstrates that elected leaders in the United States care about what happens in their country." The work of this Commission may not be noticed by many of our colleagues or even our constituents, but it is vitally important to support and strengthen parliaments of new democracies around the world

In 2006, the commission was active in Afghanistan, East Timor, Georgia, Indonesia, Kenya, Lebanon, and Macedonia. I was glad to join the House Democracy Assistance Commission delegation to Lebanon and Kenya. During the trip, the delegation met with our counterparts in the Lebanese National Assembly and the National Assembly of Kenya. In Kenya, the delegation visited the Kimana Health Center and the Sinet water project, both of which were then dedicated in honor of Representative DAVID DREIER and DAVID PRICE, respectively.

The final leg of this trip was to a meeting with Liberian President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf. Liberia is home to the first female head of state in all of Africa and is a country founded by freed American slaves, it is essential that the United States remain actively engaged in helping to build Liberia's fledgling democracy.

Madam Speaker, the House Democracy Assistance Commission has only begun its important work. With the approval of this resolution, the Commission will be able to continue to spread its good work with an ever expanding list of partner countries.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 24, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM TO ESTABLISH A PUBLIC JUDICIAL INQUIRY INTO THE MURDER OF NORTHERN IRELAND DEFENSE ATTORNEY PATRICK FINUCANE

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 20) calling on the Government of the United Kingdom to immediately establish a full, independent, and public judicial inquiry into the murder of Northern Ireland defense attorney Patrick Finucane, as recommended by Judge Peter Cory as part of the Weston Park Agreement, in order to move forward on the Northern Ireland peace process, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 20

Whereas human rights defense attorney and solicitor Patrick Finucane was brutally murdered in front of his wife and children at his home in Belfast on February 12, 1989;

Whereas many international bodies and nongovernmental human rights organizations, including Amnesty International, British Irish Rights Watch, the Committee for the Administration of Justice, and Human Rights First, have called attention to serious allegations of collusion between loyalist paramilitaries and British security forces in the murder of Mr. Finucane;

Whereas in July 2001 the Governments of Ireland and the United Kingdom under terms of the Weston Park Agreement appointed retired Canadian Judge Peter Cory to investigate the allegations of collusion between loyalist paramilitaries and British security forces in the murder of Mr. Finucane and other individuals;

Whereas Judge Cory reported to the Governments of Ireland and the United Kingdom in April 2004 that sufficient evidence of collusion existed to warrant a full, independent, and public judicial inquiry into the murder of Mr. Finucane and recommended that a public inquiry take place without delay;

Whereas the Government of the United Kingdom in April 2005 adopted the Inquiries Act 2005 which empowers the Government to block scrutiny of state actions and limits independent action by the judiciary in inquiries held under its terms, and, after the enactment of this legislation establishing new limited inquiry procedures, the Government announced that an inquiry into the murder of Mr. Finucane would be established which would operate under terms of the new legislation;

Whereas Judge Cory, in a written statement presented to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives in 2005, stated that his 2004 recommendation for a public inquiry into the

murder of Mr. Finucane had ''contemplated a true public inquiry constituted and acting pursuant to the provisions of the 1921 Act'' (the Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act 1921), and also stated that ''it seems to me that the proposed new Act would make a meaningful inquiry impossible'';

Whereas the family of Mr. Finucane has rejected the limited authority of an inquiry conducted under terms of the Inquiries Act of 2005;

Whereas Amnesty International, British Irish Rights Watch, the Committee for the Administration of Justice, and Human Rights First have likewise rejected any proposed inquiry into the murder of Mr. Finucane established under procedures of the Inquiries Act of 2005 and have called for the repeal of the Act;

Whereas the Dial Eireann (Parliament of Ireland) adopted a resolution on March 8, 2006, calling for the establishment of a full, independent, and public judicial inquiry into the murder of Patrick Finucane;

Whereas the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–228) and House Resolution 128 (April 20, 1999) support the establishment of a full, independent, and public judicial inquiry into the murder of Patrick Finucane;

Whereas on May 18, 2006, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly agreed to House Resolution 740, which declared in part that the House of Representatives ''urges the Government of the United Kingdom immediately to establish a full, independent, and public judicial inquiry into the murder of Patrick Finucane''; and

Whereas on January 22, 2007, the Police Ombudsman for Northern Ireland released a comprehensive report which confirms that police in Northern Ireland have colluded with members of a loyalist paramilitary organization in specific murders that took place over the last dozen years that the Ombudsman investigated and that such collusion could not have occurred ''without the knowledge and support of the highest level'' of the Northern Ireland police: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) expresses to the family of Patrick Finucane deepest condolences on his death, commends their steadfast pursuit of justice in his brutal murder, and thanks his wife Geraldine and son Michael for their willingness to testify on this matter before committees of the House of Representatives on numerous occasions;

(2) supports the efforts of the Administration in seeking the full implementation of the Weston Park Agreement and the establishment of a full, independent, and public judicial inquiry into the murder of Patrick Finucane;

(3) calls on the Government of the United Kingdom to reconsider its position on the matter of an inquiry into the murder of Mr. Finucane, to amend the Inquiries Act of 2005, and to take fully into account the objections of Judge Cory, objections raised by officials of the United States Government, other governments, and international bodies, and the objections raised by Mr. Finucane's family; and

(4) urges the Government of the United Kingdom immediately to establish a full, independent, and public judicial inquiry into the murder of Patrick Finucane which would enjoy the full cooperation and support of his family, the people of Northern Ireland, and the international community as recommended by Judge Cory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. These are promising times for Northern Ireland. Sinn Fein, the party linked to the Irish Republican Army, has just voted to start cooperating with the Northern Ireland police. With this action, Sinn Fein has abandoned decades of opposition to law and order, and vastly improved the chances of a Catholic-Protestant administration in Belfast before long.

□ 1315

Yes, Madam Speaker, these are promising times for Northern Ireland. But there are also reminders that the road to reconciliation remains long and tortuous. Last week the Police Ombudsman for Northern Ireland released a comprehensive report confirming that police in Northern Ireland have colluded with the loyalist paramilitaries over the last dozen years, and that such collusion could not have occurred, and I quote, ''without the knowledge and support of the highest level of the Northern Ireland police.'' Such incidents must be thoroughly investigated and their perpetrators caught.

Madam Speaker, February 12 marks the anniversary, 18 years ago, of the tragic murder of Northern Ireland defense attorney Patrick Finucane. He was brutally shot 14 times by masked men before his wife and two young children in his North Belfast home.

He was a solicitor who represented republicans in many high profile cases, most notably, IRA hunger striker, Bobby Sands. But he also acted on behalf of loyalists.

A wide array of human rights groups alleged that his murder was at the hands of loyalist paramilitaries, colluding with British security officers of the Royal Ulster Constabulary Special Branch. The paramilitaries later claimed that Mr. Finucane was killed because he was a high-ranking officer in the provisional IRA. However, the police indicated at his inquest that they had no evidence to support that claim.

Canadian Judge Peter Cory was appointed by the governments of Ireland and the United Kingdom to examine these allegations. In 2004, the report came that sufficient evidence of collusion existed to warrant a full, independent and public inquiry without delay.

Madam Speaker, in order to move the Irish peace process forward, the resolution before us today calls on the Government of the United Kingdom to conduct a full, independent and public judicial inquiry into Mr. Finucane's murder, which will enjoy the full cooperation and support of his family and the international community. The time to bring justice and put an end to this tragic matter is long past due.

Again, I would like to thank our distinguished colleague, Mr. CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey, for his tireless pursuit of this most important issue. Mr. SMITH has been a long-time friend of Ireland, and his dedication to this issue and to human rights across the globe is well known and much admired by many, certainly including myself.

I want to thank the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for her strong support for this measure.

I strongly support this legislation and encourage all of my colleagues across the full spectrum to do so as well.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let me at the outset thank Chairman LANTOS for his leadership on this issue in general, human rights. But also especially in the case of Patrick Finucane, which so many of us have cared so deeply about for so many years. He has been a great friend of Ireland as well, and I want to thank him for that.

I also want to thank the original sponsors of this legislation, including my good friends and colleagues, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KING, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCNULTY and Mr. ROTHMAN and the many others who cosponsored this truly bipartisan resolution.

H. Con. Res. 20, Madam Speaker, calls on the British Government to live up to its commitment as part of the Northern Ireland peace process to implement a public, independent judicial inquiry into the murder of human rights attorney Patrick Finucane. Mr. Finucane, who represented Catholics in Northern Ireland, was gunned down in his home in 1989 in front of his wife and his children. I would note parenthetically his wife was wounded as well.

For years, Madam Speaker, nongovernmental human rights organizations, regional and very much renowned international legal experts, have raised serious allegations that Mr. Finucane's murder resulted from collusion between loyalist paramilitaries and British security forces. In 2004, retired Canadian Supreme Court judge Peter Cory, who was appointed by the governments of Ireland and the United Kingdom to examine these allegations under the Weston

Park Agreement, reported that sufficient evidence of collusion existed to warrant a full, independent and public judiciary inquiry without delay.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, the British Government has yet to comply.

Many of my colleagues know that as chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and as chairman of the Helsinki Commission I have held 11 hearings on the peace process in Northern Ireland. Central to each of these hearings has been the ongoing concern about the human rights abuses by members of the police service in Northern Ireland. The Finucane family has testified. Judge Cory has testified. The U.N. Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers has testified, as well as many numerous human rights leaders. All have advocated for a special investigation into the possibility of collusion in the Finucane murder.

Beyond this, Madam Speaker, last year, the Irish Parliament passed a resolution calling for an open and independent investigation. Our special envoy, Ambassador Mitchell Reiss, has testified before our committee that he and the Bush administration have urged for the establishment of a credible investigation into the Finucane murder. And Congress has supported it as well last year with H. Res. 740 and previously as part of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act.

Madam Speaker, this resolution could not be more timely. Just last week the Northern Ireland Police Ombudsman, Nuala O'Loan, who testified before our committee in 2004, released a devastating report which confirms that police in Northern Ireland have colluded with loyalist paramilitaries in several murders over the last dozen years. The very fact that a police ombudsman exists, and that a report as revealing as hers can be published underscores that policing in Northern Ireland is, in fact, very different, very much improved than it was when the Good Friday Agreement was signed in 1998. Further testimony to the advancements and improvements in the policing in Northern Ireland is that just this past Sunday, on January 28, Sinn Fein voted overwhelmingly to move to participate in the community policing system that was set up as part of the Good Friday Agreement.

Today, the Independent Monitoring Commission set up in 2004 by the British and Irish Governments to report on paramilitary activity has praised Sinn Fein for its new commitment to policing. When referring to the IRA, the IMC concludes that ''terrorism and violence have been abandoned.''

These developments clearly are greatly welcome, and there is a new optimism that elections for a new, devolved power-sharing government will be held this spring. Yet, Madam Speaker, with reconciliation must come full disclosure of the truth.

The lack of resolution of charges of official collusion in the murder of a defense attorney such as Mr. Finucane leads people to question the government's commitment to accountability and, above all, to justice. His murder symbolizes the depth and danger of official state-sponsored collusion in Northern Ireland and a disregard for the rule of law. It has left victims who deserve answers. And I know, because many of my colleagues and I have all spoken to them, how they want these answers. There will be no closure and there will be no reconciliation without the truth.

As the U.N. Special Rapporteur told us in 1998: ''Harassment and intimidation of defense attorneys goes to the core of the independence of the legal profession and the administration of justice in any society.''

I am also reminded of the riveting testimony offered on this matter at one of my hearings in 1998. Rep. DON PAYNE, my colleague from NJ, remembers it as well. He was there, when Rosemary Nelson, an attorney for Northern Ireland testified. Mrs. Nelson, who was also a wife and mother, told Congress that defense attorneys in Northern Ireland feared that they could be murdered themselves because no one had been held accountable in the murder of Patrick Finucane. Six months later, after her testimony, Rosemary Nelson was killed, the victim of a car bomb.

Madam Speaker, I would like to again express my deepest condolences to the Finucane family, as well as Rosemary Nelson's family, and thank them for their courageous and tireless efforts on behalf of justice, not only for their loved one, but for all others who have been victims of state-sponsored collusion in Northern Ireland.

Similarly, I would like to acknowledge the work and support from many human rights activists, including Jane Winter of British Irish Rights Watch; Elisa Massimino from Human Rights First, formerly known as Lawyers Committee for Human Rights; Maggie Beirne, Martin O'Brien and Paul Mageean, who have also testified before Congress on behalf of the Committee of the Administration of Justice and have provided very, very useful and timely insights to our committee.

I would again like to thank my cosponsors and again thank Mr. LANTOS.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend from New York, Congressman ELIOT ENGEL, a distinguished senior member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure, my friend, the chairman, to call him the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I thank him for yielding to me.

Before I start my remarks, I just want to pay tribute to Mr. SMITH, the gentleman from New Jersey, who has been an outstanding supporter of human rights, not only for the Irish peace process, although he has been a leader in that, but throughout the world. And I commend him for this resolution, and I am pleased to be a sponsor of it, I believe the lead Democrat on the resolution; and it is something that has been a long time coming.

As the chairman said, the struggle for peace and justice in Ireland, particularly the north of Ireland, continues. We are all very hopeful because there has been great progress made, and we think that progress will continue to be made. And the chairman explained Sinn Fein's acceptance of policing and everything else. So we have to continue.

One of the things that is so important is the fact that the Finucane family, and I have met with them a number of times, they are convinced that until there is an independent inquiry, any other inquiry will be tainted. And that is why this resolution calls for an independent inquiry. We want to get to the bottom of what really happened to Pat Finucane. We all know, we all suspect, but we need an impartial commission. We need an impartial investigation because of collusion with loyalist forces and the police for many, many years. Nothing short of that will do, and that is what this resolution calls for. Before you can put the past behind you, you have got to have it all come out and know exactly what happened.

There has been great progress. The Irish Government, the British Government have all worked together for progress. And they are both to be commended. Both governments are to be commended because progress is being made. But there is still a long way to go. So I support this. And we still have other things that need to be put in place here in the United States, the case of Malachi McCallister, and I want to mention it, who is struggling to stay in this country, and many of us are behind him and fighting to keep him in this country.

There are still many injustices that have been perpetrated in the past that still have to be resolved. But starting here with inquiry into Pat Finucane's murder is something that is very, very important and very important for this Congress to go on record as supporting. And this is bipartisan. It is something, I think, that can make progress. And, again, only when we put the past behind us and let the truth hang out can we really put the past behind us. And that is what this resolution attempts to do. Again, only an independent commission will suffice.

□ 1330

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from New Jersey, a distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, let me once again commend him for the outstanding work that he is doing as the chairman, but in his

many years as a member of the International Relations Committee then and the Foreign Affairs Committee now. We really appreciate his work.

Let me say to the gentleman from New Jersey, I had the opportunity to work with him in the last 2 years on our subcommittee, and I commend him for bringing forth so many of the human rights issues, and it has really been a pleasure working with him, and also on this H. Con. Res. 20, the gentleman, Mr. SMITH from New Jersey.

Earlier this week, we witnessed a breakthrough in the peace process in Northern Ireland. Sinn Fein agreed to the legitimacy of the police service there, and in doing so, they made a strong statement about their future in the north of Ireland. They chose peace over violence and the rule of law over chaos.

I have had the privilege of visiting Northern Ireland on a number of occasions. I was there to monitor the parades, and I was lucky enough to accompany President Clinton on a trip there. In each case, I saw great things along with terrible things, but always the hope of the people that one day there would be peace and understanding in their great country.

Thanks to no small part to Special Envoy George Mitchell and efforts that we as a nation should be proud of, the 20th century saw the cessation of violence and the beginning of political equality. The Good Friday Agreement stands as a breakthrough, a powerful statement, and a revelation of that hope that there was always there and that would not be overshadowed by violence and death. The good people continued to push forward.

In 1989, Patrick Finucane became a victim of that violence. He was murdered by paramilitary soldiers, gunned down in front of his wife and his children. It was a brutal act perpetrated by men in a time of great contention, violence, and fear. It was a small, sad episode in a larger battle between two sides unwilling to compromise, unwilling to talk, each fearful of each other. Northern Ireland is a different place now. There is peace. And with that peace, the initial signs of trust and cooperation because for any peace to work there must be trust that must be followed by cooperation.

It is in this spirit that I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 20. The peace of Northern Ireland depends in no small part on openness and cooperation. Only a full independent and just examination of the past can lead to a peaceful trust in the future. This investigation should begin. And with that, I commend Sinn Fein and Gerry Adams.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from New Jersey, a fighter for justice for all the Irish people, Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say that I rise today in support of this resolution, and to commend the Finucane family for their tireless pursuit of justice in the murder of Pat Finucane, who spent his life fighting for the rights of the disadvantaged in Northern Ireland.

Nothing short of a full public inquiry, without the limitations imposed by the British Inquiries Act, will enable the Finucane family to determine what actually happened when Pat was gunned down in his home on February 12, 1989.

This House and numerous international groups have consistently called for a full public inquiry to settle the troubling allegations of collusion surrounding this murder. A recent report of the Northern Ireland police ombudsman concluded that there was a disturbing level of collusion between the RUC Special Branch and loyalist paramilitaries, making this inquiry more important than ever.

Madam Speaker, ensuring a lasting peace in Northern Ireland requires us to continue the fight for justice that people like Pat Finucane, Rosemary Nelson, and others carried on throughout their lives, and that is why again I want to commend everyone and particularly our sponsor, my colleague from New Jersey, for introducing this resolution and urge its passage as quickly as possible so that we can actually see an independent, full inquiry.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Friends of Ireland group, our colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman LANTOS and certainly Chairman SMITH for bringing this resolution to the floor today.

One of the reasons that American foreign policy has triumphed in Ireland has been because this was done in a bipartisanship way, a bipartisanship way, the way American foreign policy formally was conducted. And the success that we have enjoyed in the North of Ireland has largely been indispensable due to the involvement of America, and revisiting these cases, as Mr. SMITH has requested and Mr. LANTOS has sanctioned, is terribly important.

Think of these murders, cold-blooded murders, shooting down attorneys who were providing a common defense for suspected, suspected, members of the IRA. Never was there ever indication that they were members of the IRA; they were suspected members of the IRA, and they were not entitled to a common defense under the former justice system in the North of Ireland. So, the attorneys are murdered as well as the suspected members of the IRA.

What is notable about this is what occurred last week. Many of us in this Chamber, Members of this House, have been involved in cases dating back to Gibraltar, to Birmingham, and to a series of other cases which we in this House brought forward. It is Members of this body that demanded that the British Government bring these cases to light and be put under the magnifying glass of critical analysis. And now we find that not only was there collusion on the ground, there was collusion at the highest levels of the British Government where the military gave information to paramilitaries on the loyalist side, who then cleared the area so that attorneys could be targeted for assassination. That is how far reaching these murders were.

What is also significant is this: It is because of this Chamber that the IRA and its political ally Sinn Fein had the courage to proceed with not only disarmament but, just as importantly, they decided to join policing. And let me just say this about policing today in the North of Ireland. One section of the community used policing to keep the other section of the community in line. That is what this was about.

And now the faith that has been offered by the Good Friday Agreement, again in a bipartisan sense, has allowed us to proceed and to move forward. And it could not have been done without people like Mr. SMITH. And I could go on and on with Members of this Chamber, and Mr. LANTOS again offers support to this initiative today.

So it is terribly important. And I want to thank all of you, and Mr. McCord, the chief constable from the North of Ireland will be in my office tomorrow to answer questions from the Members of Congress

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 20, to address the issue of the murder of Northern Ireland defense attorney Patrick Finucane. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, for introducing this legislation. It is essential that we bring to light the suspicious circumstances of this terrible murder and the need for our friends in the Government of the United Kingdom to conduct a full and transparent inquiry into the matter.

On February 12, 1989, Patrick Finucane was murdered by two masked members of the loyalist paramilitary in front of his wife and children in his home in North Belfast. Since then, reports have indicated a strong possibility of conspiracy within the British police in the region. The loyalist paramilitary organization, known as the Ulster Defense Association, UDA, or the Ulster Freedom Fighters, UFF, claimed that it killed Mr. Finucane because of his high rank in the Provisional Irish Republican Army, IRA. Circumstances suggest that Mr. Finucane had ties to the IRA; he had three brothers who were actively involved in the IRA, one of his clients was the infamous IRA hunger striker, Bobby Sands, and former IRA member Sean O'Callaghan alleges he was a member. However, law enforcement authorities have reported that there is no evidence whatsoever that Mr. Finucane was a member of the IRA.

In 1999, Royal Ulster Constabulary, RUC Special Branch Agent William Stobie was found to have supplied one of the guns used to kill Mr. Finucane. Agent Stobie was a member of the UDA/UFF, which at the time was a legal organization.

In 2001, after significant pressure from Amnesty International and as a result of the Weston Park talks, the British and Irish Governments initiated an investigation. They appointed retired Canadian Judge Peter Cory to examine allegations of collusion by the RUC, British Army, and Peace Guard of Ireland in the murder of Mr. Finucane and others. In 2004, Judge Cory reported that he recommended the establishment of public inquiries into the matter. The British Government later announced an inquiry, but under a recently enacted law, the Inquiries Act 2005, the government was allowed to block scrutiny of state actions. Judge Cory strongly criticized the law.

H. Con. Res. 20 passed the House in the last Congress as H. Res. 740, but unfortunately the Senate did not act on the legislation. I urge my colleagues to renew their support for this important legislation by voting in favor of it this Congress.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the resolution introduced by my friend from New Jersey, CHRIS SMITH.

I stand among my colleagues and say that it is a privilege to be an original cosponsor of this important statement by the House of Representatives.

The movement towards peace in the north of Ireland is moving at a steady but slow pace. It is the slowness of this pace which is regrettable. However, the movement forward is one which we can continue to commend and support.

The political parties of the north of Ireland must continue to overcome the obstacles for the sake of the people who they were elected to represent. The people of the north must be given the representation in government that they have sought out.

However, in order to continue to build and promote this ongoing peace process, we must make sure that the past atrocities have been fully investigated and those who are guilty, held responsible.

The British and the Irish Governments had agreed to hold public inquiries into high profile murders of human rights defenders like Pat Finucane. We must build better trust between the people of the north, and so it is time for the British to allow the truth to come out.

I wish to express my deepest sympathy to the family of Patrick Finucane at this time. After this brutal murder, justice must be pursued, and I wish to thank Geraldine and her son Michael for agreeing to testify before the committee of the House of Representatives.

The family of Pat Finucane has a right to know the full extent of collusion that existed and caused the death of this husband and father.

Under the Weston Park Agreement and the commitment made by Judge Cory, the British must live up to their obligations by reconsidering their position on the matter of inquiry into Pat Finucane's death and amending the Inquiries Act of 2005.

It is time for an independent, judicial inquiry into the murder of Pat Finucane.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time. We are striking a blow for justice, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 20, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL ENGINEERS WEEK

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 59) supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 59

Whereas engineers use their professional, scientific, and technical knowledge and skills in creative and innovative ways to fulfill society's needs;

Whereas engineers have helped meet the major technological challenges of our time—from rebuilding towns devastated by natural disasters to designing an information superhighway that will speed our country into the future;

Whereas engineers are a crucial link in research, development, and demonstration and in transforming scientific discoveries into useful products, and we will look more than ever to engineers and their knowledge and skills to meet the challenges of the future;

Whereas engineers play a crucial role in developing the consensus engineering standards that permit modern economies and societies to exist;

Whereas the 2006 National Academy of Sciences report entitled ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm'' highlighted the worrisome trend that fewer students are now focusing on engineering in college at a time when increasing numbers of today's 2,000,000 United States engineers are nearing retirement;

Whereas the National Society of Professional Engineers through National Engineers Week and other activities is raising public awareness of engineers' significant, positive contributions to societal needs;

Whereas National Engineers Week activities at engineering schools and in other forums are encouraging our young math and science students to see themselves as possible future engineers and to realize the practical power of their knowledge;

Whereas National Engineers Week has grown into a formal coalition of more than 70 engineering, education, and cultural societies, and more than 50 major corporations and government agencies;

Whereas National Engineers Week is celebrated during the week of George Washington's birthday to honor the contributions that our first President, a military engineer and land surveyor, made to engineering; and

Whereas February 18 to 24, 2007, has been designated by the President as National Engineers Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week and its aims to increase understanding of and interest in engineering and technology careers and to promote literacy in math and science; and

(2) will work with the engineering community to make sure that the creativity and contribution of that community can be expressed through research, development, standardization, and innovation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 59, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 59, supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week.

National Engineers Week takes place this year February 18 through February 24. This is not a random week that is chosen; it is chosen because this is the week that we celebrate George Washington's birthday. George Washington is widely recognized as our Nation's first engineer.

Engineers have helped make our country great from their service in the American Revolution to developing key modern industries, such as aerospace and energy. I would like to honor and recognize the more than 2 million engineers in the United States and the contributions that they have made to our country.

Engineers are at the forefront of human advances because engineers combine imagination and creativity, with math and science training to solve problems. Engineers are not just builders, as they are sometimes envisioned; they are problem solvers. This is one of the first things I was taught when I was a graduate student at Stanford University in the department of engineering economic systems.

Engineers in the past have helped build the boats to cross the seas, railroads to take us west, and the Internet to communicate with the world. We need the innovative capability of engineers to confront the problems and challenges before us today. Engineers will help Americans develop energy independence, find solutions to confront global climate change, and make our Nation more secure.

I have a unique perspective as only one of a handful of engineers in Congress. Besides my Master's degree from Stanford, I earned a Bachelor's degree

from Northwestern University in mechanical engineering. I have seen that America is falling behind other countries in this discipline. U.S. students continue to score below international averages on math and science tests. It has been reported that in 2004 China graduated more than six times the number of engineers that graduated in the U.S.

On a recent tour of Northern Illinois University's college of engineering and engineering technology, I again heard how few Americans are getting engineering degrees, especially graduate degrees. It is great that America has such top universities that we are attracting some of the brightest minds from around the world to come to study here, but we are beginning to lose more and more of these students when they graduate and they go back home. This is harmful to America's future.

In 2005, the National Academy of Sciences released a report entitled, ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm,'' which raised questions about America's future technological competitiveness. This report echoed by the President of the United States in the State of the Union address last year emphasized the need for government to take a number of actions, including addressing the potential for a shortage of engineers.

We must act quickly to take up this challenge. We cannot let another year go by and we cannot afford to let our economic future falter, and that future requires continuing technological innovation supplied by our Nation's engineers.

National Engineers Week seeks to raise public awareness about engineers' contributions to society and our quality of life. It has inspired future engineers for more than 50 years. Founded by the National Society of Professional Engineers, including more than 100 society, government, and business sponsors and affiliates, including Boeing, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, and the American Council of Engineering Companies, National Engineers Week draws upon local and regional experts to promote high levels of math, science, and technology literacy. Annually, it reaches thousands of parents, teachers, and students in communities across the country.

From national and regional engineering competitions such as the Future City Competition, to events such as Introduce a Girl to Engineering Day, this week helps inspire the next generation of engineers and scientists.

□ 1345

If we are going to produce more American engineers, one needed step is to improve STEM education, that is science, technology, engineering and math education. But we must also do more to inspire our children to become interested in engineering.

When I was growing up in Chicago, I was fascinated in learning how things work, as most kids are. I remember it was Father Fergus who taught me physics in high school at St. Ignatius, and in that class he took my childhood fascination with how things worked and got me interested in engineering. He spurred me to follow up on that when I went to college.

We need events such as National Engineers Week and things that go on within the week to help encourage and inspire more kids to go into engineering. We have to do everything we can to inspire future engineers so that America continues its leadership in this increasingly competitive world.

I would like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) for his involvement also with this National Engineers Week resolution. And I would like to especially thank the engineers that contributed so much to America and to honor them for their commitment to continue working to better our society.

I ask my colleagues to support H. Res. 59 in its deserved recognition.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H. Res. 59, of course, supports the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week, which is going to be celebrated this year during the week of February 18. The National Society of Professional Engineers established the first National Engineers Week back in 1951. The purpose of the week is to increase the understanding of and interest in engineering and technology careers, and to promote K–12 literacy in math and science. It also showcases the important contributions that engineers have made to our society.

Engineers have a critical role to play to help keep our Nation ahead of the innovation curve. It is essential that we capitalize on opportunities such as National Engineers Week to raise the awareness of the valuable work and contributions of engineers to society and to attract young people of all ages to this very rewarding profession. As such, I ask my colleagues to support H. Res. 59.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would like to express my strong support for H. Res. 59, and the authors that made this possible, supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week.

Texas is an energy-producing State, and the engineering workforce plays a major role in Texas livelihoods.

The fruits of engineering are technologies enjoyed by every American. We need engineers to put creative ideas into real-life solutions. Engineers are the fabric of our workforce. They design beautiful and energy-efficient buildings, and build industrial robots that construct everything from cars to computer chips with precision. Engineers are in the business of improving the quality and design of many different products such as chemicals, computers, engines, aircraft and toys, and they are an integral component to our Nation's innovative workforce.

We need many more than we produce, and we need many more to get graduate degrees so we can continue to produce them.

I am proud to support this resolution celebrating National Engineers Week, and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS), the ranking member on Energy.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 59, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week.

It is particularly helpful to have people from all walks of life in this body. It is especially helpful to have Mr. LIPINSKI as an engineer here, along with some other engineers, to cause us to focus on the crucial need for engineering education in this country.

My dad is an engineer. He lost this son to political science and the law. Not everybody can be an engineer. But the folks that can be engineers really will help us solve the challenges of the future.

Here is our challenge in terms of numbers: India is graduating somewhere north of 200,000 engineers a year; China is graduating nearly 300,000 engineers a year; and the United States is somewhere in the order of magnitude of 60,000 engineers a year. That doesn't bode well for us.

In a technological world, we need more engineers. We need people to enter science, technology, engineering and math education. And so it is a good thing to have a week to celebrate the importance of engineering to the history of the country and to the future of the country. I applaud the gentleman from Illinois' effort to bring this to the floor, and I am in complete support of the resolution and look forward to its adoption.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), the distinguished plasma physicist.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Illinois.

Madam Speaker, as one who has taught engineers earlier in my career, I am delighted to rise in support of this legislation that will recognize National Engineers Week and, through that, highlight the contributions made to society by engineers.

The programs that fit under National Engineers Week are broad. They will include such activities as Introduce a Girl to Engineering that will encourage women to pursue engineering and recognize those who do.

Other initiatives will include competitions and online exhibits, as well as

television programs. It will highlight that engineering is critical to the security of our country, certainly through developing sustainable energy production and use, in preventing and mitigating natural and man-made disasters, and to make our world work better and to contribute to the livability of our society.

Now Congress can pass this legislation supporting the excellent programming of National Engineers Week. Congress can also ensure that we make the best decisions based on the best information related to science, engineering and technology, such as we used to do with the help of the Office of Technology Assessment.

Congress can pass legislation to ensure that students nationwide are taught technical skills, that they are taught the importance of those skills as well, and to make sure that there are no financial obstacles for individuals who seek to pursue higher education in engineering and related fields. And Congress can ensure that federally funded research and development is not neglected as we put together the budget.

This is good legislation that highlights important work. I am pleased to support it.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri who is an engineer, Mr. AKIN.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, I thought it would be appropriate to make a comment or two about engineering because I was trained as an engineer. I must not have been much of one because I ended up in politics. It doesn't happen that often that people who have an engineering background end up in the political sector; but it is quite common in engineering for people to get the undergraduate degree and then to move into other kinds of areas, and the engineering background gives them a tremendous problem-solving basis to be able to be quite effective in various other kinds of careers.

It is a national concern to us as Americans that we are producing fewer and fewer engineers. What happened was, in the era of Sputnik when I was a kid, everybody realized we were technologically behind, particularly behind the Soviet Union, and realized the urgency in having people develop an interest and background in science and engineering. At that time, we produced a good number of engineers, and they were fine engineers. They now work for many of our household-name large corporations, certainly many in my own district, Boeing Corporation, for example.

These engineers have also started all kinds of different businesses and been very successful, and have been very successful in producing a lot of the technology that keeps our young men and women safe on the battlefields. It also is technology that has given us a wonderfully high standard of living and has allowed America to prosper in many ways.

Unfortunately, now there is a tremendous dearth of engineers. We have a number of small companies that produce products that are related to the defense industry that I know of in the St. Louis area, just as an example, and they are saying that we would give anything to be able to hire engineers. We just can't get any of them. The only engineers we can get are coming out of India or some other country far away, and our own students, Americans, are not choosing careers in engineering. That is distressing.

I suppose that there are reasons for why this is going on. Perhaps one of them is the malaise and the very lukewarm kind of results that we are getting out of secondary education in America. The SAT scores are continuously changed year to year, and they can be adjusted downward. Engineering is very rigorous. It requires an understanding of mathematics, and it is a very hard undergraduate degree. Many people that start in engineering end up in something like political science. It is far easier than engineering.

But there are rewards in engineering, and if there are young people that are paying attention to what we are discussing here on the floor of the U.S. Congress today, I would encourage them that engineering is a fantastic undergraduate choice, and it doesn't have to end up behind a drawing board. It ends up in all kinds of positions and opportunities to those who have a disciplined mind and are capable of understanding basic principles of how things work.

I have to say, in Congress it is tremendously helpful. I serve on the Committee on Armed Services, and we are constantly getting involved in technical kinds of questions, things like armor on Humvees, body armor, how to defeat IEDs, all of the technology of software and people tapping into databases. On the Science Committee, as well, we deal with all kinds of areas, everything from exploration of space to the simple use of materials.

I would encourage all young people to seriously consider engineering.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California, a new member of the Science Committee and an engineer himself, Mr. MCNERNEY.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 59 and the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week.

As an engineer for my entire professional career and only one of a handful in the House, I thank Mr. LIPINSKI for introducing this legislation to bring the spotlight onto this professional career choice.

My father was an engineer; I am very proud to be following in his footsteps. As we vote on this legislation today, I am reminded of something that my mother used to tell me over and over: It was the engineers that would be solving many of our Nation's and our world's problems. Her words couldn't have been more relevant than they are today, as we face many challenges such as global warming, the demand for fresh water and food throughout the world.

Well, in the 1970s, the engineering profession wasn't considered the most exciting, but throughout the 1990s, we became aware of how exciting the challenges are that we are facing in engineering; and this has led to a resurgence in interest and inspired a whole generation of young people.

□ 1400

I am hopeful that with the passage of H. Res. 59 we will help inspire more of those young people to get involved in the engineering profession.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my friend Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I wanted to let the majority know that I have no other speakers requesting time, and I will just reserve the balance of my time for my closing remarks.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. We have no more speakers besides myself.

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

I want to thank the Chair for allowing me to manage the remaining time on our side in the absence of the ranking member, Mr. HALL, who had a very important meeting before the Rules Committee, and I thank the Chair for allowing that.

Madam Speaker, I am not an engineer but I went to an engineering school. In fact, I went to one of the very best engineering schools in this country. I am a Ramblin' Wreck from Georgia Tech and a heck of an engineer and actually not an engineer but a chemist. I look forward to the next bill as we honor Dr. Julian.

But engineering, Madam Speaker, is a profession in this country that is very, very important to us, to our ability to compete in this global economy, and as we all know, we are losing unfortunately far too many engineers to retirement and not replacing them. If we are going to remain competitive in this country, and I know the work of the Education and Labor Committee of this House and Chairman MILLER and before him Chairman MCKEON and Chairman BOEHNER, we have addressed these issues in our reauthorization of higher education and how important it is; and I know that Chairman MILLER, as we go forward to reauthorizing No Child Left Behind and highly qualified teachers and special incentives for math and science teachers at elementary, middle and high school levels so that we do stimulate more bright young minds in this country, and yes, many more women than may be traditionally would select engineering as a professional track, as a career, because this is the only way we are going to be able to compete in this global economy.

I love sports, Madam Speaker, and I know we all do and we honor sports teams all the time up here, whether it is basketball, football, hockey. You name it, we are doing these resolutions, but I like to see more and more of this kind of activity where we are supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineering Week with H. Res. 59 to say, look, what is really important in this country is not games. Games are fun and games are a diversion, but this is about life and the success of our individual young students and, indeed, our country.

So to have an opportunity to stand here and have the closing remarks on supporting H. Res. 59, I commend the majority and my friend Representative LIPINSKI and others that have brought this, Representative JOHNSON and other members of the Science Committee. I think this is a wonderful opportunity to salute our engineers and the profession.

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

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

I thank Mr. INGLIS, Mr. GINGREY and Mr. HALL for their support on this resolution. As an engineer but also as a former political science professor, I do not want to disparage political science whatsoever. However, it is clear that America does need more engineers, and to do this we have to value engineers and engineering much more in this country.

I am very hopeful that this resolution is going to be the first step that this Congress takes to not only honor our current engineers but also inspire more American children to become engineers and to find the solutions to the challenges that we face today.

We need to do more. We need to take more steps. We need to improve science, technology, engineering, math, known as STEM education. We need more R&D funding; but today, let us just take this first step and urge my colleagues to take this first step. Vote for H. Res. 59 and honor engineers during National Engineers Week.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I proudly rise in strong support of H. Res. 59 which supports the goals and ideas of National Engineer Week. As you know, new discoveries and technologies are changing the way Americans live and work. Through dedicated research and development, engineers expand our knowledge and lay the foundation for the progress of our country. This week is an opportunity to recognize engineers for their many contributions to our way of life and to encourage young people to pursue their curiosity by studying math and science.

Engineering education began in America under circumstances that differ substantially from those of the other leading professions. Medical schools, for example, were established by individual physicians, and then loosely affiliated with universities.

By contrast, engineers were first trained by apprenticeship, particularly on canal construction projects. This tradition was perpetuated on railroad construction projects, and later in factories and machine shops, long after college engineering programs were established. Eventually, engineering schools in the United States were sponsored by the Federal Government, the U.S. Military Academy in 1802, and the land-grant colleges beginning in 1862. They were also fostered by public-spirited citizens who fostered the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and from within established universities in response to interest or demand.

The engineering workforce is the driver of society's technological engine, an awesome responsibility. We will not be able to address this responsibility without diversifying the pool of science and engineering talent. This broadening of participation must come from the Land of Plenty, mostly untapped potential of underrepresented minorities and women—America's "competitive edge" for the 21st century.

We know that more than any other species, humans are configured to be the most flexible learners. Humans are intentional learners, proactive in acquiring knowledge and skills. And, it turns out that we are more successful learners if we are mindful or cognizant of ourselves as learners and thinkers.

To date, our knowledge of the science of learning, is just the tip of the iceberg of what we have yet to learn. Our ultimate goal is truly not to waste a single child and to teach and train a workforce that is well prepared and can adapt and change.

The revolution in information technologies connected and integrated researchers and research fields in a way never before possible. The Nation's IT capability has acted like adrenaline to all of science and engineering. A next step is to build the most advanced computer-communications infrastructure for researchers to use, while simultaneously broadening its accessibility.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 59.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF PERCY LAVON JULIAN

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) honoring the life of Percy Lavon Julian, a pioneer in the field of organic chemistry research and development and the first and only African American chemist to be inducted into the National Academy of Sciences.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 34

Whereas Percy Julian was born on April 11, 1899, in Montgomery, Alabama, the son of a railway clerk and the first member of his family to attend college, graduating from DePauw University in 1920, receiving a M.S. degree from Harvard University in 1923 and a Ph.D. from the University of Vienna in 1931;

Whereas in 1935 Dr. Julian became the first to discover a process to synthesize physostigmine, the drug used in the treatment of glaucoma;

Whereas Dr. Julian later pioneered a commercial process to synthesize cortisone from soy beans and yams, enabling the widespread use of cortisone as an affordable treatment of arthritis;

Whereas Dr. Julian was the first African American chemist elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1973 for his lifetime of scientific accomplishments, held over 130 patents at the time of his death in 1975, and dedicated much of his life to the advancement of African Americans in the sciences; and

Whereas Dr. Julian's life story has been documented in the PBS NOVA film "Forgotten Genius": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress honors the life of Percy Lavon Julian, a pioneer in the field of organic chemistry research and development and the first and only African American chemist to be inducted into the National Academy of Sciences.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 34, the resolution that is now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mine is a simple concurrent resolution honoring the life of Dr. Percy Lavon Julian. Dr. Julian was an outstanding chemist and, as a black man, overcame countless obstacles to achieve international recognition for his scientific accomplishments.

He spent his youth in Birmingham and Montgomery, Alabama. When he decided to leave home to go to college to DePauw University in Indiana, his entire family came to see him off at the train station, including his 99-year-old grandmother, a former slave, and his grandfather who was also there.

His grandfather's right hand was two fingers short. The fingers had been cut off for violating the code forbidding slaves to learn to read and write.

At DePauw University, Julian worked in the attic of a fraternity house. His support and tuition came

from his earnings as a waiter. Often he worked as a ditch digger during the day and attended classes in the evening.

Though at the top of his class in college, he was discouraged from pursuing graduate studies because of potential racial sentiment on the part of future coworkers and employers.

Madam Speaker, I firmly believe that no one should be discouraged from pursuing their dreams. NANCY PELOSI, our first female Speaker of the House, is a prime example of someone who ignored the words of naysayers. We must hold these people up as examples. Let them light the paths of others.

Dr. Julian earned a fellowship to study chemistry at Harvard University, where he received his master's degree; and in 1931, he earned his Ph.D. from the University of Vienna.

Dr. Julian synthesized a chemical treatment for glaucoma, and he synthesized cortisone for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. He is also noted for inventing a foam used during World War II to extinguish gasoline and oil; and over the course of his career, he acquired more than 100 patents.

Percy Julian received wide recognition by the scientific community for his research and was elected into the prestigious National Academy of Sciences. He was a bright, talented individual who excelled in science in the face of overwhelming challenges.

My bill, House Concurrent Resolution 34, honors his life. We have 12 cosponsors, as well as partnership with the other body from the gentleman from Illinois. I am pleased that the leadership has chosen to pass a bill celebrating the success of an African American. He is a role model, and we want our young people to know that you can make it even in spite of some of the hardships that you have.

So for future generations coming along, the minority students, I feel it important to uplift women and minorities to excel in math, science and engineering. I hope the House leadership will consider substantial policies to encourage more women and minorities to pursue careers in science, technology, engineering, and math. They need more help than what is currently being provided.

But, again, I thank Chairman GORDON and my colleagues for their support of this resolution. It is a good start, and I hope a bellwether for future legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, as my good friend and colleague, Representative EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, has already stated, House Concurrent Resolution 34 honors the life of Dr. Percy Lavon Julian, a pioneer in organic chemistry, research and development.

Dr. Julian identified and synthesized, and my trusty assistant had to tell me how to pronounce it, physostigmine. I should know that from medical school. Dr. Julian, though, synthesized that, and it is a drug used to treat glaucoma. I think we all know about glaucoma and the ravages of that, particularly with our elderly, more recently to improve memory in Alzheimer's patients and as an antidote to nerve gas.

He also made great advances, Madam Speaker, in synthesizing the drug known, as we all know, as cortisone, and making it affordable treatment back then for arthritis, and of course, it is used for that and many other things today.

In addition to his glaucoma and arthritis treatment contributions, Dr. Julian's impressive achievements also include the invention of a soy-based fire extinguishing foam used on Navy ships during World War II, various improvements in paints and coatings while employed with the Glidden Paint Company, with which he was affiliated, I think, for over 18 years; and he developed a method to filter chemicals in soybean oil to mass produce hormones for medical application.

Once again, Madam Speaker, as a retired OB/GYN physician, I know a little bit about the use of hormones for medical conditions.

As an African American in the early 20th century, Dr. Julian overcame great adversity to succeed and to make his mark on society. The National Academy of Sciences recognized and honored his significant contributions to organic chemistry when they inducted him in 1973.

Madam Speaker, I remember to this day my organic chemistry teacher at Georgia Tech in those 5, 6-hour labs that we had twice a week in addition to all the classroom work. I wish I had had the privilege of being taught by Dr. Julian, but Dr. Cherry was a fine professor in his own right.

I encourage my colleagues to give Dr. Julian the same recognition today and support this resolution honoring him and his great life.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding.

I know all of the folks out in the Bay Area of California are indeed pleased and proud to see you in the Chair. They are as proud as the people in the neighborhood where I live are of Dr. Percy Lavon Julian who lived a few blocks from where I currently live.

□ 1415

Born the son of a railroad clerk and a school teacher, the grandson of a slave, young Percy Julian, early in his life, got ahold of Donald Adams' poem, ''Seven Fold,'' and its charge to ''Go Farther On'' reigned in his spirit.

In academia, racial prejudice followed him like a shadow. He was class valedictorian in 1920 from DePauw University, but still discouraged from seeking admission into graduate school because of potential racial sentiment on the part of future coworkers.

He got straight A's at Harvard University, graduated in 1923. But even with his success, Julian was unable to get a teaching job at any major university because of the perception that white students would refuse to learn under a black instructor.

After he received a Ph.D. degree in organic chemistry at the University of Vienna in 1931, he took a position at DePauw, his alma mater, where he collaborated with Dr. Josef Pikl and successfully created a drug which was used as a treatment for glaucoma. Although internationally recognized for his achievement, however, the color of his skin prevented him from being appointed chair of DePauw's chemistry department.

He became the chief chemist and the director of research at the Glidden Company in Chicago, where he created a flame retardant that saved countless sailors of the United States Navy during World War II.

I might add that my brother worked at Glidden Durkee as a quality control director, because he somehow or another also became a chemist and followed in the footsteps of Dr. Julian.

He discovered that soy sterol could be used to manufacture male and female hormones, progesterone and testosterone. Yet his achievements were not properly appreciated. He created synthetic cortisone, and his products led directly to the development of chemical birth control and medicines to suppress the immune system, crucial in performing organ transplants.

He was named Chicagoan of the Year in 1950. He became the first black to move into the prestigious Oak Park community, but his house was firebombed twice simply because some folk didn't want a black neighbor.

He parlayed his genius into countless awards, has over 100 patents to his credit, became a millionaire in 1961, was asked to serve on numerous commissions and advisory boards, and yet his story is not taught nearly as much as it needs to be.

Racial obstacles can be pernicious, but if we persist, like Dr. Julian, to ''Go Farther On,'' then we all become proud. I am proud of the folks in the community where I live because there are Percy Julian artifacts and memorabilia, schools named after him, streets named after him. He is an icon in the Oak Park community.

I commend again my colleague from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for introducing this resolution.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I had one other request for time, but he is detained at this point. Right now, I don't have any other speakers.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to Dr. HOLT, the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend from Texas.

Madam Speaker, we have heard about the numerous obstacles that Dr. Julian faced, no public high schools for African-Americans in Montgomery, so he had to go as a subfreshman to DePauw University, but his skill, his intelligence, allowed him to thrive there against the adversity. We have heard that a research job fell through because African-Americans were not allowed to stay overnight in a town in Wisconsin where he was going for that work.

We have heard about his contributions: fire retardants, treatments for glaucoma, a low-cost process to produce cortisone. That brings us up to today, why we are talking about this. Of course, we want to honor and recognize someone of such skill and such perseverance, but we want to highlight it for a reason, and that reason is that even today we are excluding people whose talents we need.

African-Americans constitute 14 percent or so of the U.S. population, but receive fewer than 4 percent of the doctorates awarded in chemistry and chemical engineering; hold about 1 percent, one out of 100 chemistry faculty positions in the top universities. These distressing numbers are not just an indication of unfairness. They are an indication of the loss of talent, the loss of creativity, that we need in our society. So this is not just to extol the accomplishments of Percy Julian, but to remind us that we have to make way for these talented individuals in our society today.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, just a few words in closing. We talked about Engineers' Week in the previous suspension resolution. I was just listening to my good friend, RUSH HOLT, talk about the importance of making sure that we encourage people of color and someone like Dr. Julian and many more like him to get an opportunity.

I am sure it must have been awfully difficult back in those days, and actually in 1961, that was when I was a student at Georgia Tech, and there were literally no African-American students at school. I don't remember any at that time, and that was just, what, 46 years ago. It is unbelievable.

But, thank God, you know, times have changed; and certainly to learn about Dr. Julian, I didn't know of him until my colleagues on the majority side, on the Science Committee, brought forward this resolution.

I am honored to manage for the ranking member, Mr. HALL, on this side of the Science Committee and to get to know more about the life of Dr. Percy Julian, talking about the work he did in developing and manufacturing a process for the production of cortisone. Madam Speaker, I can really appreciate him in regard to that, because just yesterday morning, I was lying on an operating table getting cortisone injected into my arthritic neck, and I feel better already. I will say, Thank you, Dr. Julian, for that discovery, and I appreciate it very much.

But it is an honor to pay respect to this gentleman. I am pleased in a reading of his life that, unlike a lot of other people who do great things, and they get honored 25 years after their death, and everybody else seems to capitalize on their discovery, the fact that he was not only honored in his lifetime by the National Academy of Sciences, but also was able to get financial remuneration for his work in the sale of his company to a big pharmaceutical, I think it was Smith, Kline & French or one of the major pharmaceutical companies back in 1961 purchased his company for $2.1 million. Well, that is great, and I am very happy that occurred and happy for him and his family.

It is great to have these good bipartisan opportunities, Madam Speaker. I want to ask all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and I know all my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, to support this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H. Res. 34, which gives long overdue recognition to a great American, Dr. Percy Lavon Julian. Dr. Julian was a brilliant African-American scientist, inventor, civil rights leader and an unsung hero. A pioneer and widely acclaimed for his work in organic chemistry, Dr. Percy broke the color barrier in science. During his lifetime, he made great strides in the field of chemistry. In 1973, he was elected to the National Academy of Sciences in recognition of his outstanding lifetime achievements. He received 19 honorary degrees and was awarded 105 patents, among them a foam fire retardant, a treatment for glaucoma, and a low-cost process to produce cortisone.

Born in 1899, in Montgomery, AL, the grandson of slaves, Dr. Julian overcame many obstacles and racism and went on to be the first member of his family to attend college. He was the valedictorian of his graduating class at DePauw University in 1920, then went on to receive his M.S. from Harvard University in 1923 and later getting his Ph.D. from the University of Vienna in 1931.

At a time of inequality for African-Americans, Dr. Julian persevered and pioneered a commercial process to synthesize cortisone from soy beans and yams, enabling the widespread use of cortisone as an affordable treatment of arthritis. Dr. Julian also became the first to discover a process to synthesize physotigmine, the drug used in the treatment of glaucoma.

Dr. Julian broke down barriers to achieve many significant firsts in his lifetime, one of which was becoming the first Black scientist hired for a high-level corporate research position as director of research at the Glidden Company. It was here during his 18-year tenure that he launched a process for the chemical synthesis of cortisone whose affordability promulgated its widespread use.

Not only was Dr. Julian an esteemed scientist and innovator, he was also a leader in his community and a champion for civil rights. In 1950, on Thanksgiving Day, before moving in to his new home in the exclusive Chicago Oak Park neighborhood, his home was firebombed. Not one to crumble in the face of adversity, Dr. Julian instead fought tirelessly for integration and went on to encourage the Human Relations Commission in the village government and the Oak Park Housing Center in Illinois towards becoming one of the most efficient systems of integration in the country.

Dr. Julian's business savvy was showcased in 1954 when he left the Glidden Company to establish his own laboratories, Julian Laboratories. There he specialized in producing his synthetic cortizone and established Laboratorios Julian de Mexico in Mexico City and used wild yams in Mexico, which he found to be more effective than soy beans for some of his products. His business savvy was further evidenced when he sold the Oak Park plant to Smith, Kline, and Smith for $2.3 million, an astounding amount of money for anyone during that time period.

Dr. Julian played an integral role in his Chicago community as a civil rights activist. He founded the National Negro Business and Professional Committee for the Legal Defense fund, raised funds for the NAACP and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Many African-American pioneers and leaders, who came long before the civil rights movement for equality, were not recognized for the contributions they made to this Nation and were never thanked for bettering our society and contributing to humanity. Too many were forgotten and unrecognized for their diligence and commitment to their field of work and their contribution that continues to affect each and every one of our lives today.

As we draw closer to the month of February and Black History month is recognized, let us take a moment to honor an unsung hero, let us declare that his memory is not forgotten. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and honor Dr. Julian Percy because he embodies the ideals that make America a great nation: pioneering spirit, hard work, innovation, perseverance, and dedication.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I urge support of this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 34.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

HIRE A VETERAN WEEK

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 5) expressing support for the designation and goals of ''Hire a Veteran Week'' and encouraging the President to issue a proclamation supporting those goals.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 5

Whereas the people of the United States have a sincere appreciation and respect for the military personnel who serve in the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas veterans possess special qualities and skills that make them ideal candidates for employment, but many veterans encounter difficulties in securing employment;

Whereas it would be inconsistent, inconsiderate, and contrary to the economic competitiveness of the United States to neglect the post-military needs of the military personnel who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas many of the brave men and women who have served the United States so gallantly and selflessly in the war on terrorism and the war in Iraq since September 11, 2001, are beginning to return home to be reunited with their loved ones and will be reentering the workforce or searching for their first jobs outside of military service; and

Whereas the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Labor, the Office of Personnel Management, and many State and local governments administer veterans programs and have veterans employment representatives both to ensure that veterans receive the services to which they are entitled and to promote employer interest in hiring veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes the importance of the men and women who have served or who currently serve in the Armed Forces of the United States;

(2) supports the designation of an appropriate week as ''Hire a Veteran Week''; and

(3) encourages the President to issue a proclamation calling upon employers, labor organizations, veterans service organizations, and Federal, State, and local governmental agencies (including such agencies in the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any other territory or possession of the United States) to lend their support to increase employment of the men and women who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 5.

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

There was no objection.

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

I want to thank my colleagues for allowing this bill to come to the floor. I want to thank my partner in the bill, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, for his work and support on the measure, and also the chairman and ranking members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and the Armed Services Committee.

The bill calls upon the President to establish a permanent ''Hire a Veteran Week'' to help promote employment of veterans in a more concentrated fashion. Last year the House passed this bill by a voice vote. The bill enjoyed overwhelming support on both sides of the aisle because all of us understood that we had a lot more to do to help our veterans find jobs, start businesses on their own and get ahead as employees; and we still do have much more to do. I am grateful that the House leadership has allowed this bill to come forward today.

One of the reasons I am glad we are doing this is, we need to change the paradigm of how we think about veterans. Too often we spend a couple of days a year, Memorial Day, Veterans Day, thinking about veterans. But for too many Americans, these have simply become additional days to go shopping instead of recognizing the courage, the service, the sacrifice of those who have worn the uniform of our Nation, and that needs to change.

Since September 11, 2001, America has been creating the largest new pool of veterans since the Vietnam era. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have passed through Iraq and Afghanistan, including tens of thousands in our Guard and Reserve. All of these veterans are returning home and many, many of them, need help in obtaining and sustaining employment.

The most basic thing we can do is remind employers on a regular basis that veterans make great employees. It is not just that we owe it to them, although we do. It is not just that it is a matter of fairness, although it is. It is also that they are good workers with real, very real, life experience.

Some companies are making an effort to do this. One of them, in my district, Facile Corporation, has offices at Fort Monmouth, also in Camden, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Washington, Arlington, Colorado Springs and in, Madam Speaker, the State of California as well. Facile is a diversified company providing a range of services to military and civilian clients, information technology services and so forth.

But what makes this company special for me is the fact that 26 percent of its workforce nationwide is comprised of veterans. This didn't just happen. The employer made a conscious and conscientious effort to do so, to hire these veterans.

Last November, just before Veterans Day, I had the privilege of meeting with employees of Facile and learning how this effort to hire veterans truly was a win/win proposition for the company and for the veterans. I came away more convinced than ever that we need to institutionalize that kind of outreach, which is why I am proud to cosponsor this bill with a number of other colleagues here.

□ 1430

We face many difficult days ahead. Those wearing the uniform of the United States, the various uniforms who are serving in harm's way to defend us, face many difficult days ahead. They should not face more difficulties when they come home. One thing we can all agree on is that we need to give our veterans every opportunity to achieve the American Dream. That is the point of this legislation, to create the Hire a Veteran Week and to encourage the President to support the goal of Hire a Veteran Week.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The resolution before us today is identical to H. Con. Res. 125, passed by the House in the 109th Congress on July 24, 2006. I want to thank Congressman HOLT and Congressman BROWN for bringing forward this very, very important resolution.

Vince Lombardi said: ''The harder you work, the harder it is to surrender.'' Maybe that is why the men and women on the front lines today, who have sacrificed the most to achieve a success, remain dedicated to achieving victory in the face of adversity. And it is this determination and dedication that make our veterans such outstanding employees when they return to civilian life.

American veterans, especially those who serve the Nation during challenging times, understand the value of work. When these men and women return to civilian life, they only ask that the Nation, through her employers, recognize the value of their experience as members of our Armed Forces.

Today, our Nation is honored by the service of millions of volunteer service men and women, including hundreds of thousands who have served in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. By putting these veterans to work in our factories, our offices, construction sites, and all types of industries, we give them the opportunity to continue contributing to the Nation they have so honorably defended in uniform.

Today, diversity is a common goal of employers. I would offer that one facet of diversity can only be provided by a veteran, that 1 percent of society that protects and defends the other 99 percent.

I also want to thank those businesses who are proactively working to hire veterans today. I am working with many Arkansas-based businesses. In fact, in my situation and Congresswoman HERSETH's situation, we are working with businesses all over the country, both large and small, to encourage additional veterans outreach. I

urge my colleagues to take the initiative in reaching out to businesses in your communities as well.

To the Nation's employers, large and small, I say hire a veteran. You will get an employee who understands honor and commitment, who is skilled and drug free and loyal. You can't do any better than that.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH).

Ms. HERSETH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 5, a resolution endorsing the designation and goals of Hire a Veteran Week. I would like to thank my friends, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN), for introducing this important resolution.

As the chairwoman of the House Veterans' Affairs Economic Opportunity Subcommittee, which maintains jurisdiction over veterans employment and re-employment matters, I have been working with the ranking member and former chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BOOZMAN, to explore the perceptions, activities, employment practices, and entrepreneurship opportunities for former servicemembers.

The men and women serving in the military today are professional, highly trained, and motivated. And if given the opportunity, they would be valuable additions to our workforce and overall economy.

As we all know, this is a key transitional period for many members of our Armed Forces serving overseas. Increasing numbers of service men and women are expected to return home from Iraq and Afghanistan. The men and women in uniform who defend this country and make our economic and political systems possible have earned a fair opportunity to successfully transition from military service to civilian life and employment.

We have asked hundreds of thousands of our best and brightest, including a great number of National Guard and Reservists from South Dakota and across the country, to serve overseas in Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom.

We owe these brave men and women and their families a great deal for their sacrifice during these difficult times. We owe them the opportunity to make good on the American Dream they have fought to defend. Indeed, our Nation's employers would serve their business, their customers, and their bottom line well by hiring a veteran of the United States military.

H. Con. Res. 5 helps recognize the achievements of veterans and benefits of their employment. I ask my colleagues to support all veterans by supporting this resolution.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN), one of the gentlemen working with Mr. HOLT that was able to bring this resolution forward.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, which will do so much to highlight the contributions made by so many veterans even after they have stopped wearing the uniform.

I want to especially call attention to the hard work of my colleague Mr. HOLT. During the last Congress, I was proud to work with him on this resolution and am glad to see it come to the floor so early in this Congress.

Leadership, teamwork, integrity: these are all skills and qualities that employers today are looking for in order to compete in today's fast-paced and complex business environment. Thankfully, these are all attributes our Nation's veterans bring to the table. Their training in our Nation's military and experience working under pressure have provided them with skills and qualities that should put them at the top of any hiring list.

However, many veterans still find getting a job after they leave our military a challenge. Veterans may not understand how their military skills can translate into civilian life, and employers may not recognize the benefit of focusing on hiring veterans. This resolution highlights some of the ways we are trying to help both veterans and employers.

One tool out there is the Web site HireVetsFirst.gov, which is a comprehensive career Web site for hiring veterans of America's military. The Web site contains dedicated resources for matching employment opportunities with veterans. I urge Members to highlight this Web site as much as possible in the coming weeks.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I want to thank Mr. HOLT for introducing this resolution and thank Chairman FILNER and Mr. BUYER for their work to bring it to the floor. It says a lot that we are considering such an important resolution so early in the 110th Congress.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his good words.

Madam Speaker, now I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and himself a military veteran.

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank him for bringing this important resolution forward.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 5, the designation of Hire a Veteran Week. I encourage the President to issue a proclamation supporting this designation.

I would once again like to thank Mr. HOLT for offering this resolution and thank the committee on Veterans' Affairs, Mr. BOOZMAN, who has been a strong leader on veterans affairs issues. I am proud to be a member of that committee.

As a Member and as a veteran of the United States Army, I understand the important and sometimes difficult adjustments that face our soldiers when they return home from their tour of duty. Securing employment should not be one of those difficult tasks.

Many are not aware that the men and women of the United States military have amazing skills that translate perfectly into civilian occupations. Veterans also have the ability to learn new skills and concepts and can enter the workforce with those skills proven in real-world situations. Veterans know what it means to do ''an honest day's work.'' Employers know that they are gaining someone with a track record of integrity.

Madam Speaker, we must take care of veterans when they return home. We value the commitment that veterans have shown to this great country. We value what veterans have learned from their military experience. Together, we can use that experience to continue our country's prosperity and the individual prosperity of our service men and women. There is no better way to send this message than by hiring a veteran.

I would like to encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important resolution.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. FALLIN).

Ms. FALLIN. Madam Speaker, Oklahoma has a proud tradition of men and women who serve in our military and put their lives on the line to defend our freedoms. We have over 350,000 military veterans and more than one in 10 Oklahomans who serve in the military. And we are very proud of our veterans, Madam Speaker, and we believe that the men and the women returning from the war on terror deserve our honor and our respect and a hero's welcome home.

It is, however, an unfortunate truth that the military men and women returning to duty do not always return to the jobs that they deserve. In fact, military veterans of various ages, both men and women, face considerably higher unemployment rates than their civilian counterparts. Madam Speaker, this is what I believe is an injustice. America's heroes should not return home from the battlefield to face unemployment and hardships.

It is for this reason I wholeheartedly support the creation of a Hire a Veteran Week. The resolution before us today is an important chance for Congress to encourage our employers to help our war veterans returning home by lending them a helping hand in finding employment and supporting their families. We must reaffirm our commitment to our men and women who have served our great Nation.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ), a

member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and himself a retired command sergeant major in the Minnesota National Guard.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for giving me this opportunity.

Madam Speaker, I rise in enthusiastic support of House Concurrent Resolution 5 on Hire a Veteran Week. This resolution will recognize the importance of our service men and women by designating an appropriate week as Hire a Veteran Week and will encourage the President to make a proclamation encouraging all employers to hire veterans.

I spent 24 years in the Army National Guard and did retire as a command sergeant major. Having recruited, trained, deployed with, and returned home with soldiers of many different ages, I know how difficult it can be to reintegrate into everyday civilian life. These veterans, who have sacrificed so much and asked for so little, deserve to return home to a solid job market and solid finances for their family. We owe it to them to use the power of this body to recognize those sacrifices and encourage our employers nationwide to hire veterans whenever possible.

These soldiers are truly the hardest working, noblest Americans we have, and any employer should be fortunate to call these veterans employees.

Madam Speaker, I ask the support, the unanimous support, of the entire House in creating a Hire a Veteran Week and encouraging this great Nation to work to employ its veterans. It is the very least we can do for them when they have given so much to us.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Tennessee is known as the Volunteer State because we have consistently been willing to go and to serve. There are approximately 70,000 veterans in the First District of Tennessee. My district is also the home of the James H. Quillen VA Medical Center, a 500-bed teaching medical facility located in northeast Tennessee.

Veterans possess special qualities and skills such as a strong work ethic, training, discipline, and dedication to make the ideal candidates for employment. Our dedicated men and women have sacrificed so much for us. Now it is our turn to support them.

I would like to encourage President Bush to issue a proclamation calling upon employers, veterans service organizations, and Federal and State and local government agencies to lend their support for an increase in employment for the men and women who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to Mr. ROSKAM of Illinois.

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 5, which we have heard spoken about frequently in the past few minutes; but it is deeply personal to me.

My life was influenced greatly, Madam Speaker, in 1944, and it was actually 17 years before I was born. A fellow named George Jenkins took the beach at Normandy and was killed there. He was an Iowan. And his mother and dad, Roy and Ella Jenkins, decided to do something with his life insurance money. They took it and they chose a young man, who happened to be my father, V.R. Roskam from Iowa, and they plucked him out of adversity and plucked him out of a bad situation. And they paid his tuition, room, board, books, fees, spending money; and they even bought him this class ring that I have on my hand today.

□ 1445

Madam Speaker, it was the generosity of the Jenkins family in honoring a veteran that literally changed my life and the trajectory of our family, even before I was born, even before I was thought of. And so I rise in proud support today of this notion of singling out veterans.

It is an area where so many times in our public life today there is a great deal of strife, it seems, among us. But it is this group of people that we can universally come together and honor and celebrate and hold up high.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 5 which expresses support for Hire a Veteran Week. I could not agree more with this resolution or with the initiative it expresses support for. I believe it should be the goal of all businesses, whenever feasible, to hire a veteran.

Madam Speaker, America's brave men and women put their lives, both personal and professional, on hold to serve this country and defend freedom. The very least we can do as a body is endorse initiatives intended to help with the transition back into society. I am proud to join Members on both sides of the aisle in supporting this legislation and encouraging the President to issue a proclamation supporting the goals of ''Hire a Veteran.''

Madam Speaker, I am an ardent supporter of America's veterans, having already sponsored three pieces of legislation intended to improve veterans' benefits. As such, I will continue to support legislation intended to improve the lives of our veterans and their families.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, with no more speakers present, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to Congressman REICHERT of Washington.

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

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, as a veteran of the United States Air Force Reserve, I am pleased to rise in support of this resolution. It is our responsibility to provide for all of our veterans' needs, whether they are on the front lines of global conflict or in the communities to which they return in civilian life.

Our efforts must be proactive in their outreach and comprehensive in their scope. In a few short weeks, I will be holding a veterans resource fair to further assist Washington State veterans to discover new jobs and job training opportunities. I encourage all of my colleagues to conduct similar events in their districts.

We must forge partnerships between the public and private sectors to help veterans find jobs. I am proud to work with Labor Ready, the Nation's leading provider of temporary labor to support the creation of thousands of jobs and opportunities for jobs for National Guard members and reservists across this country.

This resolution is just one of many measures that we must pass in support of those among us who have made individual sacrifices to preserve our freedom. I hope that we will continue to work together in a bipartisan way to protect and promote meaningful benefits for our veterans.

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE), the ranking member of the Oversight Subcommittee of Veterans' Affairs.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 5.

When men and women of our country separate from the military, they leave with some of the best training and discipline in the whole wide world. While one would think that the private sector employers would jump at the opportunity to hire those individuals, that unfortunately is not always the case. In fact, recently discharged veterans see a higher unemployment rate than the national average.

Today's bill supports the goals of Hire a Veteran Week and sends an important message to support both our Nation's veterans and employers.

Moreover, employers will receive a strong reminder of the highly motivated and skilled segment of our labor force that is sometimes overlooked.

Listen up, America; it is time to help our veterans find jobs as they transition back from the military. I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

(Mrs. MUSGRAVE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

Madam Speaker, I come today with many other colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support House Concurrent Resolution 5, expressing our support for Hire a Veteran Week. Many people go into the military and gain incredible life experiences and discipline. They have so many skills to offer when they come home, and many of them come home wanting to resume a normal life. An important part of a normal life is having a job.

I really believe that the public sector and the private sector can express our gratitude for the sacrifices that these veterans have made on our behalf. Many of these men and women have made economic sacrifices while they have been serving this country, and they need to come home and have encouragement from all of us. So a great way to say thank you is to promote the Hire a Veteran Week.

I am encouraging the President to issue a proclamation in support of this. This is very personal to me. My father-in-law is a veteran, my uncle was a World War II veteran that was captured during the Battle of the Bulge, and my son and daughter-in-law are currently serving in the military.

And I think so many families are affected by this that we benefit, and the veterans and their families will benefit, if we encourage this.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, in closing, I just want to thank Mr. HOLT for his efforts, and Mr. BROWN, in bringing this forward. I can only echo what has being said in this Chamber about the value of hiring veterans and how important this is. We are a nation at war, and these men and women and their families sacrifice greatly.

And so, again, I know that certainly my efforts, I think Congress and their efforts through doing things like this, all of our efforts in trying to solve the problem of putting our veterans back to work.

Again, thank you very much, and a special thanks to the staff for their hard work in bringing this forward.

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

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Madam Speaker, I thank those who have spoken today. I, too, thank the staff of the majority and minority on the Veterans' Committee for preparing this legislation.

Madam Speaker, our veterans returning from Afghanistan and Iraq will require a range of services and assistance in making the transition back to civilian life. We will take up many issues related to those veterans. We will take up issues of war and peace here on the floor.

In the meantime, we should remind all employers, both in the government sector and in the private sector that hiring veterans is a smart choice. Their discipline, their work ethic, their prior service to our Nation make them excellent employees. I know. I have a couple working for me. They are superb.

We should pass this legislation for Hire a Veteran Week because we owe it to those who have borne the battle. We owe it to our country. Employers owe it to their stockholders and their clients and their customers, and they owe it to themselves.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation that I hope will become a reality soon so that we will have a Hire a Veteran Week in America.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, today as we prepare to pass House Concurrent Resolution 5, which will express support for the designation of Hire a Veteran Week, I would like to highlight two people, who have built a Web site that has assisted many of the military heroes and veterans from my Congressional District find employment upon their return home from Iraq and Afghanistan.

In February, 2005, Mark and Tori Baird created the Web site www.hiremarines.com to serve Marines at Camp Pendleton, CA, who were seeking to find either part-time or full employment after bravely serving our Nation. This site quickly caught on with local employers and media, and soon the Baird's received e-mails from military personnel across the country that wanted to use their site. After 6 months, www.hiremarines.com was expanded to included servicemen from all branches of the Armed Forces, both in Southern California and beyond, and the name of the site was changed to www.hirepatriots.com.

As a U.S. Army veteran, I have a sincere appreciation and respect for the military personnel who serve in our Armed Forces. Veterans posses special qualities and skills that make them ideal candidates for employment, and the Congress should do everything that it can to encourage more employers to hire them.

Many of the brave men and women who have served the United States so gallantly and selflessly in the war on terrorism and the war in Iraq since September 11, 2001, are beginning to return home to be reunited with their loved ones. They will soon be reentering the workforce or searching for their first jobs outside of military service.

H. Con. Res. 5 is an important effort to highlight this issue. I hope it will encourage other citizens to follow in the example of Mark and Tori in either hiring veterans, or providing assistance to those that are currently seeking jobs.

This is a small thing to do for these brave men and women who defend our safety and freedom.

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 5, a bill expressing our commitment to expanding employment and business opportunities for our Nation's veterans.

H. Con. Res. 5 will establish Hire a Veteran Week, and encourages the President to issue a proclamation supporting those goals. Our Nation's veterans must be given the opportunities they deserve to make a successful transition to civilian life, and build a successful future for themselves and their families.

There are now more than 25 million living veterans in the United States. These dedicated men and women are among our Nation's greatest citizens. Many of our Nation's leading figures in both the private and public sectors are military veterans.

Military service provides valuable training in a variety of specialized fields, and helps build leadership, problem solving and management skills. Military veterans have also proven their dedication to the service of their Nation and their communities, and are eager for the opportunity to continue serving the public good in whichever field they enter after leaving the military. The opportunities we provide veterans today will benefit our Nation for many years to come.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in thanking our Nation's veterans for their service and supporting H. Con. Res. 5, establishing Hire a Veteran Week, and I encourage all members of the American business community to recognize the value of hiring veterans and contracting with veteran-owned businesses.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 5.

Providing our veterans with the resources necessary to make their transition to civilian life as effortless and successful as possible is a goal all members of Congress share. This resolution reiterates the need for employers to hire veterans.

We must make a commitment as a Nation to ensure the men and women who put on a uniform to protect and defend our Nation have the ability to find employment within the government or private sector upon their return.

While the previous Congress enacted several pieces of legislation to improve Veterans' benefits, there is still more to be done. This resolution takes another step toward focusing our country on the need to increase veteran's employment.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 5, to express support for the designation and goals of Hire a Veteran Week. This concurrent resolution serves to recognize the men and women in our Armed Forces by encouraging support for them when they come home.

One of the biggest items on the agenda of the Democratic majority this Congress is to bring the troops home, because we believe that this is the best way we can support them. At the same time, it is equally critical to continue supporting them once they are home and no longer in active duty, by providing them and their families with the resources they need.

American veterans make up over a third of our nation's homeless population, and about 250,000 live on our city streets. Madam Speaker, it is shameful that those who served

our Nation heroically must endure such conditions.

Last year, the U.S. Labor Department found that 15.6 percent of America's youngest veterans, aged 20 to 24 years old, were unemployed, as opposed to 8.7 percent of non-veterans at that age. This rate has since fallen slightly, perhaps due to the efforts of the U.S. Labor Department's Veterans' Employment and Training Service, VETS. It is important that we join them in recognizing that veterans need and deserve our support at home too.

I commend the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. HOLT, for introducing this resolution to establish Hire a Veteran Week and to encourage employers to remember our Nation's heroes. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Con. Res. 5, a truly outstanding piece of legislation that reflects the best of our values.

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, this resolution expresses the support for the designation and goals of Hire a Veteran Week, and calls upon the President to issue a proclamation supporting these goals. It is identical to the legislation passed by the House in the 109th Congress on July 24, 2006.

America's veterans deserve special employment opportunity more than any other sector of society. These men and women have volunteered to put themselves in harm's way to preserve the Nation's way of life and economic system. They have worn the uniform from pole to pole, often risking their lives not only in combat, but also in exploring, rebuilding infrastructures devastated by natural disasters, providing medical care in remote locations, and transporting refugees from genocide. They answer the Nation's call to duty, asking in return only our support and our thanks.

Veterans are the most diverse communities in America. They come from every major ethnic and socioeconomic group. Today's veterans are goal-oriented, physically fit, know how to take and give orders, and are comfortable with technology. The best way to say thanks to veterans for their service is to give them the opportunity to prove their worth in the workplace.

I also want to thank Congressman JOHN BOOZMAN and Congresswoman STEPHANIE HERSETH for their very effective work during the 109th Congress to improve employment opportunities for veterans, and particularly disabled veterans, and I look forward to their continuing efforts during the 110th Congress.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for allowing this legislation to come to the floor for consideration, and ask that my colleagues support the bill, H. Con. Res. 5.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 5.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Mr. HOLT. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CONGRATULATING LOVIE SMITH AND TONY DUNGY ON BECOMING THE FIRST AFRICAN-AMERICAN HEAD COACHES OF NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE TEAMS TO QUALIFY FOR THE SUPER BOWL

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 90) congratulating Lovie Smith of the Chicago Bears and Tony Dungy of the Indianapolis Colts on becoming the first African-American head coaches of National Football League teams to qualify for the Super Bowl.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 90

Whereas in the 40 Super Bowls prior to Super Bowl XLI, to be held on February 4, 2007, no National Football League (NFL) team that played in the Super Bowl had an African-American head coach;

Whereas on January 21, 2007, in Chicago, Illinois, the Chicago Bears, coached by Lovie Smith—an African-American—defeated the New Orleans Saints by a score of 39 to 14 in the National Football Conference Championship game and advanced to Super Bowl XLI;

Whereas Lovie Smith was named the 13th head coach in Chicago Bears history on January 15, 2004;

Whereas Lovie Smith was named the Associated Press NFL Coach of the Year for 2005;

Whereas Lovie Smith's 11 victories in 2005 are the most by a second-year coach in the history of the Chicago Bears and he became the first second-year coach of the Bears to win a division title, earning the second seed in the National Football Conference playoffs;

Whereas on January 21, 2007, in Indianapolis, Indiana, the Indianapolis Colts, coached by Tony Dungy—an African-American—defeated the New England Patriots by a score of 38 to 34 in the American Football Conference's Championship game and also advanced to Super Bowl XLI;

Whereas Anthony Kevin ''Tony'' Dungy was named head coach of the Indianapolis Colts on January 22, 2002;

Whereas the 2006 season was Tony Dungy's 5th with the Colts and 11th as an NFL head coach;

Whereas Tony Dungy is the 35th coach in NFL history to earn 100 career victories (including playoff victories);

Whereas Tony Dungy leads all NFL head coaches in wins from 1999 to 2005, with a record of 78 wins and 34 defeats;

Whereas the NFL had a record 7 African-American head coaches in 2006 and a record of 197 African-American coaches total, including 7 assistant head coaches; and

Whereas since Frederick Douglass ''Fritz'' Pollard became the first African-American head coach in the NFL in 1922, there have been nine other African-American head coaches in the NFL—including five who are currently serving: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates Lovie Smith of the Chicago Bears and Tony Dungy of the Indianapolis Colts for their accomplishments and for being the first African-American head coaches of National Football League teams to qualify for the Super Bowl.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, this Sunday, history will be made in the National Football League when two African American head coaches battle for a Super Bowl championship.

Not only is this the first time a black head coach has vied for the title, but two have done so in the same season. Lovie Smith, of the Chicago Bears, and Tony Dungy, of the Indianapolis Colts, are hailed as two of the most humble in the league.

In an era where professional sports is crowded with big egos and loud mouths, these two quietly push their players to be better athletes and better individuals.

Like myself, Coach Smith grew up in a small town in the South. Coach Smith talks about how growing up in the small town of Big Sandy, Texas, taught him the values of hard work, self-determination, self-discipline and teamwork. These are American values taught in a small town.

One thing that I admire about Lovie Smith is that he approaches coaching as a professor, as a mentor. He does not yell or swear at his players. He teaches them and motivates them. He builds his players up, reflecting a strength of character to be commended and imitated.

□ 1500

Coach Smith started his coaching career studying under Tony Dungy in Tampa Bay, and the two developed a defense that relied on team speed and hard hitting. They also developed a close friendship that continues, even as opponents in the largest single sporting event in America.

Through their relationship, both have become brilliant defensive football minds and refined player managers. Their class and work ethic make them part of an elite group of coaches, and their contributions continue to have a great effect on league diversity in the coaching ranks. Their achievements stretch far beyond the football field, and their impact is felt throughout the entire African American, as well as the entire American, community.

I congratulate both of these coaches for their hard work and success. Of course I want them both to be successful on Sunday, but I must confess that I would rather that Lovie Smith be more successful than his mentor.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You know, this is really a great Super Bowl we are facing for a number of reasons, not the least of which for the first time we have two African American coaches who are going to be coaching the football teams in the Super Bowl. There has never been an African American coach reach the Super Bowl, and now we have two, both teams. They are two of the finest men you are ever going to want to see coaching football teams, let alone teams in the Super Bowl. Tony Dungy, in his fifth season with the Colts, has compiled a record of 68–20. He has had five playoff appearances, he has had four AFC South titles, two AFC championship games, and finally an AFC championship. He has just done an outstanding job.

And Lovie Smith has done an outstanding job with the Chicago Bears. With a team racked by injuries, his first season he went 5–11. Then they went 11–5 and made the playoffs before falling to the Carolina Panthers. And then this year they made the Super Bowl for the first time since Mike Ditka led the Bears back in 1986.

They are both very fine men. They are not just a credit to the African American race, but they are a credit to humanity. I have watched both of them on television. They are both very strong Christian men, they are both very patriotic men, and they are loved by their teams.

I have not been conversant with how the people in Chicago feel about Lovie Smith, but everybody in Indianapolis thinks that Tony Dungy walks on water; they think he is the greatest coach we have ever had. And he is the kind of guy that, even when he is behind, doesn't know the meaning of giving up. I mean, this last playoff game when they came from behind from a greater deficit than any playoff championship team in history was really something. I admitted, when we were talking about the game the other night on the floor, that in the first half I was so upset I almost changed to American Movie Classics. We were behind 21–3. And I changed over the channel for a minute and I thought, no, I can't give up on the Colts; they won't give up. I changed the channel back, and daggone they came from that deficit to win the game. It was an outstanding championship effort. And it was led by an African American, Tony Dungy, who was the coach.

Lovie Smith did an outstanding job with the Bears. He led them through a very difficult last few seasons and led them to the championship. They were both talking about being the first African American in the Super Bowl, and now they are both at the same time. So I think that really shows what kind of men they are.

The only difference I would have with my colleague on the other side of the aisle who has a great resonant voice, Mr. DAVIS, is that I am one of the few guys here on the floor today who is going to be rooting for the Indianapolis Colts.

Now, we may be outnumbered here tonight. My colleagues are going to be speaking, and most of them are going to be talking about Lovie Smith and the Bears, you will outnumber us, but on Sunday you won't because the Colts are going all the way. As I said the other night, I am blue through and through and I am rooting for the Colts and they are going to win, but I still love the Bears and Lovie Smith, and I am very sorry that they won't win, but he is still a great coach.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana. He is a distinguished Member of this body, and sometimes he is very prophetic, he can predict things. Of course I think today he is making an error. I certainly look forward to Tony Dungy and the Colts not giving up, but I've got a feeling that they might give out.

It is my pleasure right now to yield such time as she might consume to the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus, the originator of this resolution and one who comes from a great sports town where basketball is the name of their game, Representative CAROLYN KILPATRICK from the State of Michigan.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me the time.

Madam Speaker, I am an avid football fan, an avid basketball fan, as well as hockey. Michigan and Detroit proper are always part of that game.

Championships. Unfortunately, two other great teams are in the Super Bowl, one of the most exciting sports activities happening this weekend in Miami, Florida as we have seen since the last Super Bowl was held in Detroit, Super Bowl XL. And I am honored to stand here, as some of my previous colleagues have said, to just pay respect to the National Football League. This is not my first association with them. We have run a coaches' clinic with the National Football League now for some time. They work with high school coaches to develop their skill so that their athletes and graduates will matriculate into the NFL as they go through their college years.

So I am honored to, first of all, thank the NFL for working with us and with the men across this country, that the young men become strong in their character, in their competitiveness and in their nature as they win Super Bowls.

As was said a little bit earlier, Chicago Bears, one of my favorite teams, and thank you, Coach Lovie Smith and the front office and all of you who have brought the Bears this far, to the players, to the wives, to the families for the sacrifices that you have made. We honor you, Chicago Bears; and we wish you the best, Coach Smith.

And also Coach Tony Dungy. I have followed his career for many years. The tragedy that he had last year, we all prayed for him in this Nation, and our prayers are with you as well.

Indianapolis, Chicago, Super Bowl XLI in Miami, just a few hours from now; and for the first time in the history of the sport, which started in 1869, we have not one, but two African American men, Lovie Smith being a protege of Tony Dungy, leading two fantastic teams in one of the greatest sports of mankind.

So I stand here to thank the NFL and to thank the coaches, the players, their families and the institution. It was the NFL who started, in 1987, the Minority Coaches Fellowship that allowed many offensive coaches and defensive coaches to become head coaches. Today, we have three head coaches who graduated from that program and actively working with their sports to bring them this far.

Over the years, and in 2002, the late Johnny Cochran and Cyrus Mehri put forth a program known today as the ''Rooney Program'' after Dan Rooney, who I had an opportunity to meet, the owner of the Pittsburgh Steelers just last year in Detroit during the Super Bowl, which allows and asks that NFL teams consider achievement and expertise, that they might move forward and present championship coaches as has been had right now as we begin to celebrate Super Bowl XLI.

It is a great day that is coming in the next few days. Thank you to the league, as well as to our heroes, Coach Tony Dungy, Coach Lovie Smith. And I don't want to stand here and pick a winner; I like the game too much. Unfortunately, the Detroit Lions won't be there, but we like you, too, Detroit Lions. Just do better next year, okay? But for the rest of the world, and as this sport will be watched across the world, congratulations to the first two African American coaches to reach the Super Bowl.

May the best team win, and we will be hollering and screaming for you all Sunday evening. God bless

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Before I yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Texas, a former judge, before I recognize him, I just want to say that I have wagered some Indiana popcorn for a deep dish pizza and some kind of cake, and anybody that wants to bet on the Bears, call me up, I've got plenty of popcorn.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I certainly appreciate my good friend, Mr. BURTON, yielding, even though I rise to say how much I agree with the gentleman from Illinois about the greatness of Lovie Smith.

Chicago Bears' head coach Lovie Smith is a Super Bowl-bound gentleman. He was born May 8, 1958 in the wonderful town of Gladewater, Texas in my home district in the middle of east Texas. He grew up in Big Sandy, Texas, was voted the boy most likely to succeed in the class of 1976 in Big Sandy High School. He was also part of

three State football championships there in Big Sandy, Texas, where they do know good football.

After playing college ball at Tulsa, where he earned two-time All-America and three-time All-Missouri Valley Conference honors, he began his coaching career at his hometown high school in Big Sandy, Texas.

Now, 2 years later, Lovie Smith began coaching collegiately at Tulsa, Wisconsin, Arizona State, Kentucky, Tennessee and Ohio State. After coaching the linebackers for the Tampa Bay Buccaneers and then helping the St. Louis Rams return to the Super Bowl, Lovie Smith eventually found himself in Chicago as the defensive coordinator for the Bears. The team allowed the fewest points in the NFL in 2005 and ranked second in overall defense. He was named the 13th head coach in Chicago Bears history on January 15, 2004. Coach Smith was named the Associated Press NFL Coach of the Year for 2005.

Lovie Smith and his wife, Maryann, have three sons, Matthew, Michael and Miles, as well as twin grandsons, Malachi and Noah.

Now, Big Sandy City Hall tells us today that they have 1,275 residents; and within that delightfully proud town, there is a street in which Lovie Smith's childhood home was, where he grew up. It burned down a couple of years after they moved, but that street is now marked with a sign that bears the name of Lovie Smith. Coach Smith responded to that naming: ''Where else would I want it to be? Those are my roots; that is where I grew up. Most of who I am today came from that street. There is no other place I would want a sign with my name on it. I am proud of where I came from.''

Let me tell you, Madam Speaker, we are certainly proud of Coach Lovie Smith in east Texas.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, if I ever get an opportunity, I want to go and visit Big Sandy, Texas. So, Representative GOHMERT, you can look forward to visitors coming time and time again.

It is now my pleasure to yield such time as he might consume to my colleague from Chicago, unfortunately, the Bears are in my congressional district, right outside of his district, but we all share the Bears, Representative BOBBY RUSH.

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, the NFL did not have a single black head coach in the modern era until the Oakland Raiders, your district, hired Art Shell way back in 1989. The reason for this was not simply because the NFL was considered a racist league, but it was that teams tended to hire people they knew, team owners hired the individuals who they were familiar with. And they looked for candidates that offered a comfort level and an image of what sports success had always looked like in the National Football League.

□ 1515

Unfortunately, that image was always white, that is, until now, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, regardless of who wins this Sunday, although I proclaim victory, the owners and fans will hopefully realize that success is not always white and male. Hopefully, after Super Bowl XLI is concluded, NFL teams will truly seek to find the best and most qualified candidate to lead their teams, whether they look like Bill Parcells or Dennis Green. Hopefully, other African American assistant coaches and candidates for coaching positions who have never been given an opportunity to coach a team will finally have a chance to make a name for themselves rather than NFL teams continually recycling the same old faces regardless if they have ever been successful or not.

Who knows if it is mere coincidence or not that the Steelers, the Pittsburgh Steelers, hired young Mike Tomlin, the team's first black head coach in its 74-year history and, I might add, an assistant under Tony Dungy in Tampa Bay, on the same day that Lovie Smith and Tony Dungy made the Super Bowl.

Madam Speaker, it is always appropriate at this time to share gratitude and high regards for those individuals who make courageous decisions, and I share my gratitude and my high regards for Steelers owner Dan Rooney, the namesake of the so-called Rooney rule, the man who successfully lobbied in 2002 for a history-making rule that requires all NFL teams to interview minority candidates for coaching jobs before they hire their choices.

It is because of visionaries like Mr. Rooney that people like Lovie Smith and Tony Dungy were even given a chance to become a head coach in the NFL in the first place. And the whole NFL league, indeed the Nation, is better off because of it.

Madam Speaker, I would like to send my congratulations to both coaches, Tony Dungy and Lovie Smith, and to their teams, the Chicago Bears and the other team, and say, Go Bears this Sunday in Miami.

Madam Speaker, I name it and I claim it. On Sunday, the Chicago Bears will be the new NFL Super Bowl champions. And I know my friend and colleague from Indiana realizes that deep down in the pit of his heart.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Before I yield time to my good friend from Illinois, another Bears fan who played football without a helmet, I just would like to say to Congressman RUSH, I want lots of pepperoni on the pizza you are going to buy me Sunday.

I recognize the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) for 3 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. Last week, I placed a wager with one of our colleagues, Dr. JINDAL, and Mr. BOUSTANY, on the Bears and whether they would win a place at the Super Bowl. Who won? The Bears. And now we look forward to welcoming these two sons of Louisiana to pay their football wager, which is to spend a work session at the Lake County, Illinois, Habitat For Humanity, ironically preparing a home for a new family displaced by Hurricane Katrina and now living in northern Illinois.

Regarding the coming contest, my district is home to both Lovie Smith and the Bears' training facility, Halas Hall in Lake Forest. I am honored to represent Lovie, whose life story is an inspiration. Raised in rural Big Sandy, Texas, Lovie's modesty and work led him to become the premier head coach of the NFL. Since his 5–11 start in 2004, his first season in Chicago, Lovie coached the Bears to a spectacular 26–9 record over the past two seasons, including two impressive playoff victories.

Lovie embodies the Bears tradition of tough, hard-nosed football that has defined the organization since its founding in 1919. As the Bears' 19th head coach, Lovie has joined the coaching giants like Mike Ditka and George Halas as leaders of the Monsters of the Midway. Chicago has embraced Lovie as a football icon, and I am proud to honor him on the floor today.

And today we also have a message for the Bears organization. Lovie deserves a raise and a ring because he has earned the respect of everyone from Chicagoland. Best of luck to you, Coach, in Miami. And I won't say anything cheap like, Bears love horse meat for breakfast

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I am going to continue to reserve for a minute. I am hoping that my good friend JULIA CARSON manages to make it over. I know that she is on her way. And so I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I am very happy at this time to recognize another great American and a great Indianapolis Colts friend from Indianapolis, Mr. MIKE PENCE, for 3 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend in case I say anything especially offensive to the Bears.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, let me say from my heart that I am honored to cosponsor this important resolution. It represents an important cultural step in American life. That we would shatter the color barrier and ceiling that for reasons unknown to this Hoosier seem to have prevented the matriculation of an African American head coach to the Super Bowl, that we would shatter it in a way that both teams arrive with distinguished head coaches of African descent is enormously important. I think it sends an extremely important message particularly to African American youth, and I rejoice in that.

Now, as to whether or not the coach of the Bears deserves a raise and a ring, let me say with great respect to Lovie Smith, I rise in particular admiration

of head coach Tony Dungy in his fifth season with the Indianapolis Colts. Under his leadership, the Colts have had a record of 60–20, five playoff appearances, four AFC South titles, two AFC championship games, and as the world watched in wonder a week ago Sunday, an AFC championship.

But as Mr. BURTON attested, it is his career in Indiana off the field that I find more impressive than his career on the field. Since his time in Tampa Bay, he has brought his commitment to Christian values to young people through the Fellowship of Christian Athletes. He launched Mentors for Life, a program that provided tickets to Buccaneers home games to area youth and their mentors. And I was there about a year ago when Coach Dungy welcomed thousands of young people to the arena known as the Wigwam in Anderson, Indiana, and there he shared about his faith and the importance of faith and character and values to the young men and women who gathered there.

Whoever it is that walks away with the ring, and I remain adamantly confident that the horseshoe will leave Miami with the ring, let me say that Tony Dungy has earned a ring and earned our praise as Lovie Smith has. Our admiration to two great men, two great leaders.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I have no speakers, but I will reserve for the purpose of closing.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, we have no further speakers.

I would like to just say that Congresswoman CARSON is not yet here, but I know I speak for her when I say that she admires very much both Lovie Smith and Coach Tony Dungy, and I am sure that she would say if she were here that she is going to be rooting very strongly for the Indianapolis Colts even though she does admire Lovie Smith as a great American and a great leader. And if she were here, I am sure she would also want me to say that she would like a piece of the pizza I am going to get from some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle after the game on Sunday.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, to close, we have heard all of the richly and rightly deserved accolades, and I really can't think of any person in the profession of athletics that I admire more than I do Tony Dungy. He is indeed just a gentleman's gentleman, a man of impeccable character, a man who inspires you. Even if you are rooting for the other team, you still can feel his depth coming through. And so I wish him well. I certainly hope that he will have some reserves to share with my good friend Representative BURTON so he can help him pay off the debt.

But I also want to say that I represent lots of different things in the district that I have. I represent the Bulls, I represent the Bears, Oprah Winfrey, the mayor of the city of Chicago, and we take great pride in all that our community is. Lovie Smith has brought the level of character to the Illinois area, the Chicago community, unmatched. We wish him and the Bears well. And I am going to leave all of the room that I can have for everything that my friends DAN BURTON and JULIA CARSON will bring. Go Bears.

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 90, recognizing the accomplishments of two outstanding head coaches in the NFL, Lovie Smith of the Chicago Bears and Tony Dungy of the Indianapolis Colts. On February 4th, 2007 these two men will not only lead their teams to the field to play in the largest sporting event in America, Super Bowl XLI, they will also become the first African-American head coaches to ever bring a team to the NFL title game.

This past season, both Coach Smith and Coach Dungy experienced tremendous successes, leading their teams to 13–3 and 12–4 seasons respectively, and winning divisional and conference crowns for the cities of Chicago and Indianapolis. But throughout their tenure as coaches in the NFL, these two men have consistently represented the pinnacle of class and humility, providing exemplary role models for their players, families, and any child in America.

Lovie Smith and Tony Dungy are not just competitors, they are also friends and colleagues. Smith served as Linebackers Coach for Dungy during their time together in the Tampa Bay Buccaneers franchise.

During this time, Mr. Dungy served as a mentor and friend for Mr. Smith, engendering the calm and professional manner for which both coaches are highly regarded.

As a lifelong Chicagoan and a Bears fan, I am especially proud of Lovie Smith and the Chicago Bears, and I wish them the best of luck in Super Bowl XLI. This Sunday marks the first Chicago appearance in the Super Bowl in over 20 years, and we are all looking forward to a great game. Regardless of the outcome, the milestone that Coach Smith and Coach Dungy have reached makes Super Bowl XLI even more special. For the first time, an African-American head coach will hoist the Lombardi Trophy over his head as NFL Champion, and we can all be proud of both of the two men poised to earn that honor.

Madam Speaker, I again extend my congratulations to Lovie Smith and Tony Dungy on their outstanding seasons and for their breakthrough at the highest level of coaching. I wish them both the best of luck in all of their endeavors, though I certainly wish Coach Smith a bit more luck this particular Sunday. Go Bears.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, this Sunday, when Tony Dungy takes the field as head coach of the Indianapolis Colts, he, along with Chicago Bears head coach Lovie Smith, will become the first African-Americans to coach a football team in the Super Bowl, the National Football League's championship game.

This is just one accomplishment in the extraordinary life of this native son of Michigan's 7th Congressional District.

Born October 6, 1955, in Jackson, Michigan, Anthony Kevin ''Tony'' Dungy lives his life in a way that truly embodies all the best about south central Michigan.

Dungy attended Parkside High School in Jackson, excelling on the football field, basketball court and in the classroom.

Tony next starred as the quarterback of the University of Minnesota football team from 1973–76. By the time his collegiate career ended, Dungy finished as the school's all-time leader in attempts, completions, touchdown passes and passing yardage.

Dungy played an integral role in the Pittsburgh Steelers' Super Bowl winning season of 1978, when he led the team in interceptions.

Following his successful playing career, Dungy spent time as a collegiate and professional assistant coach, before being named head coach of the Tampa Bay Buccaneers in 1995.

In 2002, the Indianapolis Colts franchise named Tony Dungy its head coach, and this season is Dungy's fifth in Indianapolis and his 11th as an NFL head coach.

Dungy is the first NFL head coach to defeat all 32 NFL teams and became the 35th coach in NFL history to earn 100 career victories in 2005. Dungy also is one of six coaches to win 100 or more regular-season games in his 10 years as a head coach.

During the past four seasons, Dungy's Colts have won four AFC South Division championships and compiled the best winning percentage in the NFL.

As remarkable as Dungy's career on the field has been, he is perhaps best known for his unique contributions off of it.

Dungy and his wife Lauren, proud parents of five, have been involved with multiple organizations in the communities he has coached in, including Fellowship of Christian Athletes, Athletes in Action, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Boys and Girls Club, Basket of Hope and the Prison Crusade Ministry.

Through his example of faith and family, Dungy has impacted thousands of men and women of all ages across our great country.

On behalf of Michigan's 7th District, I would like to extend congratulations to Coach Dungy, a native son, for his outstanding accomplishments this season and wish both he and his family happiness in the years to come.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I proudly rise in strong support of H. Res. 90 to commend both Lovie Smith, head coach of the Chicago Bears, and Tony Dungy, head coach of the Indianapolis Colts, for leading their respective teams to berths in Super Bowl XLI, to be played this Sunday, February 4, 2007, in Miami, Florida. Never before in history has a team playing in the Super Bowl been led by an African American head coach. Super Bowl XLI will make history as the first Super Bowl to feature not one, but two, African American head coaches. Although it has taken 41 years, this is an achievement of which all Americans can and should be justly proud.

Madam Speaker, on January 21, 2007, in Chicago, Illinois, the Chicago Bears, coached by Lovie Smith defeated the New Orleans Saints by a score of 39 to 14 in the National Football Conference Championship game and advanced to Super Bowl XLI. For his phenomenal performance in restoring the Chicago Bears to their former glory as the ''Monsters of the Midway,'' Lovie Smith, the 13th head coach in the storied history of one of the NFL's greatest franchises, was named the Associated Press NFL Coach of the Year for 2005.

In the 2005 season, Lovie Smith's Chicago Bear's won 11 games, the most ever by a second-year coach in the history of the Chicago Bears and he became the first second-year coach of the Bears to win a division title, earning the second seed in the National Football Conference playoffs. The 2006 Chicago Bears won 14 of their 16 games and earned the top seed in the National Football Conference playoffs.

Madam Speaker, on January 21, 2007, in Indianapolis, Indiana, the Indianapolis Colts, coached by Tony Dungy defeated the 3-time Super Bowl Champion New England Patriots by a score of 38 to 34 in the American Football Conference's Championship game to win the right to play the Chicago Bears in Super Bowl XLI for the NFL Championship. Tony Dungy, who is in his 5th season as head coach of the Indianapolis Colts and 11th as an NFL head coach, having previously coached the Tampa Bay Buccaneers to the NFC Championship game in the 2000 season, is one of the NFL's most outstanding head coaches.

For example, Madam Speaker, Tony Dungy is only the 35th coach in the history of the NFL to win 100 games in his career. And Tony Dungy leads all NFL head coaches in wins from 1999 to 2005, with a record of 78 wins and 34 losses. Should his Indianapolis Colts prevail in the Super Bowl, Tony Dungy will join Mike Ditka and Tom Flores and become the newest member of one of the most exclusive clubs in all of sports: a Super Bowl champion as both a player and head coach.

Madam Speaker, the NFL had a record 7 African American head coaches in 2006 and the 197 African-American coaches, including 7 assistant head coaches, is also a record. While no one would dispute that there is still much progress to be made on the sidelines and front offices of the NFL and other professional sports, it is also indisputable that much progress has been made since Frederick Douglass "Fritz" Pollard became the first African American head coach in the NFL in 1922.

For this reason, Madam Speaker, I take great pride in congratulating both Lovie Smith and Tony Dungy and their outstanding football teams for their excellence on the field and the dignity with which they have conducted themselves off the field. I join with the more than 100 million Americans and billions of viewers globally who will be watching the Super Bowl in congratulating these two men and their teams for putting themselves within one victory of the sport's ultimate prize. And I join with viewers and fans everywhere in wishing to see one of the great games in Super Bowl history and hoping that the best team wins.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 90.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. 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, this 15-minute vote on suspending the rules on H. Res. 90 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on suspending the rules on H. Res. 24 and H. Con. Res. 20. Remaining postponed votes will be taken tomorrow.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 425, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—425

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
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
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
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
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Alexander
Davis, Jo Ann
Hastert
LaHood
McDermott
Norwood
Paul
Sullivan
Waters
Wolf

□ 1557

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING THE HOUSE DEMOCRACY ASSISTANCE COMMISSION FOR THE 110TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 24, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 24, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 426, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—426

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
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
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
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
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
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
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Alexander
Davis, Jo Ann
Fattah
Hastert
LaHood
McDermott
Norwood
Paul
Wolf

□ 1607

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM TO ESTABLISH A PUBLIC JUDICIAL INQUIRY INTO THE MURDER OF NORTHERN IRELAND DEFENSE ATTORNEY PATRICK FINUCANE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 20, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 20, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 364, nays 34, answered ''present'' 25, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—364

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel

Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—34

Akin
Baker
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Boozman
Brown (SC)
Campbell (CA)
Carter
Cubin
Culberson
Deal (GA)
Everett
Flake
Forbes
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hayes
Hoekstra
Issa
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Marchant
Poe
Putnam
Rogers (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Turner
Walberg
Westmoreland
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—25

Bartlett (MD)
Bishop (UT)
Bonner
Boyda (KS)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Cannon
Chandler
Conaway
Doolittle
Emerson
Foxx
Gingrey
Gohmert
Hensarling
Hill
Jordan
Lewis (KY)
Manzullo
Matheson
Melancon
Pence
Sali
Tanner
Wilson (NM)

NOT VOTING—12

Alexander
Davis, Jo Ann
Fattah
Hastert
Keller
LaHood
McDermott
Meeks (NY)
Norwood
Paul
Pryce (OH)
Wolf

□ 1617

Mr. MARCHANT changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. CLEAVER changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

Mr. POE changed his vote from ''present'' to ''nay.''

Mr. CONAWAY changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''present.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, earlier today I was in my congressional district at a hearing held by the Virginia State Corporation Commission presenting testimony in opposition to a proposed major increase in tolls on the Dulles Greenway, a commuter route for many of my constituents.

Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 61, H. Res. 90, congratulating Lovie Smith of the Chicago Bears and Tony Dungy of the Indianapolis Colts on becoming the first African-American head coaches of National Football League teams to qualify for the Super Bowl; rollcall 62, H. Res. 24, establishing the House Democracy Assistance Commission for the 110th Congress, and rollcall 63, H. Res. 20, calling on the Government of the United Kingdom to immediately establish a full, independent, and public judicial inquiry into the murder of Northern Ireland defense attorney Patrick Finucane, as recommended by Judge Peter Cory as part of the Weston Park Agreement, in order to move forward on the Northern Ireland peace process.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Speaker, had I been present for the votes on H. Res. 24 or H. Con. Res. 20, I would have voted "yea."

MAKE THIS THE YEAR OF OUR TRANSITION OUT OF IRAQ

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, a front page story in today's Washington Post reports that once again we are sending our troops into harm's way in Iraq ill equipped.

Madam Speaker, it is unconscionable that our Commander in Chief is resigned to send another 21,500 of America's brave sons and daughters into battle again not ''with the Army you want but with the Army you have.''

Although the Deputy Defense Secretary and Chief of Naval Operations told us in the Budget Committee last week that they will need another $5.5 billion just to fund the surge, apparently that is not enough to supply these troops with an adequate number of Humvees or training needed to achieve the mission.

Short-changing our heroes in the face of a relentless insurgency is unworthy of this Nation. If we cannot supply a surge, we must not escalate our presence.

Madam Speaker, let us resolve to make this year the year of transition out of Iraq that Americans have been waiting for. And let us make sure our policy never again falls short of measuring up to the valor and sacrifice of our troops.

URGING A VOTE AGAINST THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, Speaker PELOSI put forth this promise on November 13, 2006, regarding her intentions to govern the House in a bipartisan, well-mannered fashion:

''We will restore civility to our debate. We will restore bipartisanship to the administration of the House, reestablish regular order, and ensure the rights of the minority are heard. The voice of every American has a right to be heard, and that is what the American people expect and deserve.''

Those are the words of Speaker PELOSI. But the actions of Speaker PELOSI and this Democrat majority are very different. And it is no surprise that this week, just like last week and the previous week, the Democrats are railroading legislation through this House. This time it is a $460 billion spending bill that won't see a committee hearing, won't see a committee markup, that won't see the light of day, Madam Speaker, and will cost every taxpayer in America $3,500 apiece.

The Democrats believe that regular order is still out of order. They also believe that campaign promises are not worth keeping.

I believe the American people deserve better, and I think we should vote down this continuing resolution that spends $460 billion of our own taxpayer money.

IMPLORING EVERY MEMBER OF CONSCIENCE TO SPEAK UP CONCERNING THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I just want to take this 1-minute opportunity to address comments through the Speaker to my friends in the Democratic Party.

We are being asked to vote on a continuing resolution tomorrow, $463 billion.

Now, as I understand it, the Democrats didn't have any input. Basically, just the very top had input on how this would be spent.

I would implore every Democrat of conscience, Madam Speaker, to talk to your leadership. This isn't right. You talked about being open and fair, sunlight. This isn't it. Good government means at least you should have some input, even though we are not having any. Talk to your leadership. Let's get some openness, some sunlight into the process for the good of the American people.

I implore every Member of conscience to speak up.

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.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, 110TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)2 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I hereby submit the rules of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for the 110th Congress. These rules were adopted by voice vote on January 18, 2007, at an open meeting of the Committee.

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM—ADOPTION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE—U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 110TH CONGRESS, JANUARY 18, 2007

RULE 1—APPLICATION OF RULES

Except where the terms ''full committee'' and ''subcommittee'' are specifically referred to, the following rules shall apply to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and its subcommittees as well as to the respective chairs. [See House Rule XI, 1.]

RULE 2—MEETINGS

The regular meetings of the full Committee shall be held on the second Thursday of each month at 10 a.m., when the House is in session. The chairman is authorized to dispense with a regular meeting or to change the date thereof, and to call and convene additional meetings, when circumstances warrant. A special meeting of the Committee may be requested by members of the Committee following the provisions of House Rule XI, clause 2(c)(2). Subcommittees shall meet at the call of the subcommittee chairs. Every member of the Committee or the appropriate subcommittee, unless prevented by unusual circumstances, shall be provided with a memorandum at least three calendar days before each meeting or hearing explaining (1) the purpose of the meeting or hearing; and (2) the names, titles, background and reasons for appearance of any witnesses. The ranking minority member shall be responsible for providing the same information on witnesses whom the minority may request. [See House Rule XI, 2 (b) and (c).]

RULE 3—QUORUMS

(a) A majority of the members of the Committee shall form a quorum, except that two members shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, and one third of members shall form a quorum for taking any action other than for which the presence of a majority of the Committee is otherwise required. If the chairman is not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee, the ranking member of the majority party on the Committee or subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

(b) The chairman of the Committee may, at the request of a subcommittee chair, make a temporary assignment of any member of the Committee to such subcommittee for the purpose of constituting a quorum at and participating in any public hearing by such subcommittee to be held outside of Washington, DC. Members appointed to such temporary positions shall not be voting members. The chairman shall give reasonable notice of such temporary assignment to the ranking members of the Committee and subcommittee. [See House Rule XI, 2(h).]

RULE 4—COMMITTEE REPORTS

Bills and resolutions approved by the Committee shall be reported by the chairman following House Rule XIII, clauses 2–4. A proposed report shall not be considered in subcommittee or full Committee unless the proposed report has been available to the members of such subcommittee or full Committee for at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, unless the House is in session on such days) before consideration of such proposed report in subcommittee or full Committee. Any report will be considered as read if available to the members at least 24 hours before consideration, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays unless the House is in session on such days. If hearings have been held on the matter reported upon, every reasonable effort shall be made to have such hearings printed and available to the members of the subcommittee or full Committee before the consideration of the proposed report in such subcommittee or full Committee. Every investigative report shall be approved by a majority vote of the Committee at a meeting at which a quorum is present. Supplemental, minority, or additional views may be filed following House Rule XI, clause 2(l) and Rule XIII, clause 3(a)(1). The time allowed for filing such views shall be three calendar days, beginning on the day of notice, but excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays (unless the House is in session on such a day), unless the Committee agrees to a different time, but agreement on a shorter time shall require the concurrence of each member seeking to file such views. An investigative or oversight report may be filed after sine die adjournment of the last regular session of Congress, provided that if a member gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, minority or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than seven calendar days in which to submit such views for inclusion with the report. Only those reports approved by a majority vote of the Committee may be ordered printed, unless otherwise required by the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 5—PROXY VOTES

In accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives, members may not vote by proxy on any measure or matter before the Committee or any subcommittee. [See House Rule XI, 2(f).]

RULE 6—RECORD VOTES

A record vote of the members may be had upon the request of any member upon approval of a one-fifth vote of the members present.

RULE 7—RECORD OF COMMITTEE ACTIONS

The Committee staff shall maintain in the Committee offices a complete record of Committee actions from the current Congress including a record of the rollcall votes taken at Committee business meetings. The original records, or true copies thereof, as appropriate, shall be available for public inspection whenever the Committee offices are open for public business. The staff shall assure that such original records are preserved with no unauthorized alteration, additions, or defacement. [See House Rule XI, 2(e).]

RULE 8—SUBCOMMITTEES; REFERRALS

(a) There shall be five standing subcommittees with appropriate party ratios. The chairman shall assign members to the subcommittees. Minority party assignments shall be made only with the concurrence of the ranking minority member. The subcommittees shall have the following fixed jurisdictions:

(1) The Subcommittee on Domestic Policy—Oversight jurisdiction over domestic policies, including matters relating to energy, labor, education, criminal justice, and the economy. The Subcommittee also has legislative jurisdiction over the Office of National Drug Control Policy;

(2) The Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service, and the District of Columbia—Federal employee issues, the municipal affairs (other than appropriations) of the District of Columbia, and the Postal Service. The Subcommittee's jurisdiction includes postal namings, holidays, and celebrations;

(3) The Subcommittee on Government Management, Organization, and Procurement—The management of government operations, reorganizations of the executive branch, and federal procurement;

(4) The Subcommittee on Information Policy, Census, and National Archives—Public information and records laws such as the Freedom of Information Act, the Presidential Records Act, and the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the Census Bureau, and the National Archives and Records Administration; and

(5) The Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs—Oversight jurisdiction over national security, homeland security, and foreign affairs.

(b) Bills, resolutions, and other matters shall be expeditiously referred by the chairman to subcommittees for consideration or investigation in accordance with their fixed jurisdictions. Where the subject matter of the referral involves the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee or does not fall within any previously assigned jurisdiction, the chairman shall refer the matter as he may deem advisable. Bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to subcommittees may be reassigned by the chairman when, in his judgment, the subcommittee is not able to complete its work or cannot reach agreement therein. In a subcommittee having an even number of members, if there is a tie vote with all members voting on any measure, the measure shall be placed on the agenda for full Committee consideration as if it had been ordered reported by the subcommittee without recommendation. This provision shall not preclude further action on the measure by the subcommittee.

RULE 9—EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

The chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee shall be ex officio members of all subcommittees. They are authorized to vote on subcommittee matters; but, unless they are regular members of the subcommittee, they shall not be counted in determining a subcommittee quorum other than a quorum for taking testimony.

RULE 10—STAFF

Except as otherwise provided by House Rule X, clauses 6, 7 and 9, the chairman of the full Committee shall have the authority to hire and discharge employees of the professional and clerical staff of the full Committee and of subcommittees.

RULE 11—STAFF DIRECTION

Except as otherwise provided by House Rule X, clauses 6, 7 and 9, the staff of the Committee shall be subject to the direction of the chairman of the full Committee and shall perform such duties as he may assign.

RULE 12—HEARING DATES AND WITNESSES

(a) Each subcommittee of the Committee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the full Committee on any measure or matter referred to it.

(b) No subcommittee of the Committee may meet or hold a hearing at the same time as a meeting or hearing of the Committee.

(c) The chair of each subcommittee shall set hearing and meeting dates only with the approval of the chairman with a view toward assuring the availability of meeting rooms and avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

(d) Each subcommittee chair shall notify the chairman of any hearing plans at least

two weeks before the date of commencement of the hearings, including the date, place, subject matter, and the names of witnesses, willing and unwilling, who would be called to testify, including, to the extent the chair is advised thereof, witnesses whom the minority members may request.

(e) Witnesses appearing before the Committee shall so far as practicable, submit written statements at least 24 hours before their appearance and, when appearing in a non-governmental capacity, provide a curriculum vitae and a listing of any Federal Government grants and contracts received in the previous fiscal year. [See House Rules XI, 2 (g)(3), (g)(4), (j) and (k).]

RULE 13—OPEN MEETINGS

Meetings for the transaction of business and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public or closed in accordance with Rule XI of the House of Representatives. [See House Rules XI, 2 (g) and (k).]

RULE 14—FIVE-MINUTE RULE

(a) A Committee member may question a witness only when recognized by the chairman for that purpose. In accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(j)(2), each Committee member may request up to five minutes to question a witness until each member who so desires has had such opportunity. Until all such requests have been satisfied, the chairman shall, so far as practicable, recognize alternately based on seniority of those majority and minority members present at the time the hearing was called to order and others based on their arrival at the hearing. After that, additional time may be extended at the direction of the chairman.

(b) The chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the Committee by motion, may permit an equal number of majority and minority members to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than thirty minutes for each side.

(c) The chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the Committee by motion, may permit Committee staff of the majority and minority to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than thirty minutes for each side.

(d) Nothing in paragraph (b) or (c) affects the rights of a Member (other than a Member designated under paragraph (b)) to question a witness for 5 minutes in accordance with paragraph (a) after the questioning permitted under paragraph (b) or (c). In any extended questioning permitted under paragraph (b) or (c), the chairman shall determine how to allocate the time permitted for extended questioning by majority members or majority Committee staff and the ranking minority member shall determine how to allocate the time permitted for extended questioning by minority members or minority committee staff. The chairman or the ranking minority member, as applicable, may allocate the time for any extended questioning permitted to staff under paragraph (c) to members.

RULE 15—INVESTIGATIVE HEARING PROCEDURES

Investigative hearings shall be conducted according to the procedures in House Rule XI, clause 2(k). All questions put to witnesses before the Committee shall be relevant to the subject matter before the Committee for consideration, and the chairman shall rule on the relevance of any questions put to the witnesses.

RULE 16—STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

A stenographic record of all testimony shall be kept of public hearings and shall be made available on such conditions as the chairman may prescribe.

RULE 17—AUDIO AND VISUAL COVERAGE OF COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

(a) An open meeting or hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, Internet broadcast, and still photography, unless closed subject to the provisions of House Rule XI, clause 2(g). Any such coverage shall conform with the provisions of House Rule XI, clause 4.

(b) Use of the Committee Broadcast System shall be fair and nonpartisan, and in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 4(b), and all other applicable rules of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Government Reform. Members of the committee shall have prompt access to a copy of coverage by the Committee Broadcast System, to the extent that such coverage is maintained.

(c) Personnel providing coverage of an open meeting or hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee by Internet broadcast, other than through the Committee Broadcast System, shall be currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

RULE 18—COMMITTEE WEBSITE

The chairman shall maintain an official Committee website for the purpose of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee members and other members of the House. The ranking minority member may maintain an official website for the purpose of carrying out official responsibilities including but not limited to communicating information about the activities of the minority to Committee members and other members of the House.

RULE 19—ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF CHAIRMAN

The chairman of the full Committee shall:

(a) Make available to other committees the findings and recommendations resulting from the investigations of the Committee or its subcommittees as required by House Rule X, clause 4(c)(2);

(b) Direct such review and studies on the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the Committee's jurisdiction as required by House Rule X, clause 2(c);

(c) Submit to the Committee on the Budget views and estimates required by House Rule X, clause 4(f), and to file reports with the House as required by the Congressional Budget Act;

(d) Authorize and issue subpoenas as provided in House Rule XI, clause 2(m), in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities within the jurisdiction of the Committee;

(e) Prepare, after consultation with subcommittee chairs and the minority, a budget for the Committee which shall include an adequate budget for the subcommittees to discharge their responsibilities;

(f) Make any necessary technical and conforming changes to legislation reported by the committee upon unanimous consent; and

(g) The chairman is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the chairman considers it appropriate.

RULE 20—SUBJECTS OF STAMPS

The Committee has adopted the policy that the determination of the subject matter of commemorative stamps and new semi-postal issues is properly is for consideration by the Postmaster General and that the Committee will not give consideration to legislative proposals specifying the subject matter of commemorative stamps and new semi-postal issues. It is suggested that recommendations for the subject matter of stamps be submitted to the Postmaster General.

RULE 21—PANELS AND TASK FORCES

(a) The chairman of the Committee is authorized to appoint panels or task forces to carry out the duties and functions of the Committee.

(b) The chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee may serve as ex-officio members of each panel or task force.

(c) The chairman of any panel or task force shall be appointed by the chairman of the Committee. The ranking minority member shall select a ranking minority member for each panel or task force.

(d) The House and Committee rules applicable to subcommittee meetings, hearings, recommendations, and reports shall apply to the meetings, hearings, recommendations, and reports of panels and task forces.

(e) No panel or task force so appointed shall continue in existence for more than six months. A panel or task force so appointed may, upon the expiration of six months, be reappointed by the chairman.

RULE 22—DEPOSITION AUTHORITY

The chairman, upon consultation with the ranking minority member, may order the taking of depositions, under oath and pursuant to notice or subpoena.

Notices for the taking of depositions shall specify the date, time, and place of examination. Depositions shall be taken under oath administered by a member or a person otherwise authorized to administer oaths.

Consultation with the ranking minority member shall include three business day's written notice before any deposition is taken. All members shall also receive three business day's written notice that a deposition has been scheduled.

Witnesses may be accompanied at a deposition by counsel to advise them of their rights. No one may be present at depositions except members, Committee staff designated by the chairman or ranking minority member, an official reporter, the witness, and the witness's counsel. Observers or counsel for other persons, or for agencies under investigation, may not attend.

A deposition shall be conducted by any member or staff attorney designated by the chairman or ranking minority member. When depositions are conducted by Committee staff attorneys, there shall be no more than two Committee staff attorneys permitted to question a witness per round. One of the Committee staff attorneys shall be designated by the chairman and the other by the ranking minority member. Other Committee staff members designated by the chairman or ranking minority member may attend, but may not pose questions to the witness.

Questions in the deposition shall be propounded in rounds, alternating between the majority and minority. A single round shall not exceed 60 minutes per side, unless the members or staff attorneys conducting the deposition agree to a different length of questioning. In each round, a member or Committee staff attorney designated by the chairman shall ask questions first, and the member or Committee staff attorney designated by the ranking minority member shall ask questions second.

The chairman may rule on any objections raised during a deposition. If a member of the Committee appeals in writing the ruling of the chairman, the appeal shall be preserved for Committee consideration. A witness that refuses to answer a question after being directed to answer by the chairman may be subject to sanction, except that no sanctions may be imposed if the ruling of the chairman is reversed on appeal.

Committee staff shall ensure that the testimony is either transcribed or electronically recorded or both. If a witness's testimony is transcribed, the witness or the witness's counsel shall be afforded an opportunity to review a copy. No later than five days thereafter, the witness may submit suggested changes to the chairman. Committee staff may make any typographical and technical changes requested by the witness. Substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments to the deposition transcript submitted by the witness must be accompanied by a letter signed by the witness requesting the changes and a statement of the witness's reasons for each proposed change. Any substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments shall be included as an appendix to the transcript conditioned upon the witness signing the transcript.

The individual administering the oath, if other than a member, shall certify on the transcript that the witness was duly sworn. The transcriber shall certify that the transcript is a true record of the testimony, and the transcript shall be filed, together with any electronic recording, with the clerk of the Committee in Washington, DC. Depositions shall be considered to have been taken in Washington, DC, as well as the location actually taken once filed there with the clerk of the Committee for the Committee's use. The chairman and the ranking minority member shall be provided with a copy of the transcripts of the deposition at the same time.

The chairman and ranking minority member shall consult regarding the release of depositions. If either objects in writing to a proposed release of a deposition or a portion thereof, the matter shall be promptly referred to the Committee for resolution.

A witness shall not be required to testify unless the witness has been provided with a copy of the Committee's rules.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, 110TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Rule XI clause 2, I am submitting the Committee on the Budget's rules for the 110th Congress. The rules were adopted during our Committee's organizational meeting, which was held January 18, 2007.

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, JANUARY 18, 2007

GENERAL APPLICABILITY

Rule 1—Applicability of House Rules

Except as otherwise specified herein, the Rules of the House are the rules of the committee so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege.

MEETINGS

Rule 2—Regular meetings

(a) The regular meeting day of the committee shall be the second Wednesday of each month at 11 a.m., while the House is in session.

(b) The chairman is authorized to dispense with a regular meeting when the chairman determines there is no business to be considered by the committee. The chairman shall give written notice to that effect to each member of the committee as far in advance of the regular meeting day as the circumstances permit.

(c) Regular meetings shall be canceled when they conflict with meetings of either party's caucus or conference.

Rule 3—Additional and special meetings

(a) The chairman may call and convene additional meetings of the committee as the chairman considers necessary, or special meetings at the request of a majority of the members of the committee in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(c).

(b) In the absence of exceptional circumstances, the chairman shall provide written notice of additional meetings to the office of each member at least 24 hours in advance while Congress is in session, and at least 3 days in advance when Congress is not in session.

Rule 4—Open business meetings

(a) Each meeting for the transaction of committee business, including the markup of measures, shall be open to the public except when the committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(g)(1).

(b) No person other than members of the committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the committee may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public.

Rule 5—Quorums

A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum. No business shall be transacted and no measure or recommendation shall be reported unless a quorum is actually present.

Rule 6—Recognition

Any member, when recognized by the chairman, may address the committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration before the committee. The time of such member shall be limited to 5 minutes until all members present have been afforded an opportunity to comment.

Rule 7—Consideration of business

Measures or matters may be placed before the committee, for its consideration, by the chairman or by a majority vote of the members of the committee, a quorum being present.

Rule 8—Availability of legislation

The committee shall consider no bill, joint resolution, or concurrent resolution unless copies of the measure have been made available to all committee members at least **[4]** *6* hours prior to the time at which such measure is to be considered. When considering concurrent resolutions on the budget, this requirement shall be satisfied by making available copies of the complete chairman's mark (or such material as will provide the basis for committee consideration). The provisions of this rule may be suspended with the concurrence of the chairman and ranking minority member.

Rule 9—Procedure for consideration of budget resolution

(a) It shall be the policy of the committee that the starting point for any deliberations on a concurrent resolution on the budget should be the estimated or actual levels for the fiscal year preceding the budget year.

(b) In the consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget, the committee shall first proceed, unless otherwise determined by the committee, to consider budget aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters on a tentative basis, with the document before the committee open to amendment. Subsequent amendments may be offered to aggregates, functional categories, or other appropriate matters, which have already been amended in their entirety.

(c) Following adoption of the aggregates, functional categories, and other matters, the text of a concurrent resolution on the budget incorporating such aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters shall be considered for amendment and a final vote.

Rule 10—Roll call votes

A roll call of the members may be had upon the request of at least one-fifth of those present. In the apparent absence of a quorum, a roll call may be had on the request of any member.

HEARINGS

Rule 11—Announcement of hearings

The chairman shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any committee hearing at least 1 week before the hearing, beginning with the day in which the announcement is made and ending the day preceding the scheduled hearing unless the chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

Rule 12—Open hearings

(a) Each hearing conducted by the committee or any of its task forces shall be open to the public except when the committee or task force, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, or would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. The committee or task forces may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

(b) For the purposes of House Rule XI, clause 2(g)(2), the task forces of the committee are considered to be subcommittees.

Rule 13—Quorums

For the purpose of hearing testimony, not less than two members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

Rule 14—Questioning witnesses

(a) Questioning of witnesses will be conducted under the 5-minute rule unless the committee adopts a motion pursuant to House Rule XI clause 2(j).

(b) In questioning witnesses under the 5-minute rule:

(1) First, the chairman and the ranking minority member shall be recognized;

(2) Next, the members present at the time the hearing is called to order shall be recognized in order of seniority; and

(3) Finally, members not present at the time the hearing is called to order may be recognized in the order of their arrival at the hearing.

In recognizing members to question witnesses, the chairman may take into consideration the ratio of majority members to minority members and the number of majority and minority members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

Rule 15—Subpoenas and oaths

(a) In accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(m) subpoenas authorized by a majority of the committee may be issued over the

signature of the chairman or of any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or such member.

(b) The chairman, or any member of the committee designated by the chairman, may administer oaths to witnesses.

Rule 16—Witnesses' statements

(a) So far as practicable, any prepared statement to be presented by a witness shall be submitted to the committee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation, and shall be distributed to all members of the committee in advance of presentation.

(b) To the greatest extent possible, each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or sub-grant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years.

PRINTS AND PUBLICATIONS

Rule 17—Committee prints

All committee prints and other materials prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the committee prior to any distribution, unless such print or other material shows clearly on its face that it has not been approved by the committee.

Rule 18—Committee publications on the Internet

To the maximum extent feasible, the committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

STAFF

Rule 19—Committee staff

(a) Subject to approval by the committee, and to the provisions of the following paragraphs, the professional and clerical staff of the committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the chairman.

(b) Committee staff shall not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to committee business, and shall be selected without regard to race, creed, sex, or age, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions.

(c) All committee staff shall be entitled to equitable treatment, including comparable salaries, facilities, access to official committee records, leave, and hours of work.

(d) Notwithstanding paragraphs a, b, and c, staff shall be employed in compliance with House rules, the Employment and Accountability Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and any other applicable Federal statutes.

Rule 20—Staff supervision

(a) Staff shall be under the general supervision and direction of the chairman, who shall establish and assign their duties and responsibilities, delegate such authority as he deems appropriate, fix and adjust staff salaries (in accordance with House Rule X, clause 9(c)) and job titles, and, at his discretion, arrange for their specialized training.

(b) Staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority members of the committee, who may delegate such authority, as they deem appropriate.

RECORDS

Rule 21—Preparation and maintenance of committee records

(a) A substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings shall be made of all hearings and business meetings subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(b) The proceedings of the committee shall be recorded in a journal, which shall among other things, include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

(c) Members of the committee shall correct and return transcripts of hearings as soon as practicable after receipt thereof, except that any changes shall be limited to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(d) Any witness may examine the transcript of his own testimony and make grammatical, technical, and typographical corrections.

(e) The chairman may order the printing of a hearing record without the corrections of any member or witness if he determines that such member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time for correction, and that further delay would seriously impede the committee's responsibility for meeting its deadlines under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) Transcripts of hearings and meetings may be printed if the chairman decides it is appropriate, or if a majority of the members so request.

Rule 22—Access to committee records

(a)(1) The chairman shall promulgate regulations to provide for public inspection of roll call votes and to provide access by members to committee records (in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(e)).

(2) Access to classified testimony and information shall be limited to Members of Congress and to House Budget Committee staff and staff of the Office of Official Reporters who have appropriate security clearance.

(3) Notice of the receipt of such information shall be sent to the committee members. Such information shall be kept in the committee safe, and shall be available to members in the committee office.

(b) The records of the committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the committee.

OVERSIGHT

Rule 23—General oversight

(a) The committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject of which is within its jurisdiction.

(b) The committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under clause (1)(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House, and, subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 6 of Rule X, to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Government Reform in accordance with the provisions of clause (2)(d) of House Rule X.

REPORTS

Rule 24—Availability before filing

(a) Any report accompanying any bill or resolution ordered reported to the House by the committee shall be available to all committee members at least 36 hours prior to filing with the House.

(b) No material change shall be made in any report made available to members pursuant to section (a) without the concurrence of the ranking minority member or by a majority vote of the committee.

(c) Notwithstanding any other rule of the committee, either or both subsections (a) and (b) may be waived by the chairman or with a majority vote by the committee.

Rule 25—Report on the budget resolution

The report of the committee to accompany a concurrent resolution on the budget shall include a comparison of the estimated or actual levels for the year preceding the budget year with the proposed spending and revenue levels for the budget year and each out year along with the appropriate percentage increase or decrease for each budget function and aggregate. The report shall include any roll call vote on any motion to amend or report any measure.

Rule 26—Parliamentarian's Status Report and Section 302 Status Report

(a)(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 311 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending and revenues as compared to the levels set forth in the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the committee shall advise the Speaker on at least a monthly basis when the House is in session as to its estimate of the current level of spending and revenue. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the committee, transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Parliamentarian's Status Report, and printed in the Congressional Record.

(2) The committee authorizes the chairman, in consultation with the ranking minority member, to transmit to the Speaker the Parliamentarian's Status Report described above.

(b)(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 302 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of committees as compared to the appropriate allocations made pursuant to the Budget Act in conformity with the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the committee shall, as necessary, advise the Speaker as to its estimate of the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of appropriate committees. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the committee and transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Section 302 Status Report.

(2) The committee authorizes the chairman, in consultation with the ranking minority member, to transmit to the Speaker the Section 302 Status Report described above.

Rule 27—Activity report

After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, the Chair of the committee may file any time with the Clerk the committee's activity report for that Congress pursuant to clause (1)(d)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House without the approval of the committee, if a copy of the report has been available to each member of the committee for at least seven calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the committee.

MISCELLANEOUS

Rule 28—Broadcasting of meetings and hearings

(a) It shall be the policy of the committee to give all news media access to open hearings of the committee, subject to the requirements and limitations set forth in House Rule XI, clause 4.

(b) Whenever any committee business meeting is open to the public, that meeting

may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 4.

Rule 29—Appointment of conferees

(a) Majority party members recommended to the Speaker as conferees shall be recommended by the chairman subject to the approval of the majority party members of the committee.

(b) The chairman shall recommend such minority party members as conferees as shall be determined by the minority party; the recommended party representation shall be in approximately the same proportion as that in the committee.

Rule 30—Waivers

When a reported bill or joint resolution, conference report, or anticipated floor amendment violates any provision of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman may, if practical, consult with the committee members on whether the chairman should recommend, in writing, that the Committee on Rules report a special rule that enforces the Act by not waiving the applicable points of order during the consideration of such measure.

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.)

NUMBER 183, BRING OUR TROOPS HOME, THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, let me say you look wonderful up there in that chair.

Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about the forgotten victims of this war: the children and the legacy we leave them.

Today, I placed a pair of baby-sized shoes on my front office door. They were presented to me by the pro-peace organization Code Pink. These tiny shoes symbolize the passing of one of the tens of thousands of Iraqis who have been killed over the past 4 years. Her name is Aisha al Tarish, and she was 2 years old.

But these shoes also symbolize the children here in the United States who will grow up without a parent because he or she died while fighting so bravely in our Armed Forces.

What too many are ignoring in this debate is the toll that this occupation of Iraq is taking on children here at home, in Iraq, and around the world. In fact, my 7-year-old grandson recently asked his dad, he said, Daddy, what do the children in Iraq do when bombs are going off?

How do you answer that? My son said, I think you ought to talk that over with your grandma, Teddy.

Why are we ignoring the legacy of fear of death and of insecurity? So many children are growing up in a world that has been at war since they were born. They can't feel secure. In fact, just going to school for an Iraqi child every day is a risk. And that is the risk that Teddy pointed out to us.

I know, as a grandmother, this is not the world I envisioned for my grandchildren and for their children to come. It seems like President Bush is pushing forth in Iraq absolutely despite opposition from every corner because he wants to protect his standing in the world.

What legacy are we leaving for the world's children? Our presence in the region is leaving a legacy of occupation and hate.

An administration that refuses to negotiate and refuses diplomacy gives rise to a legacy of war and the very terrorism we want to defeat, and one of the saddest legacies of all, a generation of veterans and their families without medical care, without mental health care, without jobs and businesses to return to, without homes.

This is not the legacy this country was built upon. It is not the legacy I intend to leave for our children.

The only answer to this is stop this misguided occupation. If we really want to offer a future of hope to the children of America and the children of Iraq, we must bring our troops home now. We must help the Iraqis. We must help them establish a working infrastructure, and we must help them establish a security force. We must fully fund our commitment to our veterans.

This month I introduced H.R. 508, the Bring the Troops Home from Iraq and Iraq Sovereignty Restoration Act. This is a real and comprehensive plan to accomplish these goals, to provide a safe and secure future for the youngest victims of this war.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill, to send the message that we will stand up for the troops, we will stand up for those victims and those voices who have been ignored for too long: the children.

TWO U.S. BORDER PATROL AGENTS IN FEDERAL PRISON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COHEN). 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, soon the page will bring forward a photo of two border agents who are now in prison. And it is a travesty of injustice as bad as I have ever seen.

The portrait is of the two border agents, Mr. Compean and Mr. Ramos. Mr. Compean has a wife and three children, one, his youngest, 4 months old. Agent Ramos has a wife and three sons.

Mr. Speaker, many of us in the House have made the House aware of this case. These agents were convicted last spring for wounding a Mexican drug smuggler who brought 743 pounds of marijuana across our southern border into Texas. The agents fired shots during a foot chase with the smuggler, who had fled in a van they were pursuing. The van contained approximately $1 million worth of marijuana. The U.S. Attorney's Office prosecuted the agents and granted immunity to a known drug smuggler for his testimony against our border agents.

This prosecution has been questioned by many Members of Congress and by citizens throughout this country. These men never should have been prosecuted; yet they are now handcuffed in Federal prison. We have repeatedly petitioned President Bush to pardon these agents.

Mr. Speaker, after months of silence, the President said in a television interview last week that he would take a ''sober look'' at the case and a ''tough look at the facts'' to see whether these agents should be pardoned.

I hope that at this time the President and his staff will take an honest look at the facts of this case. The facts will tell the President what countless citizens and Members of Congress already know, that the United States Attorney's Office was on the wrong side of this case. The U.S. Attorney's Office prosecuted the agents almost exclusively on the testimony of an admitted drug smuggler who claimed he was unarmed.

The drug smuggler received full medical care in El Paso, Texas, was permitted to return to Mexico, and is now suing the Border Patrol for $5 million for violating his civil rights.

The drug smuggler is not an American citizen. He is a criminal.

Mr. Speaker, the extraordinary details surrounding the prosecution of this case ensure that justice has not been served. For the sake of the agents and their families and for the sake of the American people whom they were working to protect, I encourage the President of the United States to obtain the transcripts of this trial and review the facts of this case as soon as possible.

Real justice does not fear the truth. Real justice does not fear the truth. By pardoning these two innocent men, the President can immediately reverse an injustice that never should have happened to these Hispanic Americans.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to reiterate that Agent Compean and his wife have three children and one, his youngest, 4 months old; and that Agent Ramos, himself, and his wife have three sons.

Congressman POE, who will be speaking in a few minutes on another issue, I am sure, has been outspoken on this—and a number of other Members and even some on the Democratic side. This is an injustice that should never happen to an American citizen, never under any circumstances.

Mr. President, please look at the facts of this case. Free these men. They have no business being in a Federal penitentiary for trying to protect the American citizens.

And God bless America

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1630

FOREIGN NATIONS SHOULD PAY FOR CRIMES OF THEIR CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COHEN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, a young 8-year-old-girl in Florida is kidnapped, raped and buried alive under a large concrete slab by an illegal.

A decorated Houston police officer is shot in the back four times and murdered by an illegal. A Texas State trooper was shot six times at point-blank range and left for dead at the side of the road by an illegal.

''The Railroad Killer,'' a violent predator who terrorized, stalked, raped and murdered 12 victims along the Texas railroads, an illegal. One study indicates that there are nearly 240,000 illegals who are sex offenders in the United States. They commit a total of one million crimes. These illegals create millions of victims who seek treatment and aid because they are victims.

The United States does a good job of taking care of crime victims. We have created crime compensation funds in States, programs that aid in the recovery and help with the cost of treatment, but the cost is paid by America.

Many victims are never compensated, however, and spend their life in pain and even in poverty. So why should not the country of the illegal pay for this crime as well? Countries who encourage the criminals to invade the United States should be held just as responsible as illegal perpetrators.

U.S. victims, Mr. Speaker, should be allowed to seek monetary compensation from the country the illegal came from. News sources report that a 2006 FBI report on undocumented illegals found that 95 percent of the murder warrants in Los Angeles are for illegals; 83 percent in Phoenix; 86 percent, Albuquerque. Seventy-five percent of those on the most-wanted lists in L.A., Phoenix and Albuquerque are illegals.

A recent Department of Justice study concluded that criminal illegals, once arrested, are likely to be re-arrested six more times for other crimes. They are preying on innocent victims in the United States, both citizens and legal immigrants. When they are caught, some of them even flee back to their country.

These countries should be held liable for the crimes that their citizens commit. A victim of crime by an illegal should be entitled to receive damages from the country which encourages illegal entry into the United States. Many countries, such as Mexico, Brazil, El Salvador, encourage their citizens to illegally enter the United States. Because of that, these nations should be held financially responsible for the crimes of their citizens, and victims should be allowed to have a cause of action in American Federal courts against these nations.

Now, we know many times that these nations probably will not pay for that compensation for whatever reason. They just do not pay. If that is the case, then the victims should be allowed to apply through the State Department Foreign Aid Fund that we give these nations, like Mexico, and then receive just compensation, the compensation that they were awarded in Federal court.

Victims should not have to continue to pay for the crimes of illegals. Their nations must pay. Illegals and their nations should be accountable and held accountable for the failure by coming into the United States illegally.

Americans seem to always pay for illegal entry; those days need to end, and this is one way where countries should pay for the crimes of their illegals by compensating American crime victims and citizens or people that are here legally from other nations.

Mr. Speaker, that's just the way it is.

VACATING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the 5-minute Special Order in favor of Mr. PALLONE is vacated.

There was no objection

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

GLOBAL WARMING ALARMISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, conservatives who oppose world government and massive foreign aid, such as our very unconservative war in Iraq, are sometimes called isolationists. However, anyone who makes the isolationist charge is really resorting to childish name-calling rather than a discussion on the merits.

Another major issue on which there is a lot of name-calling these days is the debate over global warming. Just today the Oversight and Government Reform Committee held a one-sided hearing on allegations that the Bush administration is guilty of political interference in the global warming debate. The implication was that Federal scientists are being intimidated by those who are skeptical about global warming.

Actually, the intimidation is coming from those who believe that global warming is the biggest or one of the biggest problems we face. Global warming alarmists get very angry if anyone even dares to question their views.

Richard Lindzen, a professor of atmospheric science at MIT wrote a few months ago about what he called, ''the sinister side to this feeding frenzy about global warming.''

Professor Lindzen said, ''Scientists who dissent from the alarmism have seen their grant funds disappear, their work derided and themselves libeled as industry stooges, scientific hacks or worse. Consequently, lies about climate change gain credence, even when they fly in the face of the science that is supposedly their basis.''

Professor David Deming, a geophysicist, said, ''The media hysteria on global warming has been generated by journalists who do not understand the provisional and uncertain nature of scientific knowledge. Science changes.''

And Robert Bradley, president of the Institute for Energy Research, writing in the Washington Times, said, ''The emotional politicized debate over global warming has produced a fire-ready-aim mentality, despite great and still-growing scientific uncertainty about the problem.''

Mr. Bradley added, ''Still climate alarmists demand a multitude of do-somethings to address the problem they are sure exists and is solvable. No job is too big for government because they welcome bigger and bigger government. They pronounce the debate over in their favor, and call their critics names such as 'deniers,' as in Holocaust deniers. This has created a bad climate for scientific research and for policymaking. In fact, the debate is more than unsettled.''

I can produce hundreds of quotes like this from experts and scientists who question or are skeptical about the wild claims from some climate change alarmists. And the charge that the Bush administration is intimidating scientists or suppressing their work seems to be coming from scientists who want more attention or publicity or who want to make themselves out to be some sort of courageous, heroic martyrs.

Actually the Bush administration has spent $25 billion on global warming and climate change research in the last 5 years, far more than any previous administration. Almost all global warming alarmists either work full time for the Federal Government or get Federal funding for their research. They know they are very unlikely to get more Federal money unless they say this problem is terrible and getting worse all the time.

There may be some global warming and some of it may be bad. In some places it may be good. However, we need to make sure we solve the problems that exist without destroying our economy, or harming humanity in the process. The worst polluters in the

world have been the Socialist and Communist countries.

Only free market systems generate the excess funds to do the good things for the environment that all of us want done. Anger and name-calling and biased hearings will not solve any serious or legitimate problems.

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.)

HONORING TERRY MILFRED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Terry Milfred upon his retirement as superintendent of the Weston School District. Terry is a dedicated public servant who has earned the respect and admiration of the teachers, staff and over 300 students under his supervision.

Most recently, Terry is revered for his efforts in comforting and uniting the local community after a tragic shooting last fall at Weston High School that took the life of a dear friend to Terry, and the schools well-respected principal, John Klang.

One hundred twenty-five students were left stunned on September 29, 2006, when a fellow classmate opened fire on faculty members and peers. Fortunately for the students of Weston High School, Principal John Klang, in the most unselfish act one person can do for others, sacrificed himself to protect his students and his faculty.

Terry Milfred and the dedicated members of his staff took immediate action and displayed steadfast leadership, establishing a safe environment in consoling the students and the faculty. In an effort to recover from this tragedy and the loss of an incredible principal, others in the administration, such as Tom Andreas and Melissa Nigh, stepped forward to ensure that students and faculty received the support that they needed.

Together, Tom, Melissa and Terry summoned leaders from around the State, forming a crisis management team to address the specific needs of each individual impacted by this tragedy. The students of Weston High School should also be commended for the courage and selflessness they displayed in overcoming this hardship and uniting as a student body.

As a husband, father, grandfather, and role model to students, parents, and members of his staff, Terry has bettered the lives of numerous individuals. He has risen to the challenge of protecting those in his care and mentoring those dearest to him. Prior to the unfortunate incident last fall, Terry served as an adviser to Principal Klang. While much of their time was spent conversing in school hallways and cafeterias, Terry and John had a relationship and respect for one another that extended beyond the classroom door.

Principal Klang was a dear friend to many and he will be greatly missed.

In memory of Principal Klang and in an effort to prepare others if such an unfortunate incident should occur in their community, Terry has dedicated countless hours addressing school groups and educators on methods to handle school violence.

Although Terry Milfred is retiring from the superintendent position, he will remain a visible actor in the lives of students and teachers at Weston School District. His advocacy and community work will leave a lasting legacy for the entire community, and the area will continue to benefit from all that he has done.

On behalf of the students and faculty of Weston School District, I would like to thank Terry for his many years of tireless service and for bringing hope in the shadows of tragedy and despair.

I wish Terry a very long and a very happy retirement.

□ 1645

BLUE DOG COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I rise on behalf of the 44-member strong fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition.

Mr. Speaker, as you walk the Halls of Congress, you will notice these Blue Dog Coalition posters along the hallways which signify that you are walking by the door to an office of a fellow Blue Dog Member. And the reason you will find these posters scattered across the Cannon, Longworth and Rayburn House Office Buildings is because we are committed to restoring common sense and fiscal discipline to our Nation's government. And it is important to us, Mr. Speaker, that we remind every Member of Congress, as well as the general public that walk these Halls, that our Nation is in debt. In fact, the U.S. national debt, as of today, is $8,721,415,192,294. And we ran out of room on the poster, Mr. Speaker, but 43 cents. Our national debt, $8,721,415,192,294.43. That is a big number. What does it mean?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what it means. For every man, woman and child living in America, including those children being born today, their share of the national debt is $29,093.20. It is what we refer to as the debt tax, D-E-B-T. That is one tax that cannot be cut, that cannot go away until we get our Nation's fiscal house in order.

Why is it important? Because our Nation is borrowing about $1 billion a day. But, Mr. Speaker, before we borrow $1 billion a day, we are going to spend a half a billion dollars paying interest on the debt we have already got. And many of America's priorities in the area of education, veterans benefits, health care, roads, many of America's priorities continue to go unmet and they will until we get our Nation's fiscal house in order.

As members of the Blue Dog Coalition, which is just another name for fiscally conservative Democrats, we are concerned about this. But, Mr. Speaker, our concerns do not end with the debt and the deficit. We are also concerned about accountability, and this Democratic Congress is going to restore accountability to this Chamber, to this administration, and, yes, to the Government of the United States of America.

The Constitution clearly gives Congress, not only the power and the authority, but it is our constitutional duty to provide oversight of this administration. And yet this Republican Congress that we have had for the past 6 years has been nothing more than a rubber stamp for President Bush and his administration.

It is time that Congress did its job. It is time that Congress put the rubber stamp in the drawer and pull out the Constitution and read it and understand that we have a duty, a constitutional duty, to provide oversight to this administration and to this government. We are going to do that. And we are doing it in many areas, including providing for accountability for how the hardworking people of this country's tax money is being spent in places like Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, you ask a hundred different people what they think about this Iraq war policy, you will get about a hundred different answers. And by the way, very few or none of them are going to agree with the direction that President Bush is currently going. If you ask fellow Blue Dog members, you will get different answers as well. I, personally, am opposed to the surge. Others may not be. That is something that we believe each Member must make a decision on and speak from their heart and represent their constituency.

But one of the things that we are united on as Blue Dog members is restoring accountability for how this money is being spent in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I want to show here a couple of numbers that are very important. One is the cost of the Iraq war. They spent $2.5 billion pre-invasion in 2001 and 2002. In 2003, $51 billion was spent. In 2004, $77.3 billion was spent. In 2005, $87.3 billion was spent. In 2006, $100.4 billion. 2007, to date, we are getting ready to vote on another supplemental appropriation bill for the war, but to date, $60 billion. That puts the total cost to the taxpayers of America at nearly $400 billion, $378.5 billion.

Now, what does that mean? That is a lot of money. How do you break it out? The total cost for 2006 alone, $100.4 billion. That is $8.44 billion per month of your tax money, Mr. Speaker, going to Iraq.

Another way of putting it, $275 million a day, or about 11 or $12 million per hour. And yet there has been a lack of accountability on how your tax money is being accounted for and how it is being spent in Iraq.

So we, Mr. Speaker, have what is called House Resolution 97 that we have filed as members of the Blue Dog Coalition. And it is a resolution to provide for Operation Iraqi Freedom cost accountability. And let me just get to the meat of it. Basically, the resolution says this: that within 30 days after the adoption of this resolution, and every 90 days thereafter, the Department of Defense Inspector General and the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction shall prepare and transmit to Congress an unclassified report with a classified annex, if necessary, that would contain, one, a detailed accounting of how military and reconstruction funds in Iraq have been spent thus far; two, a detailed accounting of the types and terms of contracts awarded on behalf of the United States, including the methods by which such contracts were awarded and contractors selected; three, a description of efforts to obtain support and assistance from other countries toward the rehabilitation of Iraq; and, four, an assessment of what additional funds is needed to complete military operations and reconstruction efforts in Iraq, including a plan for security of Iraq, a detailed plan for how any future funds will be spent and a statement of how those funds will advance the interests of the United States and Iraq.

If either Inspector General fails to submit a quarterly report, the Government Accountability Office shall conduct an audit and report to Congress. Sanctions shall be imposed against contractors who have engaged in fraud or abuse or war profiteering. Congress should create a Truman-like committee to conduct an ongoing study and investigation of the awarding and carrying out of contracts by the United States to conduct activities with regard to Operation Iraqi Freedom and make such recommendations to the House as the Select Committee deems appropriate.

Funding requests for Operation Iraqi Freedom in fiscal year 2008 and beyond must come through the regular appropriations process and not be hidden through these so-called emergency supplementals. In furtherance of the partnership that is critical to success in Operation Iraqi Freedom, the administration should firmly condition further American financial, military and political resources upon steady improvement in Iraq, assumption of principal responsibility for internally policing Iraq.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this resolution says that it is time for this administration to be accountable for how the hardworking people of this country's tax money is being spent in Iraq, no more rubber stamps for this administration. We will fulfill our constitutional duty of providing oversight.

And it also says, Mr. Speaker, that the President should do all he can to get Iraq to take responsibility for their own actions and to take the lead on trying to restore order to that country.

And it also says that this administration must be held accountable for how your tax money is being spent, that there should be transparency to the process, and full disclosure of who is getting paid to do what in Iraq when it comes to private contractors, and to make sure that this war profiteering in Iraq by private contractors comes to an end. That is basically what the resolution says.

Mr. Speaker, every one of us in the Blue Dog Coalition, and I think every one of us in this Congress, Democrat and Republican alike, supports our troops. We can't do enough for our troops. And I can tell you, as far as I am concerned, as long as we have men and women in uniform in harm's way, I am going to do my part to ensure that we provide them the resources they need to get the job done as safely as possible.

But it is also important that this Congress fulfill its constitutional oversight responsibility and demand that this administration be accountable for how your tax money, some $275 million a day, is being spent in Iraq. And there are reports that indicate that at least 20 percent of the money going to Iraq cannot be accounted for.

Think what we could do to provide health care benefits, housing benefits and other benefits for our veterans. And in Iraq and Afghanistan we have got a new generation of veterans coming home, and we have got to be there for them as a country. We cannot do enough for our men and women in uniform. We cannot do enough for our veterans. We have got to be there for them.

We have also got to be sure that this money, some $100.4 billion in 2006 that this administration is sending to Iraq, is accounted for and that it is being spent in support of our soldiers and that we have the resources to take care and to honor our veterans, including a new generation of veterans coming home today from Iraq and Afghanistan.

A number of fellow Blue Dog members will be joining me this evening as we talk about providing for Operation Iraqi Freedom cost accountability. And one of those who has joined me is a fellow Blue Dog member, someone that is very active in the Blue Dogs, was a member of our nominating committee for officers earlier this year, and that is the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CHANDLER). And I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be here this afternoon to join the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) to talk a little bit about what is obviously a very, very important subject to the American people, the subject of accountability.

Now, Mr. ROSS talked a little bit about the national debt. He had a sign up which, as he said, Blue Dog offices all over the Capitol have up, showing what the national debt of this country is, and the fact that each and every American citizen owes over $29,000 just to pay off the national debt.

Now, I don't usually, or very often, come down here to join Mr. ROSS in what I do think is a worthy goal, and that is educating the American people on our financial situation in this country. But I could not resist today. Being a former State auditor in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, I am a little bit familiar with the issue of accountability. And you talk about this debt, the fact that it is as large as it is, the fact that our people owe, each and every one of them, over $29,000 to pay it off, well, your next question is well, what are we going to do about it? What are we going to do about this debt?

Well, one of the very first things that we can do about this debt is demand accountability in the spending. And one of the glaring examples that we have got is the lack of oversight, the lack of accountability in the spending on the war in Iraq. The numbers are huge; almost $280 million a day is what we are spending in Iraq.

Now, the Blue Dogs have made a decision to have a resolution which will show our interest in making sure that this war and the government of this country is accountable for the taxpayer dollars spent in this war. What we have done is, as Mr. ROSS laid out, proposed a resolution that is called the Operation Iraqi Freedom Cost Accountability Resolution. And the resolution focused on several crucial points in demanding fiscal responsibility in Iraq.

The main points, the most crucial, I think, are, one, a call for transparency on how Iraq war funds are spent. I think another important point is the need to fund the Iraq war through normal appropriations, through that process, rather than through emergency supplemental. The third point that I believe is crucial, and one that I want to touch on a little bit today, is the creation of the Truman committee to investigate the awarding of contracts.

Now, what we want to do, the Blue Dogs, what we are calling for is the creation of a modern-day Truman committee for this war, for expenditures in this war in particular, because, in my opinion, you cannot talk about accountability in this war without talking about the need for this kind of committee, a Truman committee.

Now, in 1940, Congress prepared for the eventual involvement of the United States of America in World War II by allocating $10 billion in defense contracts. Early in 1941, stories of contractor mismanagement reached the desk of, at that time a Missouri Senator, a future President of the United

States of America, Harry S Truman. Truman, when he saw this information, decided to take action and find out for himself if this mismanagement of funds was, in fact, true. He took a 10,000-mile tour of military bases and discovered that certain contractors were getting a greater share of contracts available and that other contractors were getting paid full price for work that was either poor or inefficient. In short, what he discovered was rampant waste and mismanagement in government war contracts.

□ 1700

Does that sound familiar?

Well, as a result of his findings, Harry Truman went back to Washington and called for a special Senate committee to investigate. They got a lot of criticism. Many immediately criticized the Missouri Senator saying that his efforts might hurt war morale, while others thought that President Roosevelt ought to welcome this committee since it was being headed by a member of his own party and, therefore, would not be used for political gain.

Well, by unanimous consent on March 1, 1941, the Senate created what has proved to be the most famous and, in my judgment, the most successful committee of its time. The Truman Committee, with a budget of a mere $15,000 at the time, saved our country in excess of $15 billion; and in the early 1940s, $15 billion was real money. Up here some of the people don't think it is these days, but it was big money to be saved.

Now, don't you think that we could use a Truman Committee today? It seems pretty obvious to me.

The United States has allocated some $50 billion to private contractors for reconstruction in the rebuilding efforts in Iraq since the beginning of the war, and despite this $50 billion expenditure on these contracts, we hear a lot of reports of mismanagement or certainly of inefficiency and not getting the job done that we expected to see done.

For instance, only 25 percent of Iraqis have access to clean water. And prior to the war the Iraqis had electricity for an average of 16 to 24 hours a day, now that number is down to about 4.3 hours per day.

$17 billion of the $50 billion that has been given in contracts has been given through no-bid contracts to Halliburton, just to one company.

There were over 14,000 weapons by the United States of America, bought by our taxpayers and intended for Iraqi troops. Those 14,000 weapons are now missing.

And in addition to that, over $8.8 billion of Iraqi reconstruction funds are simply unaccounted for by the Coalition Provisional Authority.

Mr. Speaker, we desperately need a modern-day Truman Committee to bring some accountability to this war. We have got to stop the bleeding. We have got to stop this expenditure from continuing to be wasteful. We have got to find out firsthand what is going on with the spending in Iraq. We owe it to the taxpayers of this country, we owe it to the troops who are fighting this war.

We owe it so much to the troops. This is money that the troops need for their welfare in Iraq that is being diverted through the wasteful spending of those who are going to be financing this war. We owe it to them to stop the mishandling, stop the mismanagement of money in Iraq.

I strongly support this Blue Dog effort to have a cost accountability ethic relative to the war in Iraq because it is past time, way past time to hold the leaders of this country accountable for the money they spend in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman for Arkansas, and I thank him for all of his efforts on behalf of accountability to the taxpayers in this country.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, former State auditor, former State attorney general for his leadership within the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, and someone who played an important role in helping us draft this resolution, House Resolution 97. And I certainly thank him for helping sponsor this resolution that, hopefully, we will get through the House to demand accountability, fiscal responsibility and accountability for how this administration spends billions of tax money, Mr. Speaker, in a place a long way from Arkansas and a long way from America, and that is in Iraq.

And I couldn't help but think when the gentleman from Kentucky was talking about accountability, I think it is important to note that Congress has appropriated over $25 billion to various departments and agencies for reconstruction projects that are intended to improve the lives and living standards of the Iraqi people, and, yes, to endear them to our way of life; and yet we find that only half the projects have been completed.

For example, the Special Inspector General for Iraq reconstruction reported that funds allocated for health care projects, health care projects, are more than 65 percent expended—that is, the funds—but fewer than 36 percent of the projects have been completed. Funds were allocated for construction of 142 primary health care clinics and only 20 were completed.

Likewise, the Inspector General reported that a contract was made to construct 20 rehabilitation hospitals, and only 12 were completed.

A New York Times report found that thousands of weapons intended for Iraqi forces, the good guys in Iraq, our allies in Iraq, are missing. This study investigated 19, count them, 19 contracts that totaled $133 million for more than 370,000 weapons. No one knows where these weapons are. Three hundred seventy thousand weapons in Iraq, bought with U.S. tax money, are missing, and no one can account for them.

We need accountability in Iraq.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. ROSS, do you have any idea why this situation has occurred? Do you know why? Do you have answers? Do any of you have answers at this point?

Mr. ROSS. Because this Republican Congress for the past 6 years did not fulfill its constitutional duty of providing oversight of this administration and the Department of Defense. There was no oversight. It was rubber stamp after rubber stamp, and more money after more money, and no accountability.

Mr. CHANDLER. It doesn't matter, in my view, which party is in control. If we had a Democratic President, I believe that a Democratic Congress ought to hold that administration accountable just like Truman did in World War II. We have had a Republican Congress that simply has not held this Republican administration accountable. That is just simply a loss for the taxpayers. That is all you can say.

Mr. ROSS. The gentleman is right. It shouldn't matter if it is a Democratic Congress or a Republican Congress, the American people are sick and tired of all the partisan bickering. What the American people want is for us to provide leadership and accountability on how their tax money is being spent. And I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that as members of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, we are going to do our part to hold this administration accountable to find out where in the world this $133 million of your tax money, Mr. Speaker, that went to purchase 370,000 weapons, what happened to them.

It doesn't matter if there is a Democratic President or a Republican President, the gentleman from Kentucky is absolutely right, what matters is being accountable and being good stewards of the tax money of the people of this country.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is the least that we can do for the people of this country.

Mr. ROSS. And for the troops.

Mr. CHANDLER. And for the troops.

You mentioned a very important word, and that word is stewardship. That is what we owe to the people of this country, we owe them stewardship. We must be good stewards. And job one is to take care of their hard-earned resources that they send up here to Washington. And in this case, we are sending an incredible amount of those resources over to Iraq and nobody is watching what is happening with them. Nobody is holding that process accountable.

And I want to thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his efforts to bring light to this subject. I think it is very, very important. We need to continue to talk about this until something is done.

I am glad to see my colleague here from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT), who I know has come down here on a number of occasions to talk about this subject. He is a fine, fine member of our coalition. I am glad to be here with Mr. SCOTT, and I know he has a word or two to say about this also.

Mr. ROSS. I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for joining us today. And, Mr. Speaker, if you have any questions comments or concerns for Mr. SCOTT or any of us, you can e-mail us at BlueDog@mail.house.gov.

And it is a pleasure for me to be joined by a real leader within the Blue Dog Coalition, someone that demands fiscal responsibility and accountability, someone who is helping us with this House Resolution 97, a cosponsor of it, someone that helped author it, and a member of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, Mr. CHANDLER, and that is my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you so much. And thank you for those kind words you said about me. I appreciate it. And I would have called my mom, because she would have loved to hear those words, too.

You know, over this weekend, I did a couple of things when I was home. One was that I really got into the Constitution of the United States. I really got into that section in article I, section 8, that clearly gives us the exclusive responsibility as Congress to raise and support armies.

It is clear as a bell there. It gives it to us, it does not give it to the White House or the President or the executive branch. It gives it to Congress. And up until now we have failed the American people. The large measure of this—you touched upon it earlier, Mr. ROSS, but this Republican-led Congress has just completely rolled over and allowed this President to fund this war on emergency supplementals, which means that we in Congress cannot conduct the constitutionally required oversight to do what the Constitution wanted us to do.

Now, that is why we are in this situation we are in, and I would like to talk for a moment on two points.

When I was home, the other thing I did was I got around and I had some great interaction with my constituents out in Cobb County and Douglas County and in Clayton County and in Henry County. We all had town hall meetings, we had my office open. I mean, we had Chamber of Commerce annual dinners.

That is a great opportunity for folks to just come up to you and let you know exactly how they feel. And I can tell you, Mr. ROSS, they are proud to see us on this floor, offering this bill. This is not just a resolution that is nonbinding. We are going to have those that voice our opinion about this war, they are going to be voted on up or down.

Everybody knows my personal feelings about the mistake of this surge, but this resolution that we have carries a tremendous amount of weight. That is why I care about it so much. And I want to share with the American people exactly what it is in this resolution that we are doing and why it is needed and why, finally, this resolution provides a direct link and connection with what the Founding Fathers wrote in article I, section 8, of the Constitution over 200 years ago that we have the exclusive right to determine how we will manage.

Now, why do we need that?

The other thing I did over this weekend was, I read my home newspaper, the Atlanta Journal Constitution. And in there there was an extraordinary article by the Associated Press that I would like to make a part of this RECORD because this article points out the very need for this measure that we in the Blue Dog Coalition are pushing.

This article in the Atlanta Journal Constitution was written John Heilprin with the Associated Press. The title of it was this: Contractors Investigated After Army Fraud Alleged. Just listen to this, America. ''From high dollar fraud to conspiracy to bribery and bid-rigging, Army investigators have opened up to 50 criminal probes involving battlefield contractors in the war in Iraq and the U.S. fight against terrorism.''

□ 1715

What an opening sentence, what a declarative issue we have here.

It goes on to say, senior contracting officials, government employees, residents of other countries, and in some cases U.S. military personnel themselves have been implicated in millions of dollars of fraud allegations. ''All of these involve operations in Iraq, Afghanistan and Kuwait,'' Chris Grey, a spokesman for the U.S. Army Criminal Investigation Command, confirmed just this past Saturday. ''The agents will pursue leads into truth wherever it takes us. We take this very seriously.''

Here is the point. Battlefield contractors have been implicated in allegations of fraud and abuse since the United States invaded Iraq in the spring of 2003. Any wonder why this has happened? Because the Congress did not apply the oversight, because this Republican Congress just simply rubber-stamped everything.

The Special Inspector General's Office, focusing solely on reconstruction spending, has developed cases that have led to four criminal convictions. The problems stem in part from the Pentagon's struggle to get a handle on the unprecedented number of contractors now helping run the Nation's wars, and these contractors are used in battle zones to do nearly everything but fight. But they can war-profiteer, they can commit fraud, they can commit bribery, and they can abuse the taxpayers' money on the backs of our good, brave soldiers that are putting their lives on the line for much less than what these contractors are making.

They run the cafeterias, the laundries for the troops. They move supplies, run communication systems and repair weapons systems.

Special agents from the Army's Major Procurement Fraud Unit were recently dispatched to Iraq, Afghanistan and Kuwait where they are working closely and sharing information. One case involves an Army chief warrant officer accused of taking $50,000 in bribes to steer a contract for paper products and plastic flatware away from a government contractor to a Kuwaiti company, according to an indictment.

The Government Accountability Office reported in December that the military has been losing millions of dollars, and contractors are being investigated because it cannot monitor industry workers in far-flung locations. It summarizes this way: Commanders are often unsure how many contractors even use their bases or even require the food and housing protection, according to one report. One Army official quoted said, ''The service estimates losing $43 million each year just on free meals that are provided.'' That is why this bill is important.

Let me just mention specifically how this bill will help prevent and address this glaring situation that was reported in the Atlanta Journal Constitution by the Associated Press, John Heilprin, who I commend for doing an excellent job. Our bill will require, within 30 days of passage, that every 90 days hereafter the Department of Defense Inspector General and the Special Inspector General for Iraqi Reconstruction shall prepare and transmit to Congress an unclassified report, but with a classified annex, if necessary, that will contain the following:

One, a detailed accounting of how military and reconstruction funds in Iraq have been spent thus far;

Two, a detailed accounting of the types and terms of contracts awarded on behalf of the United States, including the methods by which such contracts were awarded and contractors selected;

Three, it will require a description of efforts to obtain support and assistance from other countries during the rehabilitation of Iraq;

Four, an assessment of what additional funding is needed to complete military operations and reconstruction efforts in Iraq, including a plan for security of Iraq, a detailed plan for how any future funds will be spent, and a statement of how those funds will advance the interests of the United States in Iraq.

If either inspector general fails to submit a quarterly report, the Government Accountability Office shall conduct an audit and report to Congress. Sanctions will be imposed against contractors who have engaged in fraud or abuse or war profiteering, and we will create the Truman Committee that Mr. CHANDLER spoke to earlier.

Funding requests for operations in Iraqi Freedom in fiscal year 2008 and

beyond must come through the regular appropriations process and not through these emergency supplementals that are explicitly designed to bypass oversight. That is why we have the problems we have here; and also, that is why there was not enough money put in the budget when we sent our Armed Forces over there 3 years ago, as you recall, the news reports where many of our soldiers were digging in dung heaps and landfills trying to get body armor for them.

No. No more. This Blue Dog resolution addresses that, and I would expect an extraordinarily large vote in getting it passed.

And it is so good to be on the floor with my good friend, Mr. ROSS, and also my good friend, Mr. ISRAEL from New York, who we serve together, both as cochairs on our Democratic Group on National Security. And we have been addressing these issues. So it is just a pleasure to be on the floor with you. I hope with this story and this Associated Press Atlanta Journal Constitution report, it will show the American people why we need the specific legislation and the importance in getting some accountability passed concerning our war funding.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, a fellow Blue Dog member, a member of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, for joining us to discuss the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition's House Resolution 97 that provides for Operation Iraqi Freedom cost accountability.

The Constitution clearly gives Congress oversight authority, and this Congress, this new Democratic Congress, is going to provide oversight of this administration, of this government, and fulfill our constitutional duty and demand that our troops get the money they need to get the job done as safely as possible; but also demand that it be done in a way to where this administration is held accountable for how, Mr. Speaker, your tax money is being spent in Iraq.

I recently received an e-mail from a soldier from my hometown. He wrote to me in an e-mail from Iraq, and there are a couple of points I would like to point out. I am quoting this soldier now in Iraq. ''Needless to say, war profiteering is high, and disgusting to witness as a taxpayer.'' This is a citizen soldier, this is a soldier that comes to us from the Army Reserve. He has now been in Iraq 7 months. And in his e-mail to me he said, ''Needless to say, war profiteering is high, and disgusting to witness as a taxpayer.''

He goes on to say, ''And the black market thrives over here as well. For example, much of the fuel never reaches the military; it ends up in the wrong hands through a complex network of interconnected relationships that truly reminds me of the Mafia.''

Another example from a soldier on the ground in Iraq that has been there 7 months about the need for accountability for how tax money, some $400 billion so far, some 20 percent of that $400 billion is unaccounted for, according to the most recent reports.

As members of the Blue Dog Coalition, we are offering up a resolution to demand that this money, your tax money, Mr. Speaker, be accounted for in how it is being spent in support of our soldiers in Iraq. And you know what? We might just find enough waste, fraud and abuse in Iraq that we could take that money and invest it in veterans' benefits, to ensure that our men and women coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan are properly cared for.

With that, I yield to a gentleman that knows a lot about this subject, a gentleman that is not only a very important member of the Blue Dog Coalition, but someone who served on the House Armed Services Committee, someone who now serves on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, and that is the gentleman from Long Island (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank my good friend for his leadership in the Blue Dogs, his leadership in the Congress, and my good friend from Georgia who, as he noted, cochairs with me the Democratic Study Group on National Security, which is intended to ensure that this Congress and Democrats in Congress continue to lead the fight on behalf of our troops, to lead the fight on behalf of our national security. We were founded in the acknowledgement that we need a robust, muscular military to protect us from the threats that are out there.

I think this topic is critically important, the topic of war profiteering. And who pays the price for war profiteering? Our taxpayers pay the price, our troops in Iraq, Afghanistan and around the world pay the price. But there is another group that is paying the price, and I would like to address that this evening, our National Guard units at home.

This morning there was a report in the National Journal's Congress Daily. It was headlined, National Guard May Lack Needed Gear to Deal With Domestic Crisis, GAO Says. And the report raises questions about whether the State-run National Guard units have adequate supplies to respond to disasters and emergencies on U.S. soil. It says it will remain unclear whether the Guard is equipped to respond effectively to the consequences of a large-scale terrorist attack or natural disaster.

The article in the National Journal states, ''Over the last several months, many State Guard leaders have complained that their unit took their best equipment with them when they deployed to Iraq, leaving the personnel at home short of trucks, radios and other equipment needed for domestic missions. Indeed, Lieutenant General Steven Blum, chief of the Pentagon's National Guard Bureau, told Congress last year that at least two-thirds of his units in the United States are not combat ready.''

Now this, to me, is just incredible that Halliburton made money, that these contractors made money. In my view, they gouged the military, gouged our taxpayers, marked up the services they provided, and National Guard units at home are short of the equipment they need.

I represent a district on Long Island. The World Trade Center was 40 miles from my hometown. We know what terrorism is like. We needed our emergency responders when that happened. We are likely to need them again, the gentleman from Georgia knows that very well. But when two-thirds of their equipment is sitting in Iraq, that creates a very serious problem. That is the cost of war profiteering.

Now, I understand the exigencies of war and I understand that when you go to war, you know, you have to make sure that your troops have everything they need, and there are all sorts of funding issues; but my goodness, Secretary Rumsfeld said, You go to war not with the Army you want but with the Army you have. You have got to budget for that Army. You never send people into war unequipped, underfunded, underequipped without the right number of coagulant bandages, without the right number of night vision goggles and up-armored Humvees.

If they found the money to pay these contractors that ripped us off, they can find the money to make sure that our National Guard units have the equipment they need. If they found the money to pay the excessive bills of these contractors so that they could raise their bottom lines, they could find the money to raise the equipment that the National Guard needs for the mission-critical equipment that will be required—not just in an act of terrorism, by the way, but when we have a major hurricane as we did with Katrina.

Long Island stands a very good chance of suffering a Category 3 hurricane or more. And it is going to be very difficult for me to explain to my constituents that they didn't have the National Guard equipment resources that they were depending on to respond to a Category 3 hurricane because that equipment was in Iraq; but Halliburton got what it wanted, its CEO got the salary increase he needed.

This isn't very complicated. We are short-funding our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan; we are undersupplying our National Guard units at home. The big corporations who are contracted as part of this war are making more money than ever. And there are still companies in the United States that can register their international headquarters at a P.O. Box in Bermuda so they can avoid their fair share of taxes at home. That is a disgrace.

It is time for accountability. It is time for oversight. It is time to put our money where our mouths are. It is time to quit talking about funding our

troops here and abroad and then not giving them the resources they need.

The Blue Dogs believe in fiscal accountability. We take second place to nobody when it comes to supporting our troops and supporting our military, to nobody. But we also understand that you can't say you are doing that; you have got to actually do it. You can't fight a war abroad, short-fund our troops there and be left with degraded National Guard units at home. It is time for accountability, for oversight. It is time for a different direction, and that is precisely what the Blue Dogs are going to insist on.

I thank the gentleman for recognizing me.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Long Island for his insight on this resolution to put an end to war profiteering and demand accountability on how the American people, the hard-working American people's tax money is being spent in Iraq.

I yield back to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. I want to build on the point that my good friend from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) talked about.

It was very important when James Madison wrote into the Constitution the words, ''Raise and support the Army is the exclusive domain of the Members of Congress.''

□ 1730

There was a reason for that. The reason was because Members of Congress, unlike the President, unlike the Senate, my good friends in the Senate, it is the Members of Congress that are closest to the people. Every other year we must run, and that is why they put it in there that if we are going to war, yes, we will spread this authority, some of that as Commander in Chief to the executive branch, but we must have a check and a balance. They put that in the bosom of the Congress, which has to go back before the people every other year and be accountable.

I am here to tell you the people of the United States are looking to this Congress. They are looking for us to bring some accountability to it. They are looking for us to be fair and understand what is at the core of this.

You know what is at the core of this is the soldier. When is somebody going to look at this war from the standpoint of that soldier that we are sending to Iraq now and placing in the cross hairs of a civil war, a questionable gambit at best?

The President of the United States does not have to run again. He can have all the surges he wants. He can do everything he wants. His concern now is building his legacy. He has his right to do whatever he wants to do, but the one thing he does not have to do, he does not have to go and face the American people again. We do. That is why Madison gave us the arbitrary decision to raise and support the military.

So when the Bush administration made the decision to use large numbers of these private contractors that were talked about on the battlefield in Iraq, it now has had somewhat of a perverse effect of incentivizing highly trained special operation force personnel to leave the Armed Forces. They are there voluntarily, in order to work as some of these contractors for much higher pay.

There is so much just built into this for war profiteering, but here is a statistic that we have got to be concerned about. We have got to look at this hardship on the soldier. These are not 21,500 other soldiers just sitting over there waiting. These soldiers are going, many of them, on their third and fourth tour of duties. We have a situation where we are running the military in the ground, and no more pointed example of that is this startling, disturbing and tragic information that has been handed to me by the National Security Advisory Group. Listen to this:

Between 2001 and 2004, divorce rates among active duty Army officers tripled and rates among Army enlisted soldiers grew, divorce rates by 50 percent, as deployments lengthened and with increased frequency as they are doing now. These divorce rates have served to underscore the severity of the strains on the active duty personnel and their families, and similarly, incidents of domestic violence increased over the same period. There is wear and tear not just on the equipment that we talked about, not just on not having the bulletproof vests or the Humvees riding around; it is wear and tear on the hearts and souls of our soldiers. It is too much of a strain, and we have got to correct this situation.

These and other warning signs have caused some commanders to fear that personnel who were willing to undertake successive deployments as part of, and they use these words, part of the surge cannot sustain this tempo of operations over the long term. If they do so, it will be at the adverse impact on their families.

How much more do we want to ask of our soldiers? I would tell you one thing, this Blue Dog resolution is dedicated to giving our soldiers the respect that they are due. We are going to make sure that the money we appropriate in here goes to them, and we are going to make doubly sure that we can end this situation in Iraq quickly and bring our soldiers home to their families.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his heartfelt comments.

This war has had an impact on just about every family in America; and my brother-in-law, who is in the United States Air Force, career, is now in Kurdistan, which is one of the entry points to Afghanistan.

My first cousin, his wife, gave birth to their first child while he was in Iraq, and it has had a tremendous toll on the families, and not only for the military but also the citizen soldier, those who serve as members of a National Guard and as a member of an Army reserve.

When the President talks about a surge, when the President talks about adding another 21,500 troops to Iraq, that is code for calling back up the National Guard and the Reserves. Many folks in the National Guard today have been sent out of country at historic levels. In many instances, the citizen soldiers, those in the Guard, have been called up more times than some soldiers that are in the full-time military as a career. It has a tremendous toll on the family, the families that are left behind, and a huge increase in the number of divorces that occur when they come back.

The bottom line is we are creating a generation of veterans in Iraq and Afghanistan, and we can sit here and talk about being patriotic and supporting our soldiers all night long, but what is important is that we cast our votes in a way that honors them and ensures that they have health care and the things they need when they come back so hopefully we can minimize the number of divorces. We cannot do enough to thank our men and women in uniform for their service to our country.

One of the ways I think we can honor them is by demanding accountability for how tax money is being spent in Iraq, not only in the rebuilding efforts but also in support of them, making sure those men and women in uniform have the resources they need to stay safe while they are there.

Mr. Speaker, if you have got any comments, questions or concerns for us, I would encourage you to e-mail us at bluedog@mail.house.gov. Again, that is bluedog@mail.house.gov.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CHANDLER) was talking about Halliburton earlier. Let me just make this quick point and I want to yield to the gentleman from Long Island, but last year, the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction reported that the Coalition Provisional Authority could not track over $8 billion it had transferred to Iraqi ministries and that CPA officials left millions of dollars in cash unsecured in their offices.

Halliburton failed to complete required work under its oil infrastructure work, leaving distribution points unusable. Auditors in one region found that contract managers could not account for $97 million disbursed from the development fund for Iraq.

Under its no-bid contract to rebuild Iraq's oil infrastructure contract, Halliburton overcharged by over 600 percent for the delivery of fuel from Kuwait. An audit of programs designed to train guards to protect Iraq's oil and electrical infrastructure concluded that U.S. agencies could not provide reasonable assurance that $147 million expended under these programs was used for its intended purpose.

In one case, the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction found that a company which was awarded a security management contract worth

hundreds of millions of dollars could provide no assurance that it was providing the best possible safety for government and reconstruction personnel as required by the contract and could not even show that its employees, authorized to carry weapons, were trained to use those weapons.

Halliburton tripled the cost of hand towels, hand towels at taxpayer expense, by insisting on having its own embroidered logo on each towel, and Halliburton employees dumped 50,000 pounds of nails in the desert. Why? Because they ordered the wrong size, all at taxpayer expense because it was a cost-plus contract.

Halliburton double charged tax payers for $617,000 worth of soda and charged taxpayers for services that it never provided and tens of thousands of meals that it never served our soldiers.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we have filed H. Res. 97 to demand accountability on how tax money is being spent in Iraq, and I yield to the gentleman from Long Island.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I would just close with one point.

I want to echo what the gentleman from Georgia has said. This soldier comes first. If you go into fight a global war on terror you better make sure the fighters have everything they need. Do not ask them to stand in line behind the corporate executives at Halliburton. Do not ask them to stand in line behind the CEO of Exxon Mobil who got a huge tax cut on top of his bonus, on top of his huge salary. Do not ask them to stand in line behind the big pharmaceutical companies that also got a windfall from the government in the Medicare part D program, despite their record-breaking profits.

The gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Arkansas and I believe more than anything else that our primary obligation in this place, in this House, is to support our Armed Forces and to keep this Nation safe. That takes the right priorities.

In the past, the priorities have been wrong. How do I know? Two-thirds of our National Guard units do not have the equipment they need to respond to an emergency or an act of terrorism at home because the equipment is sitting in Iraq because we did not fund the war fight properly.

It is time to put our soldiers first, not just in our rhetoric but in our budgets; and to do that, you need accountability.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. The final analysis of what we are saying is what the American people spoke to in November. They spoke to warning this Congress to stand up and demand accountability and be good stewards of their tax dollars, and that is the core of our Blue Dog resolution. I believe that and I hope that within the next couple of months we will have this resolution passed.

Might I ask for the benefit of our audience if I could ask Mr. ROSS if we could give the number of our House Resolution in the event that there might be some individuals who are in the C–SPAN audience who might want to give us a little helping hand here to help us get this bill passed.

Mr. ROSS. H. Res. 97, providing for Operation Iraqi Freedom cost accountability, and it is quite simple. We want this administration to be accountable for your tax money, Mr. Speaker, that is being spent in Iraq, number one.

Number two, we want a Truman-like commission to put an end to war profiteering in Iraq.

And, finally, we want this administration to stop playing games and asking for emergency supplementals to hide the true cost of the war and ask for the money the way that all other funds are appropriated by this Congress, through the normal process.

One hundred point four billion dollars was the cost for 2006. Over $400 billion has been spent since this war began. That is $8.4 billion a month. That is $275 million a day, and that is nearly $12 million an hour of your tax money, Mr. Speaker, and the tax money of every hardworking man and woman in this country; and it is time to restore commonsense, fiscal discipline and accountability to our government. That is one way, Mr. Speaker, that we believe we can honor our men and women in uniform.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WHAT IS GOOD FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege and the honor of being recognized to address you on the floor of the House of the United States House of Representatives, the people's House, this people's House and this new day, this new dawn that was pledged to come to this 110th Congress.

As you may or may not know, Mr. Speaker, I spend many hours here on the floor in these Special Orders and in debate on bills and in 1-minutes and in 5-minutes as we engage in this dialogue and raise the issue of what is good for America.

□ 1745

One of the very important things about determining what's good for America is to have a process for America that is conducive to the right result, and the right result in most cases, we will agree, I believe, would be the will of the people: the will of the people properly informed, the will of people properly educated, and the will of the people that have access through the first amendment rights to all the information and all the knowledge possible.

But, then, I would point out that we do not live in a democracy. As much as I have said about the reflection of the voice or the people here in the people's House, each one of us does have an obligation to listen carefully and attentively to our constituents, to the people in this country, and not just confined within our districts, but to listen to the Nation as a whole and focus on the interests of our district. But sometimes we have to put the Nation ahead of, sometimes, the will of our district.

But this is a constitutional Republic that we serve in, not a democracy. I point out that our Founding Fathers had a significant concern, and I will say even a literal fear of democracies.

On one of my earlier trips out here to Washington, DC, quite some years ago, I visited the National Archives on my first visit. As I waited in line to go around and be able to stand there and gaze upon the Declaration of Independence, upon the Constitution, upon the Bill of Rights in their original form, the original documents that our Founding Fathers placed their hands to and pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor, as I waited to view that for the first time, on display at the National Archives was a display of Greek artifacts.

The Greek artifacts that had come from 2- to 3,000 years ago in the era where the closest thing that there has been to a pure democracy from the standpoint of the Greek city-states, where of-age males would gather together, and they would debate; they would debate the issues of the day. They had a number of things they put in place for stopgap. One of the things they found out was, you will recognize the term ''demagogue.''

''Demagogue'' is a term that we use occasionally in our vernacular, perhaps here on the floor reluctantly, but also throughout our dialogue across the country. There is not a lot of history on demagogues. It is hard to Google demagogue and to become an expert, to look under amazon.com and to come up with real books that are written on real facts that identify demagogues in the Greek era. They are almost nonexistent in this Nation's literature, at least so far as I have been able to identify.

But what the Founders knew and what young Americans growing up today and, really, all of its citizens should have an understanding of is that in that purer form of democracy in the Greek-city state, they had Greek demagogues who had such an oratorical skill that they could stand up in front of that small coliseum, so to speak, and make their pitch in such a passionate, logical and rational way that it would move the emotions of the Greeks within that city.

They would not necessarily analyze the information behind that debate. They would not necessarily analyze the data, the calculations. They maybe were not even thinking for themselves. But what they would do is, they would

listen to the demagogue that had that ability to move the masses with their dialogue. That, sometimes, in fact, often, took the Greeks off on a path that was not necessarily the best path for them, because they didn't stop, step back and think about where they were going. They were moved by the emotion.

So a demagogue would be someone, then, who had that ability and that skill. When they were identified as detrimental to the best interests of the city-state, then they had a blackball system. That blackball system, again, as I recall it, was that they would each go through, and there would be a, let us call it a black marble and a white marble, and there would be one large gourd to drop the voting marble in and then one to discard your empty in. So each voting member of a city-state got two, a black marble and a white marble.

As they went through there and as they dropped that marble in, they said, I want to keep this individual here in the city-state because I like his position, or he is good for us, or he helps out with the knowledge he has, whatever the reason might be, the same way we vote for or against Presidential candidates in a lot of ways. They would drop a white ball if they wanted to keep him, into the voting.

It would actually be a piece of pottery, a smaller-necked piece of pottery, actually. Then they would discard the black ball in another piece of pottery. So no one knew how they voted; it was a secret ballot.

But if that demagogue received three black balls dropped down in the voting piece of pottery, then that would be all that was required from the entire city to banish that demagogue from the city for 7 years. That was one of the ways they protected themselves from the emotions of a democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this up because quite often, I think, in the classrooms of America, it is taught consistently and continuously that this is a democracy. We toss the term around, we are in a democracy. This is a democracy that goes on over and over and over again, and I always argue, no, this is a constitutional Republic.

Our Founding Fathers crafted a constitutional Republic for the first time in the history of the world because they were shaping a form of government that would not have the failures of a democracy in it, but had the representation of democracy in it. That is why we are a constitutional Republic. That is why we are called Representatives here in the United States Congress, because we each represent about 600,000 people.

It isn't the 600,000 people, those that are qualified and registered, those that go to vote will select each one of us, and then it is our job to be their voice here. But the first thing that we owe our constituents is not to put our finger in the wind and listen to the polls. It isn't our job necessarily to put our ear to the ground and try to stay ahead of the moving public opinion, but it is our job to listen to that public opinion.

It is also our job to be involved in all of the dialogue here and have access to all this information that is available to us here in this capital city, the information center of the world, from my experience. We owe our constituents and all American people our best judgment as we serve in this constitutional Republic.

The voice of these Members here in Congress is essential. It is essential for the functionality of a republic, and it is essential for the functionality of this great Nation. In this system of government that we have now shaped, a tried and true system for more than 200 years, we found a way to use this process of gathering the information and the data and the input from our constituents who come through my office every day. And I sit down with them every day that we are open for business here, and it is for me to gather that kind of input and information. Then I exchange back with them the things that I know about policy from sitting here.

Then we have discussions about, well, here is our budget, these are our limitations, these are the policy questions. Here is the legality, here are some of the constitutional constraints that we have, and your needs are this. So how do we shape this together so that we can come forward with a proposal that meets the needs of my constituents or anyone's constituents, stays within the framework of our budget and the Constitution and moves this Nation forward to our destiny?

Those are the questions that we are obligated to struggle to resolve here in this Congress, and we have developed a process by which we have many, many public hearings. We bring forward in the public hearings witnesses that testify into the record under oath, so that we can rely on the accuracy and the honesty and the veracity of their statements. That is some of the information.

A lot of the other government reports and other data that come from nongovernmental organizations and individual citizens and the letters that come every day and the e-mails that come every day and the phone calls that come every day, we put that all together. We sort that. We synthesize that. We go to the subcommittee or the full committee for the hearings. We ask the appropriate questions so that we can probe into these issues to represent our constituents.

Then, after the hearing process is done, then a bill comes forward, a bill comes out through the subcommittee process for a markup, and that markup always must allow legitimate germane amendments in order. It is not just a theory; it is a tried and true proven fact. The reason for amendments is to improve the legislation.

The first term that you run into, as any, one step forward, to become a legislator, whatever level of government might be, whatever political subdivision it might be, is the law of unintended consequences. That is what happens when any of us, most often in our youthful idealism, come charging into the legislative process. We say, I have a law I want to pass, this is what I want it to be.

You write that down, put it into the right format, and you submit that into the process, and immediately the wake-up call is, well, what about this implication and that? What happens when you unfund this side of it. What happens when you don't have law enforcement on the other side? What happens when you punish more people than you were trying to help because you didn't think of all the aspects?

Well, that is the law of unintended consequences. That is what happens when you have a legislative process that circumvents or usurps this tried and true, more than two-centuries-old process that we have here in the United States Congress.

This constitutional Republic cannot sustain itself if we do not have a regular order of doing business that guarantees the rights of each Member to be heard, for each Member to bring their judgment to the hearing process, to probe the witnesses, to put into the record the background that they want to gather from the witnesses they choose, as well, to offer amendments at committee and subcommittee level and at the level up at the Rules Committee.

This is all a process to perfect legislation, to reduce, and, ideally, eliminate that Murphy's Law of unintended consequences, and also to improve the quality of the legislation so that it is far more effective than it may be as if just one person with their limited vision, their limited knowledge, limited background and limited understanding could bring to this legislative body.

I have to point out, the system and the process that I have described here is anything, but what has been taking place in this 110th Congress. This is the 110th Congress that was promised to be the most open and the term, I believe, was ''democratic Congress in history.'' The leadership was going to set up a system that had rules, that allowed for amendments at every level, that allowed for open dialogue, that allowed for open hearings. In fact, the Speaker of the House is clearly on record time after time after time, making those kinds of pledges.

Well, I will point out that has not been the case. I will get back to the facts of that here in a moment.

What I would like to do is illustrate this poster that tells us what has been going on here in this new 110th Congress, which began on the 4th day of January when we organized and first brought forth the rules.

The opinion that this Congress had to live by was the promise, campaign promise, and they won the majority. In the first 100 hours, six pieces of legislation shall pass; we will do this for the American people, was the argument.

So we have two different ways of keeping time. The American people would wonder, well, the first 100 hours, if that promise of doing these six pieces of legislation in the first 100 hours is so sacrosanct that you have to suspend, maybe temporarily, and maybe not temporarily, the regular order that we call it here. This really is the entire process that I have described: the suspension of hearings, subcommittee meetings, full committee meetings, rules, consideration of amendments, and amendments being allowed on the floor, being debated, so the American people can understand what this body is doing.

That entire process has been suspended, and it has been suspended because the argument was made by the incoming leadership that those six pieces of legislation couldn't be passed within the first 100 hours if we went to a regular order and allowed any Member to have any voice in trying to improve any piece of that legislation.

So here we are this first 100 hours. I thought, well, all right, if the promise of 100 hours is sacrosanct, and it is so important that this legislation that has never been done in the history of America has to be done in the first 100 hours, if that is so important, then we ought to know at least what the criteria are for turning it on and turning it off. We ought to be able to know when that 100 hours is over, when we will go back to regular order, and the people who have campaigned and been elected to legitimately represent their 600,000 people will have a choice in this Congress to improve and perfect legislation.

So I started the clock, and I have kept this clock from the beginning. You know, there are only two legitimate ways to count time. One of them would be the 110th Congress began when we gaveled in here on the 4th day of January. You could just let the clock run all through the day, the night, the next day, and it will just essentially tick when we get sine die, gavel out of the 110th Congress roughly 2 years from now.

I don't think that is necessarily a fair and legitimate way, that keeping track of 100 hours is sacrosanct. We may give them a little bit different way to do that. Let us make it the legitimate way of keeping time, was my proposal.

Fairly simply, when the gavel comes in here in the morning, and we gavel in to start our day, and we start with the prayer and the pledge, that is the beginning of this congressional day. When we finish these Special Orders and there is a motion to adjourn, and you adjourn this Chamber, click, with the stopwatch, time is over, that is how many hours it is for that day.

Well, the Pelosi clock has a different way of keeping time. But just by comparison—and first I want to point out that those six pieces of legislation were passed not in the form I thought they were going to come to the floor in, probably not the form that the American people thought that they would be passed in, but a form that had those six titles of that legislation that came to this floor, passed within the first real 100 hours of legislation.

□ 1800

And that ended on a Friday at 11:44 a.m. when the real clock ticked over at 100 hours. But the Pelosi clock which was on the Web page, that was put up so that they would have all the time that they wanted to have to get this legislation done, and we just took a little picture of that. That clock went to 42 hours and 25 minutes. That is how much, Mr. Speaker, had been expired on the Pelosi clock.

So one can only presume that this clock was a slow clock. The Pelosi office refuses to grant us any criteria as to when they turn their clock on and when they turn their clock off. The only thing we know is this clock was not going to run up to 100 hours until those six pieces of legislation were passed. So it is kind of a backwards figuring thing, but now it has been pulled down from the Web site of the Speaker, but that was the end of the game.

So when that 100 hours is over, the request was give us some time, give us some patience. We need to have the suspension of our rules. We are going to have to go to this draconian process that no Member has a voice in anything until these six pieces of legislation are passed. We are going to have to go to that to get our six pieces passed in the first 100 hours.

Well, the six pieces are passed. The 100 hours now, it is about 148-point-something actually, where it is going to be 149 when we finish this up. That is how many hours that we have invested here in this 110th Congress. But we are still under draconian martial law in this Congress.

We are bringing to the floor of the United States Congress tomorrow, and I don't mean me, but the leadership on the other side of the aisle is bringing an omnibus spending bill. That omnibus spending bill is coming to the floor, $463 billion, without a single hearing, without a single subcommittee or committee meeting, without a markup, without an amendment; and we are going to spend $463 billion out of here tomorrow on 30 minutes of debate from the dissenting side and 30 minutes of debate from the proponents' side, and the taxpayers are going to take the hit.

And I feel sorry, Mr. Speaker, for the American people. And I feel really sorry for the freshmen that came to this Congress, especially the large class of Democrats who no doubt said, I will be your voice in Congress. I promise you that you haven't been represented well. I will be effective. When I go there, I will be heard. I am going to delve into all of this policy and I will be there. You will see that come out in the language. It will go into law.

But to this day come to the floor and I will yield to anyone, any freshman especially, who could come down here and say, I went to a hearing and I offered an amendment in a subcommittee markup or in a full committee or I am going to be allowed to offer an amendment here on the floor and it is going to improve some legislation.

I think there was a freshman that ran some legislation here last week. I just don't know if she ever got to see the language before she came to the floor to be the sitting duck for the criticism, for the narrow debate that we had.

That is the tone of where we are. The American people are being cheated by this process. And I will be very happy to yield to the man who is a judge of that, Judge LOUIE GOHMERT from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa, my good friend (Mr. KING), for yielding.

As may be known, I was a history major in college. I have studied a great deal of government history, different countries; and I would ask if the gentleman from Iowa might engage me in a colloquy to answer one question, if you are aware of the difference between the process that the former Soviet Union arrived at in order to appropriate money and the process that has been used to appropriate $463 billion tomorrow.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I am going to have to guess. I am going to turn this back to you for a definitive answer. My speculation would be, Mr. GOHMERT, that Duma probably didn't see it and maybe we get to see it for a pro forma vote, or am I wrong?

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, obviously, none of us have seen it. It got posted and we have got people trying to make sense of the 140-or-so pages. But the main difference that I can tell, and this is just my opinion, but the main difference that I can tell is that the Soviets never promised to have an open, fair, transparent democratic process to appropriate money. That is the big difference I can see. Because that is what we have here.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Texas for that insightful input. In other words, he is so gentle and subtle when he said the Soviets kept their promise because they didn't make one.

And the thing that I am addressing here, Mr. Speaker, is that there were a lot of promises made, and the integrity in this system, that is what you have to function in this body. We have to give our word and we have got to keep our word. And when we do that, this system functions. When you give your word and you don't keep your word, the system breaks down. And the people that pay the price for that are the American people.

So I would submit that all of that whole series of promises were subordinated to the 100 hours' promise, which turned out to be 42 hours and 25 minutes. Fine. I am going to grant that that stuff got done in 100 real hours.

Actually, it got done just underneath the 100 real hours. But the clock has ticked over by anybody's measure. It is over 100 hours. And there was never a justification for it anyway. I mean, I want to be on record in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker. There is not a justification for expediting the process at the expense of the voice of the people.

But that is what has been done. Well, it has been done at least under the promise that when the 100 hours is up and the six pieces of legislation are passed, we are going to then try to keep our promise on the most open Congress in history. As we know, you cannot expedite legislation very well in the process that we have now and be able to improve it.

So what they have done is they have brought this 150-or-more-page bill that was just first available last night at 11:03 p.m. on the Internet. Some of our staff had actually quit work by that time and gone home to bed; so some of them didn't find that until this morning. But of those 150 or 160 pages, in there is 463-point-something billion dollars of spending and it has changed a fair amount of line items, and what it does is it increases the spending from the Republican plan by $7 billion, Mr. Speaker. Seven billion. And it changes the resources that are committed. They go back to the districts in some places.

We even have some locations, in our short little time of looking at this, where we believe that because they have underfunded and this budget has gone on now for almost half a year that there will be some agencies that may well have to pay back because of this omnibus spending bill. And they will come, Mr. Speaker, to the floor tomorrow, and they will say, Well, this is a CR. This is a continuing resolution. And a continuing resolution being that you pass a resolution that says we are going to keep funding government at the current level and all of its line item appropriations until such time as we can get the Senate to act.

And I have to say that the Senate needs to act. We passed nearly every single one of the appropriation bills last year, sent them over to the Senate, where they sat. And so that is one of the reasons that we end up with this ugly monstrosity of an omnibus spending bill.

But it would be one thing to pass a continuing resolution and say that stuff has been through the subcommittee, committee, the markup process, been to the floor, at Appropriations. We had worked our will on all of that. It is a different Congress, but we had worked our will in the 109th Congress. It would be one thing to pass a continuing resolution to meet those standards because that has been due diligence at least. It is quite another to take all of these dollars, roll them all up, package them up, rewrite them, and then throw them out here on the narrowest of notice, $463 billion, and then say, well, there won't be any input and there won't be any amendments and it is going to be strictly an up-or-down vote, and you get 30 minutes to tell us why it is a bad idea and try to convince our people whose arms are twisted up behind their shoulder blades that they are going to have to vote for it.

And there they sit with a large class of freshmen. Some of them served in State legislatures. In fact, I would speculate that most of them have. And I would also speculate that not a single one of them has experienced a process that was so closed in its loop, that was so narrow in its scope, that was so draconian that the collective wisdom of 435 Members of Congress and all the staff and all the constituents and all the media input all goes for naught.

I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, and I will pick up whenever I need to. Thank you, Mr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for leading this Iowa Special Order, particularly in regard to what is going to be on the floor of this body tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, and that is this $463 billion monstrosity that, as the gentleman has already pointed out, gives no opportunity for Members of this body to have any input.

We heard all this rhetoric, as we started the 110th, about the need to pass those six per six bumper sticker issues that the Democratic majority had tested, had poll tested, that drew 75, 80 percent approval rating; so that was their justification of closing down the process and bundling all of those bills, H.R. 1 through 6, in a single rule, a single closed rule, and no opportunity for even Members on their own side of the aisle, the Democratic majority, the new Members of the Democratic majority, to have a voice and represent their constituents. I think it is appalling, Mr. Speaker, that they would do that.

But, also, as we railed against that process in the first 2 weeks, we had the assurance over and over again of the leadership of the Democratic majority that once they got through with their 100 hours, and as Representative KING has pointed out, we are up to 147 hours now, where is the fairness that they promised? Where is the open process? Here this $463 billion so-called CR or, in layman's terms, continuing resolution, gets posted on the Internet at 11 o'clock last night. I don't think that Members of this body were sitting up holding their breath every 15 minutes checking on the Internet to see if Mr. OBEY had finally posted the bill so that Members could see it and look at it and analyze it, study it, and hopefully come forward through the Rules Committee. Certainly there was no committee process in what they have done here.

And I do not know, maybe my colleagues can answer this question in just a minute, but I know the Rules Committee did meet today, and I am not going to hold my breath counting the number of amendments that were made in order.

But this is unconscionable, Mr. Speaker. First of all, it is not a CR. A CR would be a continuing resolution to continue to fund the government at last year's level. In fact, that would indeed save money. That would save the taxpayers money. This is no CR. A CR is three or four pages long. In fact, the last time we had a CR to cover an entire fiscal year was under the Democratic leadership back in 1987 and 1988. I don't know how long those bills were, but I do not think they were 123 pages, as this monstrosity is, Mr. Speaker.

I have heard this thing called a lot of terms other than a CR. I have heard some refer to it as a ''CRomnibus.'' To me, and maybe my colleagues can understand this better because ''CRomnibus'' is a little difficult to decipher, it looks like a hooker dressed up like a nun.

□ 1815

Now, I hope everybody can understand what I am talking about there. This is an appalling embarrassment to this body. And the Democratic majority talked about, in December and leading up to the election before that, how, give them the opportunity to lead this body and they will absolutely eliminate earmarks, totally eliminate earmarks in finishing up the fiscal 2007 and the fiscal 2008 budget.

This is a giant earmark, or if you want to call it an ''Obeymark.'' There are so many things in here. And, of course, you know we have had since about 9 o'clock this morning when people came to work, maybe a little earlier for some of us insomniacs, to study this bill. And the devil is, of course, in the details.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COHEN). Approximately 30 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I know he is limited in time, and I know our colleague from Florida is here, as well, and possibly other Members will be coming to weigh in on this.

But this is appalling, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues. I mean, the Democratic majority has talked about opening up this process and not doing as we did, as they say we did; but dawn of a new day, to start a new open process of bipartisanship. Whether they were truthful in that or not, I think if you say that, if you make that pledge as you ask people to vote or, in many instances, replace somebody on our side of the aisle, then you need to fulfill that contract.

That indeed was a pledge that has already been broken. And it does not have to be that way. It absolutely does not have to be that way.

So I thank the gentleman for allowing me to weigh in on this issue. With that, I will turn it back over to Mr. KING and continue this dialogue with my colleagues. Thank you.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the esteemed gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PHIL, for his input. I did not mean to imply that I was short of time to deal with it. So if you feel the urge a little later as well, Mr. GINGREY, I am open to whatever dialogue you may have to bring to this floor. I appreciate that input.

We are here to represent the American people. We each represent roughly 600,000, for each of us 435 Members here in the United States Congress. There is not anybody in this Congress that would concede a point that there is anybody's constituents that deserve more representation than theirs.

I will just say it this way. There are no one's constituents in America that deserve more representation than my constituents. And, conversely, there are no constituents out there in America that deserve less. That means you have got to have an open process that provides for open dialogue, that provides for opportunities along the way to perfect legislation to avoid unintended consequences and to improve legislation to perfection if we possibly can.

That is the process that is absolutely missing. It has been totally usurped. It has been a rug jerked out from underneath this entire Congress. And the promise of an open process is a broken promise. The 100 hours are up, and no one knows that better than Mr. FEENEY from Florida. I yield to Mr. FEENEY.

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my friend from Iowa and to my good friend from Georgia. And I, too, just got off the last campaign cycle, and I watched the national newspapers. I saw it in the State of Florida, where over and over again I heard that there was a new, reformed Democratic Party, people that believed very differently than the Republicans in charge here in Washington, that we are going to reform the process, make it fairer and more transparent. I heard that we were going to be under new management.

Now I find it a little funny, because as I look at the chairmen of the committees, we have got one chairman that has been here for 56 years in Congress. We have got chairmen that have been here for 30 years in Congress, for 40 years that have been Chairmen before. So really it is deja vu in terms of who the leadership is of the important committees here in Congress. There is no change.

Americans need to know they are going to go back to the Jimmy Carter high-tax, high-regulation, high-speed, high-unemployment, high-inflation rates under their so-called new leadership because it is the same old, same old.

But I was really intent as I was working in my office, studying some of the crazy things that are coming up in our committee process this week, Mr. KING. And I heard you offer to the new members of the Democratic majority that say, We are going to be very different, we are going to be transparent, we are not going to be liberal Democrats, we are going to maintain a threshold on taxes.

And yet in the very first 2 weeks, what we here have passed without one amendment allowed, without one committee hearing allowed, without any debate other than maybe an hour on this floor allowed, with the results preordained by a maestro—and we have to give her credit; the Speaker has been a wonderful leader in terms of making the trains run on time, which we know that people that do not engage in democratic processes, but engage in totalitarian processes are successfully able to do.

The first thing that the new majority, conservatives supposedly or moderates, do is pass PAYGO, which makes its easier to pass tax increases. The next thing they do is pass a minimum wage bill that exempts American Samoa. And they pass an energy bill that actually increases taxes at the pump ultimately on the people in my district that buy gas.

And, of course, they also gave as part of the Committee of the Whole here, a vote to the delegate from American Samoa who represents, he is a friend of mine, he is a great guy, but he represents approximately 60,000 people who are not a State which the Constitution requires in order for you to have an equal vote here on the floor.

Now, I would tell my friend from Iowa that I have football stadiums not far from me that hold more than 60,000 people in them. The football stadiums are not represented by a delegate or a vote in Congress. And maybe every football stadium with 60,000 or more votes under their new premise ought to be included

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, just an inquiry then. What are the odds of the people within your stadiums in Florida with 60,000 or more people in them, what are the odds of them paying Federal taxes compared to that of American Samoa?

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, my guess is about 80 percent of them are either payers of the income tax, the Medicare tax, the Social Security tax, or some Federal tax.

And with respect to American Samoa, I admire them. I actually think that they are fortunate. I am envious. They do not pay Federal income taxes, as the gentleman wisely pointed out. But they have a vote here, just like my football stadiums with 60,000 people do not have; American Samoans who do not pay Federal taxes on the Federal income code do pay taxes.

Now, I will tell my two great friends, I hope that I do not upset them here, but the States of Georgia and Iowa are two of my favorite States in the Union. But I happen to be very jealous; and believe that I was the speaker of the house of the greatest State in the country, the State of Florida.

And I will have to tell you that passing budgets is a very difficult deal, passing appropriations bills, it is hard. I like to compare every budget that I have dealt with at the Federal level or the State level as like a Clint Eastwood movie; it is part of the good, part the bad, and part the ugly. The only thing that justifies a budget is the process.

Where every elected member at the committee level, for all of the different Appropriations Committees gets to fight for his or her priorities, where on the House floor you allow amendments, you allow the entire body to sit down and figure out collectively. And democracy is an ugly process, but the only thing that justifies the outcome of budgets, which are like a Clint Eastwood movie, The Good the Bad and the Ugly, is the process itself.

The process that we witnessed today in the Rules Committee, and my friend from Georgia alluded to the fact that the Rules Committee apparently has said that not one single amendment to this omnibus package that was passed, not by a committee, but was passed by one Member, this is the Pelosi omnibus package. Nobody else had any control or say in it. Not one Member had a chance.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, just a quick point. In these appropriation bills that come to the floor under regular order, each one of the 13 separate appropriations bills came to the floor with an open rule, an open process.

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, traditionally that has always been true. This has never happened in modern history that any historian of the House can recollect.

But let me tell you exactly what has happened. I will have to admit, one of the very few things that I have liked in the first 60 days here is that the Democrats actually pledged that we are not going to have earmarks.

Now, they have pledged a lot of things. They violated virtually every promise that they made. But the earmark pledge is something I really like. I was one of the outspoken critics, even of Republican earmarks like the Bridge to Nowhere. But I have to tell you, you have got to give credit where credit is due, when they will stand up and say, we are not going to have earmarks. I thought, you know what, I can live by that policy if every other Member of the House can, or we are going to have transparent earmarks; everybody has to be honest about what they are spending the money on.

I want to read to you the definition from The Citizens Against Government Waste. An earmark is any proposal that does any one of the following seven things; if you do one of them, you are an earmark. This is important, because we are facing tomorrow the largest earmark in the history of the world under this definition that everybody uses, if you do any one of these things.

If you are requested by only one Chamber of Congress. This bill tomorrow is only going to be requested by

the U.S. House, not the Senate. If you are not specifically authorized by committees in the House. This bill has not been authorized, not one thing in it has been authorized by any committee.

If there are things in the bill that are not competitively awarded. Nothing in this bill requires any competitive awards for the new spending.

Number four, if it is not requested by the President. There are billions of dollars of spending in this bill that have not been even seen, let alone requested or reviewed by the President.

Number five, if it exceeds the President's budget request or the previous year's funding. We have issues here that have never been greater than in this bill that we have not seen because it is the Pelosi omnibus package that nobody had a chance to see or vote on.

Number six—remember, any one of those things makes it an earmark; this qualifies for all five so far—if it is not the subject of congressional hearings. Well, the funny thing is the Speaker and the Democratic leadership would not let us have a hearing on any of this spending. $463 billion, we have not had one minute of hearings, 1 minute of review.

And finally, number seven, if some of the things in the bill serve only a local or special interest. Now, I will leave you with this, Mr. KING, because I really admire the points you have made. Every taxpayer is paying the price of this horrible process. It is not just about process. This is a $463 billion earmark, not because it violates one of the rules, but all seven rules.

And I would finish with this. I was really offended when Republicans were in charge of this Chamber and we had a $250 million earmark that I referred to as the Bridge to Nowhere. The earmark tomorrow is 2,000 times greater than the Bridge to Nowhere. This is the Congress that supposedly was going to be about reform, ending earmarks, and have transparency. There is not one pledge that has been made that will not be broken tomorrow if this bill passes.

With that, I thank my friend.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. FEENEY, for adding the clarity to this issue and putting the numbers down and for also listing into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the seven points, any one of which qualifies as an earmark, all of which will be breaking the promise tomorrow, and 2,000 times larger than that large earmark that 80-some percent of America understands as the Bridge to Nowhere.

I would point out that there is a way to address this. And I have not been necessarily a critic of well-managed earmarks, as long as they are within the budget and as long as it is a Member initiative that actually is researched and debated, and it is open and it is public, there is an opportunity to go in and strike it out.

But the problem with the earmarks has been, they show up after it is too late, and the bill comes to the floor, and there is not time to read the bill, and not time to prepare amendments; or they come up in a conference, and then here comes the conference report with a whole stack of earmarks in there that are agreed to by the conference committee, but not aware, not made aware to the rest of the Members, and no access to it.

So I looked at this. And I thought, how can we fix this? And we have done some things with earmarks. But last year, in the middle of this, about this time a year ago, I began grinding and churning my way through and created an act called the Cut Act. And I have drafted and filed that information; I believe that both gentlemen here on the floor are cosponsors of that Cut Act.

But what that Act does, Mr. Speaker, is it recognizes that there will be legislation passed off the floor of this Congress, and that Members will not have an opportunity to act on that legislation, on that appropriation, and that there will be earmarks in there that are either identified or may be not identified, but maybe they are objectionable to the American people.

And it recognizes, Mr. Speaker, that this is an instantaneous Information Age if we give access on the Internet to the people in this country, all of whom have access to the Internet in one form or another.

We have not done that. We need to put sunlight on everything that we do. We need to let them have real-time bloggers be able to access all of the bills that are filed, all of the amendments that are filed. They need to be able to track this whole process. But then once we get that system set up and we provide sunlight, the Cut Act allows, recognizes that those appropriations bills will find their way over to the President's desk, and he will sign them to keep this government running.

□ 1830

And this is that there will be a whole collection of objectionable, irresponsible spending to projects that comes to mind. The bridge was referenced by Mr. FEENEY. The Cowgirl Hall of Fame strikes me as something that could be privately funded if we need one. There are a number of others out there that are objectionable earmarks. But if we pass the CUT Act, and the President signs the appropriation bill and the bloggers light up and they start sending this in and it becomes a national issue, or even just a tip that goes to a certain Member of Congress, like Mr. GINGREY for example, we could, under the CUT Act, once each quarter, four times a year, provide under the rule so that a bill would be brought to the floor that would allow for the rescission of any one of those individual line items.

So the Shell bill might come to the floor. Any Member would bring an amendment that would say I want to eliminate the funding for the Cowgirl Hall of Fame. We put it up here on the board. We vote it up or down. We do that to every single line item if we chose to do that, and it might take a long time to debate that first bill.

Mr. GINGREY. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. And I hope I won't offend the gentleman, but just as he is pointing out, these earmarks are there but they are selected, in this instance, by one person. And as you start enumerating a few, like the ones that you have already mentioned, I have got to also say that the tropical rainforest in Iowa is back at $44.6 million. Now, I don't know how the gentleman feels about that one, but that is the whole point here. A CR is supposed to save money. It is literally supposed to save the taxpayers money, because instead of increasing the amount of spending at a rate of inflation or consumer price index, you go back to the last year and you just continue that process.

So, in fact, if we had done that, if we had this year-long CR, we are talking about maybe saving $6.1 billion. But, no, what the Democratic leadership of a committee of one or two decides to do is under that budget cap authority to plus this thing all the way up from 2006 levels to the budget cap, and that is an additional $6.11 billion burden on the taxpayer.

As I mentioned earlier, I won't repeat the phrase I used in referencing this bill. But people are going to call it all kind of things in addition to CRomnibus. But really it is a CR on steroids. Maybe we should call it a steroid.

And with that I will turn it back over to the gentleman from Iowa for the continuation of this discussion

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, again I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) for reminding me about some of the earmarks that we have out there. And the list is long. And my point on this is the American people can make that list a lot longer. And at least in theory, any piece of appropriation that comes across this floor that makes it through the process should have the majority support of the House of Representatives. It ought to have the majority support of the United States Senate. We ought to agree on that number, and it should go to the President for his signature. That is the process that is structured within our constitution. That is the process as the American people envision it. That is the process that we are struggling to attain here, that will not be, even presumed to be happening tomorrow when this—not a CR, but this omnibus spending bill which is a catch-all for every single appropriation that goes into discretionary spending for the rest of—until the first day of October is when this is over.

And, again, I am so sorry for the freshmen who come here that right now don't know any better, and they

aren't even outraged. They have been led, taken by the hand and led down the primrose path. And I have offered them time and again, come down here. I would be happy to yield. Tell me what legislation you have had a voice in. What have you made a difference in? Did you make the promise to represent your constituents or didn't you? Yes, you did. Obviously everybody makes that promise. So didn't you have some high and shining ideals? When you see the flag go up over the Capitol doesn't that make your heart beat a little faster? Don't you get that feeling in your stomach and that swelling sense of pride when you look up at the dome and that you are here to represent the American people of the United States Congress?

But my news to you is you are not representing them. You are not being allowed to represent them. You aren't even a voice. You haven't been heard. Your input is not there. The expertise that you bring with your background, whatever it might be, has no value in this place. It is just a handful of people in the cabal that decide what is coming down here, the same ones that make the promise that there is going to be that opportunity, freshman, for you to be able to have that kind of input.

So, Mr. Speaker, I illustrate that and the absence of rebuttal here on this floor is confirmation of my statement of my position and that of Mr. GINGREY and that of Mr. FEENEY here this afternoon. The absence of rebuttal speaks loudly and it echoes in my ears.

But on the earmark part of this, that is why I drafted the CUT Act, so that this Congress could be able to eliminate any line item that did not have the majority support of the House and the Senate and the President, and it recognizes that the President would sign an appropriations bill and that money would get off his desk and go to the agencies, wherever it might be, and it takes them sometimes the whole year to spend the last dollar. And at any point where we rescinded that funding, it would go to reduce the national debt automatically, and then that fund would no longer be available to whatever entity was about to receive it.

That is one way that gives Congress, the CUT Act gives Congress a line item veto. And that is the piece of policy that we need to get resolved here in this Congress, along with many others. But the open process, and this is going to be and has been so far, Mr. Speaker, a very closed process, a process so closed that I will point out that, not just a matter of information, I mean, I have sent my staff down to the majority leader's office to try to find out what the criteria was for the clock, or what is the criteria for providing and offering amendments; when is this draconian martial-law going to be lifted, this open process that is promised.

And I want to point out, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) was doing a national television program here on the news, the beginning of the 110th Congress, a couple of days before we gaveled in. And they said to him, but you are going to suspend all the rules and you are going to drive all this legislation through without input from Members on either side. And he got kind of a funny look on his face and he said, well, just please, will you give us a little patience. Have some patience and let us get through this process. And once we get these six bills passed, you are going to see the most open, democratic Congress in history.

Mr. COOPER, I am waiting for you, too. I would be very happy to yield.

That is not the case today. The hundred hours is clearly up. The process is not open, and the American people are not being heard. They didn't decide they were going to anoint some people with a royalty position, whether they allege that they are the most powerful woman in the world or not. This is a government that rules by the consent of the people. And the people did not give their consent to a process that is not an open process, a process that muzzles 99 percent of the Members in this Congress.

And clearly, they are not here to speak up because they know they don't have a voice and they don't have an argument. And so we are going to continue to push on this process. We are going to go before the Rules Committee. I took an amendment up before the Rules Committee, and there were a number of us that did. We all know the results of that, the charade in the Rules Committee, which is, bring your amendment up. You can offer your amendment up here, but before you come up here, we are going to tell you we are not going to accept a single one, even if it is some kind of revelation. If it is an epiphany that just fixes the whole thing, we are not going to consider it because the meat cleaver has come down.

So we are going through a charade. No amendments, but come here and argue them anyway if you want to and we will sit through this and we will put one or two people up there and we will rotate and we will get through this process. And then we will say, why are you complaining? We had a rules process. You just didn't have any amendments with any merit. Oh, really? No amendments with any merit is the same result as no input into the process, Mr. Speaker. This government cannot function with that.

And I will also point out that the House of Representatives is where all the appropriations has to start. That is what the Constitution says and that is what we need to follow. But this bill, this omnibus bill, is going to go over to the Senate, over to those 100 Senators over there, and you can bet that they are going to be offering amendments and they are going to be improving this omnibus spending bill, and they are going to be fixing this all the way through their process. So their voice will be heard. And then we will get an amended omnibus bill back here again, and I would submit this question, will then, Mr. Speaker, will it come to the floor again with no opportunity for amendments again? And if that is the case, why have we ceded the improvement process to the United States Senate?

We are the hot cup of coffee here, and they are the saucer to cool it in. We are supposed to be the quick reaction force that has the elections every 2 years, so that vigor that comes with a new freshman class and that risk of being up for re-election every 2 years, it keeps us tuned in with our fingers on the pulse of the American people who can be heard in the legislative process.

The hot cup of coffee, the quick reaction force, the storm troops that are going to come in and fix things quickly, especially in the change-over of a majority, Mr. Speaker, is just what our Founding Fathers envisioned when they drafted our Constitution and set up this miraculous system of government that we have. But the leadership in this House of Representatives has handed over the amendment process to the United States Senate which they have a legitimate claim to their version of it, we also have a legitimate claim to ours and a constitutional duty to do so that has been usurped by this decision to make a promise and have that promise of 100 hours be sacrosanct and then like that draconian approach so much of not being challenged that they go ahead and shut the clock off at 42 hours and 25 minutes.

And we could go on in perpetuity until the American people revolt at the polls. That is what is coming. You are going to see mistake after mistake after mistake. One of those examples would be the Minimum Wage Act, American Samoa, and being exempted from the Minimum Wage Act of all of The states and territories of the United States of America, one place on the map with 60,000 people, we find out after the fact, after the minimum wage bill is passed, is exempted from the minimum wage. Well, if you can legislate wages to go up and help people, which is the argument that came out of this side of the aisle continually, Mr. Speaker, then why can't you do so in American Samoa? What is wrong with them that they don't deserve a raise like everybody else got in America that was working for a minimum wage? And the answer that I get back is, well, we had to do that because the tuna market there won't sustain this. The international competition won't sustain higher wages, so we would lose that to Asia or maybe South American companies that can produce that tuna cheaper than they can in the American Samoa.

Well, that is called competition. And how is it that Democrats can understand the effect of competition and the deleterious effect of minimum wage on a small business, large business in a small microcosm of a location like American Samoa? They can understand

it when it is a microcosm, but they can't understand it when it is 300 million people in a macrocosm. It is the same principle that applies, Mr. Speaker. But that is a fatal flaw of this approach of a closed process rather than an open process. That is what happens, Mr. Speaker, when we don't allow for amendments. And then things start to smell fishy.

What was the reason?

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just wanted to point out, and I am sure the gentleman would agree with me, that there are things in this so-called CR that we approve of. As I look through the list, and of course, I have got a lot more looking to do, but as I see things like an increase in Pell Grants to $260 up to $4,310, I think that is good. And additional funding for the Head Start program. And I could go on and on and on. There are a number of things here that I see that I could vote in favor of, but there are a number that I would be opposed to.

And just as the gentleman points out, especially for the new Members on both sides of the aisle to not have an opportunity to go through regular order and a committee markup process, go to the Rules Committee with their amendments, I am talking now about majority Member amendments, things that they have heard about, as you pointed out, Mr. KING, from their constituents, as they campaigned for the very first time for Congress and the excitement of that, and you pointed that out as well. It is just sad. It really is sad. And if it wasn't so sad, it would be almost laughable.

So I just want to say that, again, it is not that, as I register tomorrow my vote against this, it is unfortunate because there are some things in here that I would be in favor of. But I am going to be voting against the usurp of power and putting the process under the jackboot of the new majority.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY). And I will say that my sympathy and heart goes out to especially freshmen Members of Congress when they go back home to their town hall meetings, and I would just ask you, out there, and Mr. Speaker, I convey that message to the people in America, that when these freshman especially show up for their first town hall meeting, I would say to the citizens, stand up and ask them, what has been your input? What has been your impact? How have you kept your promise so far? What do you think of the process? What has been your involvement? Have you produced any amendments? Have you done anything to impact this process whatsoever? And their answer is going to be ''no.'' You need to challenge them, Mr. Speaker, to come back here and open up this process.

□ 1845

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to talk about the President's health plan that he discussed or brought forth in the State of the Union address last week, but I couldn't help after listening to some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about the continuing resolution that is going to come to the floor tomorrow to just spend one minute before I get into my health care Special Order just mentioning why I think what they said is so wrong.

I of course have been in Congress for a number of years now, and last year which was the last Republican majority Congress that we have had, I guess, or that we are going to have, the Republican leadership passed a budget that was so unrealistic that they were unable to complete work on nine of the 11 annual appropriation bills. So I think everyone needs to understand, Mr. Speaker, that whatever the Democrats do tomorrow is simply cleaning up the mess that the Republican leadership left us. They didn't do their job; they didn't do their work.

Most people would say that the main purpose of the Congress is to pass a budget and pass the appropriations bills so that the government can continue to operate, and they simply did not do that. They left here in December with only two of the 11 appropriations bills. Those dealing with defense and the military were passed. The other nine were just left, and they passed their own CR, or continuing resolution, to take us through I guess February 15, and basically said, okay, we are getting out of town and we leave this mess to the Democrats. So back in December, Senator BYRD and Congressman OBEY announced a plan to wrap up the bills in a joint funding resolution, and that CR is coming to the floor tomorrow.

But I will stress, and I don't know how many times I can keep saying the same thing: there are no earmarks in that continuing resolution. None whatsoever. In fact, there is even language in the continuing resolution, and I will reference in title I, section 12 that says: ''Any language specifying an earmark in the committee report or statement of managers accompanying the appropriations act for this fiscal year or for the last fiscal year shall have no legal effect with respect to funds appropriated by this division.''

So essentially what that says is: we are not allowing any earmarks. But even if one of the bills in the committee report or in the statement of managers, which are not binding under the law, even if one of those suggests an earmark, that the Federal agency responsible for administering that program has no obligation under the law to implement it.

I don't know how more emphatic we could be in saying no earmarks, no suggestions of earmarks. Don't pay any attention to anybody who tries to suggest an earmark. That is essentially what this language says.

So this whole effort to say that somehow there are earmarks in this is just fabrication. And beyond that, the fact of the matter is that we have no choice but to adopt this continuing resolution because they left us this mess and we have to move on to the next budget year. So I just wanted to point that out, and then I would like to move on to the real issue that I came here tonight to discuss, which is the President's health insurance proposal.

I was glad to see that in his State of the Union address that the President prioritized health care, and he said that he wanted to solve the problems of the current system both in dealing with the large number of uninsured and also with the fact that costs, the costs of the health care system continue to rise. So I will give him credit for prioritizing this issue, because he has not done so in the past.

But I have to be critical and say for the last 6 years President Bush and the Republican Congresses have ignored our Nation's health care problems. Because of that neglect, we have seen health care premiums skyrocket over the last 6 years since he has been President and the number of uninsured increase after we witnessed reductions in the number of uninsured in the late 1990s. When President Clinton was in office in the last couple years of his Presidency, for the first time in a generation the number of uninsured actually went down because of his policies. But ever since President Bush took office, the number of uninsured has gone up. And I just want to give some statistics on the President's record.

Here is the information on the uninsured: when he took office in 2001, there were 41.2 million Americans who were uninsured. Five years later, in 2006, the number had grown to 47 million. That is an increase, Mr. Speaker, of 1 million Americans every year on the President's watch. That is the first and I think most significant statistic.

And then the next poster I wanted to show has a map of the United States. And I think a lot of times when you give numbers, people don't necessarily respond to them or they just sound like a lot of bureaucracy. But forgetting the numbers for the moment, what this map shows is that the number of uninsured now exceeds the cumulative population of 24 States and the District of Columbia that we have outlined in the shade of red or orange here. So that is a lot of uninsured. That is the number of people that live in those 24 States and in the District of Columbia that are now uninsured.

And then the third thing is in terms of the premiums, because again the

President has said that he wants to address not only the problem of the uninsured but also the problem of costs for health care. So if you look at this chart, you can see that workers are now paying an average of 1,094 more in annual health care premiums for their families than they did in 2000.

So that is essentially what has happened while the President was in office. And this is based on information from the National Coalition of Health Care: workers are now paying on the average $1,094 more in annual health premiums for their families than they did in 2000.

Now, again, I appreciate the fact that President Bush highlighted this issue and suggested it needs to be prioritized, and hopefully his statement during the State of the Union address would suggest that he wants to work with the Democratic Congress to try to address these two problems, but his proposals have essentially been a nonstarter because they don't address the actual problems that he is seeking to highlight.

Essentially what he has done, and this is the one thing that I think is the most incredulous, is he is talking about a tax increase, and many of you know that President Bush repeatedly said he would never support a tax increase. It has been sort of the hallmark of his 6 or 7 years in office now, that he didn't want tax increases. But he actually said that he would effectuate a tax increase on a lot of people through his health insurance plan, because what he does is basically take those people who have a very good comprehensive policy, what you might call a Cadillac or a gold-plated insurance policy, well, they are going to be taxed. And the way that he is going to pay for the program is essentially to say, I will tax the people who have very good insurance coverage in order to give a break, a tax break, if you will, to those people who don't, and I'll encourage people to go into the individual market because we will give them the tax break paid for by a tax increase for the first time on people that have a very good policy. Now, I know it gets a little complicated there, but I think it is very important for everyone to understand that he is actually proposing a tax increase on those people that have very good insurance coverage right now.

Now, I could talk for a lot longer on this, but I see that I have been joined by some of my colleagues. So rather just talking myself for the next 5 or 10 minutes, I would like to hear from some of them. I will start by yielding to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

If I could just mention that both of my colleagues that are here tonight, one from Pennsylvania, one from Tennessee are new Members, and I particularly appreciate your coming down to discuss this.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman, and I would address the Chair. We have a situation in this country as was just outlined where we have 47 million Americans with no health insurance at all. We have tens of millions more that live in fear of losing their coverage. Employers often are unable to offer insurance to their employees. This is an epidemic in this country, and I heard about it back in the district this past weekend, I hear about it everywhere I go, because health insurance is an issue that affects everybody. It doesn't matter if you are rich or poor, live in an urban setting, rural area. No matter where you are from, health care affects you directly. And, unfortunately, for the past 6 years this issue has been ignored. And truth be told, it has been ignored for longer than that. And we need to look at this issue because this is affecting our economy.

At General Motors, $1,500 of the price of producing a car is because of their health benefits. We can't compete with the rest of the world when other countries have health insurance provided. So we are starting $1,500 in the hole.

So I do commend President Bush for including health care as one of his top priorities in the State of the Union address. It is something that is long overdue, and I am happy that he has finally decided to look seriously at this issue. Unfortunately, the plan that he has proposed is not going to be more than a drop in the bucket to solving that problem.

We have a President who has now proposed a solution based on changes in the Tax Code to solve a problem that I have outlined. We spend $2 trillion a year as a Nation on health care, so he has recommended that he in some cases actually raise the costs to people's out-of-pocket expenses by taxing health care benefits for people. And I want to tell you something, if you don't have enough money to buy health insurance right now, you are one of the 58 million families that don't have any taxable income now because you are not making enough money to pay taxes, a tax deduction is not going to help you afford health insurance. And under the President's most optimistic estimations, his plan only offers health insurance to 3 million of the 47 million Americans that currently lack health insurance. So there may be a role for a Tax Code solution to the health crisis that we are facing in this country, but it is a very small part of what is happening.

I am glad that the doctor from Wisconsin has joined us, and I am sure he will have a lot to say.

Mr. PALLONE. If I could just ask the gentleman to yield back. I just want to give an example of exactly what you were talking about.

Under the President's tax plan, a low-income person who was previously uninsured would receive about a $1,200 tax break. That is assuming that they are paying taxes. At a time when the average cost of coverage for a family is around $11,000 a year, a $1,200 tax break is not going to be enough to get that person insured. In contrast, the higher-income person who was previously uninsured would receive nearly $6,000. So the problem is, the person who is more likely to benefit from this is the higher-income person who doesn't have a very good plan. If their plan is good, then they are even going to get taxed on it.

So your point I think is very well taken, how is that little bit of a tax break going to get that person to be able to go out into the individual market and buy a health insurance policy? It is simply not the case.

I yield back to you.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman. And what this does is provide an incentive for younger and healthier workers to purchase insurance outside of the employer's plan because those benefits will be taxed, leaving only the older and sicker workers in the employer's risk pool, which is going to raise costs not only for us as individuals but for employers. And that is the last thing we need to be doing. That is going in exactly the wrong direction, because ultimately the employer's insurance is going to become unaffordable as it is left with nothing but sicker people in the risk pool.

And we need a more efficient system where we encourage people who are younger and healthier to participate in the same risk pools as everybody else, because right now if you are a small employer especially and one of your employees get sick, you get a phone call from the insurance company that says, You have two choices: we are either going to quadruple your premiums, or we are going to drop you entirely. And this plan that the President has proposed exacerbates that problem. It makes it worse, because now your benefits are taxed on top of having your premiums quadrupled.

Mr. PALLONE. I would just ask the gentleman, my question, isn't it also possible under the scenario you laid out that under the President's plan that the employer has an incentive to essentially drop insurance coverage all together and say, Okay, well, now that you have this tax deduction, why don't you just go out and buy insurance on your own. And doesn't even offer the health insurance anymore. It actually could even make the situation worse in terms of the uninsured, because he says, Okay, you go out now and buy the insurance on your own.

Mr. ALTMIRE. And it is going to flood the insurance market with people who can't afford health insurance because of health problems.

□ 1900

Now if you are young and healthy and wealthy, that is a great plan. That sounds fine. Go out in the insurance market and buy a high-deductible, catastrophic plan, and you will be fine.

But for most American families in this country, we are going to see our insurance costs increase. Even if we are not participating in any of the new plans and nothing changes for us, our

costs are going to go up because folks who are younger and healthy are now outside the system, and we are in the same insurance pool with everybody else.

Mr. PALLONE. The other thing that bothers me is that a lot of people will either individually negotiate with their employer, or if they are part of a union, negotiate through their union, a better health package, and call it a Cadillac or gold-plated package. They trade that for not having a salary increase or some other benefit because they want that health care benefit for themselves or their family.

So why should they be penalized by having to pay an extra tax because they have made that decision? These are the kinds of life decisions that people make depending on their circumstances.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. I had the distinct honor of presiding during the last 2½ hours, and I heard some verbiage that was thrown out to the freshmen about how we were not having participation in this process. And the gentleman who asked that question said nobody had answered his response. There is a rule that the Speaker cannot respond, and as a freshman it was difficult, but I restrained myself and now have an opportunity to respond.

The freshmen are happy with the procedures that are going on, and the processes, and are glad to be part of this Democratic majority.

We are funding more money in the budget for Pell Grants, which is an issue that I have great concern with. I know that Mr. ALTMIRE also does, and so does Dr. KAGEN. And we are also funding money for the COPS program and for Head Start. There are wonderful things for veterans and health care in the budget. The freshmen had input and feel comfortable with it.

I am afraid that a false impression was given to the people of America during the last hour.

Mr. PALLONE. If I may interrupt, this continuing resolution is essentially continuing the same level of funding; and yet it is making these advances, including a number in the health care area. Veterans' health care goes up, as does funding for the National Institutes of Health and funding for Ryan White and community health centers.

There is a lot of additional money to address the health care crisis in the country that we are focusing on tonight.

Mr. COHEN. If I may ask, you were here in the previous Congress. Didn't the Republican-controlled Congress have a chance to pass that budget and have all the input that they wanted, and they failed to do it? Why is the continuing resolution here?

Mr. PALLONE. Because they were the do-nothing Congress, essentially. That was their hallmark.

Today is January 30. We have met the majority of the business days this month. We have been in session. We passed bills during the 100 hours that affect so many things: negotiated prices for prescription drugs, cutting the interest rate for student loans in half, and the list goes on.

They met once in the previous session in January. The way the process works, and I know you are familiar with it, is that your appropriations bills are supposed to be passed in both the House and Senate by, say, June or July at the latest, and then you have conferences. And before October 1, which is the beginning of the fiscal year, you come back with the conference reports in September and you pass them before October 1, which is the end of the fiscal year.

They did none of that. They only passed those bills and sent them to the President in two cases: defense and military construction bills, both defense-oriented. Everything else was neglected. I don't believe the Senate passed a single bill. In the House we passed some, didn't pass others.

And when they had the lame duck session after the election, they simply went out of business. They passed a CR which just continues current levels of funding until February 15 and said, Okay, you guys won the election, you deal with it.

Normally, in January, we start the next fiscal year, having hearings and putting together the budget, and the President delivers it by the end of the month or the beginning of February. If we didn't pass the continuing resolution to get this year done quickly in the fashion we are going to tomorrow, or in the next couple of days or weeks, we would be having to deal with last year's budget left to us by them, this mess, and we wouldn't even have time to move on to the next fiscal year.

They just left this mess. The amazing thing is it has no earmarks, which is a reform, and yet they keep talking about it as if it does.

Mr. COHEN. The gentleman from Iowa talked about a cowgirl museum in Iowa. Is that in this budget?

Mr. PALLONE. I don't know the specifics in terms of each line item. It is a 400-page bill. But I would point out, we have that language in the bill that I read before that specifically says that any suggestion that there be an earmark, even if it is just in a committee report or even suggested by the managers, should be simply ignored by the agencies that are involved.

Imagine that, as Democrats in the majority, we are telling the agencies that are controlled by the Republican President, pay no attention to any suggestion of an earmark, do what you think is best. What can be more bipartisan than that? And yet they are saying it is filled with all of these earmarks.

Mr. COHEN. The gentleman started with some story about Greece. I thought about it and I thought about the Trojan horse and this health care plan. The State of the Union address mentioned health care, but when you get into it, it is really a tax increase, as Representative ALTMIRE mentioned. And it is going to affect charity hospitals, and that is the bottom line, the safety net, and it is probably going to destroy those hospitals. Is this plan not a Trojan horse?

Mr. PALLONE. I am glad you mentioned that. I think that is a very important point.

The President is very much aware of the fact that many States, and there are getting to be more and more—in my State in April there is going to be a proposal to have universal coverage in New Jersey. Many States are trying to cover everyone and get rid of all of the uninsured.

What the President said in the State of the Union address was, we will take money from disproportionate-share hospitals, and these are hospitals that are getting Federal dollars because they have a high number of charity care cases, people who have no insurance; he is saying we will cut back and we will give that to States, to the governors, so they can help deal with the problem of the uninsured.

Well, in many States, including my own, that will only aggravate the problem. They are getting that money to cover people who have no insurance. So it is like, what is the expression, robbing Peter to pay Paul. That is essentially what it is. We will take the money that is now being used to cover people, and we will cut that and give it back to you so you can cover them. It makes no sense.

Mr. COHEN. I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

We have one of our experts here, a physician and highly respected Member from Wisconsin, Representative KAGEN, and I would just say that I have learned from a lot of the briefings that the freshmen have had that the disparity of wealth in this country is the greatest it has been since the 1920s, and that is because of a lot of the actions of the previous Congress and this administration. And now they are going to make the disparity in health as great as the disparity in wealth, and we have already seen what they did with stealth.

So, Jesse Jackson, we are here.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Now that Dr. KAGEN has been mentioned, I will yield to you.

I want to say one thing, and that is, many times in the Energy and Commerce Committee the Republican side of the aisle would point out how they had a number of doctors and would suggest that they had a sort of exclusivity to their knowledge of medical and health care issues because they had these doctors. I am glad to see that there were doctors on the Republican side, but I am also glad to see we are getting more doctors on the Democratic side.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KAGEN. Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to be here with you this evening.

Everyone in this room, everyone in this country has a health care story to tell. But if you want to talk first about the President's proposal, I think it falls not in terms of a Trojan horse, but a smoke screen, much like the Social Security crisis was a smoke screen to distract people from what was really going on.

I have a chart here that demonstrates that the number of uninsured Americans exceeds the cumulative population of 24 States in our country. Really what we are talking about is the uninsured and even those that have insurance coverage, just having insurance coverage doesn't guarantee that you are going to get coverage. After all, in my medical practice every day, when I would write a prescription, maybe one chance in two, one chance in three, it wasn't covered, it wasn't on the plan, or in Medicare part D on the 44 different lists we had in Wisconsin.

I would start off on a positive note and say that the President should be commended for raising this important crisis. It is, in my view, the most important crisis facing our economy. The impossible costs of health care are holding back employment. Employers are unable to employ new employees because of the high cost of insuring them.

In my hometown of Appleton, a new teacher this year will be paid $30,000, but his or her insurance coverage will be $12,000 to $13,000, in another neighboring city, $17,000. For anyone earning less than $48,000, the cost of health insurance coverage is simply out of reach.

Medically speaking, I would say thank you to the President, but your idea is DOA, dead on arrival. It simply won't work, and it will not solve the crisis we are all facing.

He had some other interesting and positive ideas. The idea of the health savings account, I think it is a great idea that people are saving money, but no matter how much money you are saving, it doesn't affect the cost of health insurance, it doesn't affect the cost of your physician's charges, the hospital expenses, or the prescription drugs that many people need.

Everyone has a health care story to tell, and it is for those people and everyone in the country that this 110th Congress must address this crisis.

Now let me ask all of you, Mr. ALTMIRE, don't you want to know the price of a pill before you swallow it?

Mr. ALTMIRE. Absolutely.

Mr. KAGEN. If you are buying a car or truck or new suit, don't you ask the price? And when you ask the price, you find out the price.

I challenge all of us in this room tonight and everyone listening at home, call up your local hospital and ask: Excuse me, what does it cost for a mammogram, and 99.9 percent of the time you are going to get this answer: ''Well, what insurance do you have?''

I think we need to have transparency, and this is one of the ideas that President Bush is in favor of, and I am sure our Republican colleagues would be as well.

I believe we need to openly disclose all prices in health care. I believe every citizen should get the same discount. I don't believe in discrimination.

Today, on average, if you are covered by Medicare part D, if you go to the pharmacy and you are in line behind somebody from the VA, you are going to pay 46 percent more for that prescription, the identical prescription being sold to a veteran patient, and yet you are paying more. I feel that is a form of discrimination.

So if we have an open and transparent marketplace where everyone gets the same discount, where prices are openly disclosed, we form one nation again, not State by State solutions which are very difficult and challenging and unique to the region.

I believe if you are a citizen, you should be in the risk pool across the country. Everyone has a health care story tonight, and what they need to understand is that the Democrats are really listening.

This health care crisis is something that I see and feel every day as a physician. It is something all of us in Congress hear about here in Washington and when we are back home listening to our constituents. I think we need to spread the word that this Congress, the 110th Congress, and especially if I can say the word, our freshmen class, will address this issue and take it on straight away.

Mr. PALLONE. The President talks about health care costs, but in my opinion the biggest thing that could be done or one of the major accomplishments would be if he would simply go along with what we passed in the first 100 hours, which is negotiated prices for prescription drugs. Imagine the amount of money we could save with that.

It passed the House and it is over in the Senate, but he has said he is opposed to it. I am hoping that we can pass something in the Senate and we can get something to his desk that he will sign.

It is sort of hypocrisy on the one hand to talk about increasing costs, and this would be one of the easiest ways to save money, and we did it as Democrats, with all the new Members' help in the first 100 hours, and I hope that he would reconsider his opposition to it.

□ 1915

Mr. KAGEN. You are quite right, and I would look at it and phrase it a little bit differently.

I believe our President must be kind to seniors and kind to all Americans, and he would be kind in signing the opportunity to negotiate for a lower price for medications. I believe it is discriminatory, as I said.

I look at the world and say, okay, what I am about to do, is it kind or unkind. I think it would be terribly unkind to all senior citizens, to anyone certainly in AARP, if President Bush were to veto that bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I see we have also been joined by another new Member, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), and I would yield to her at this time.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, who has been a leader in this Congress on health care, and, yes, you are joined by a number of new Members tonight that were elected because of our desire to work on health care solutions for the American people.

So like my colleague from Wisconsin and my colleague from Pennsylvania, I also listened intently last week to what President Bush had to say on health care, and, unfortunately, I did not hear anything that will help one person go to the doctor's office and get health care. Instead, what he said is, you go to your accountant's office, not your doctor's office. You go to your accountant's office and you get a tax deduction and you work that out on your tax forms.

Well, that does not make sense for the vast majority of people, especially in the Tampa Bay area, 20 percent without health insurance today, having to go to the emergency room for their primary care, rather than going to a doctor's office for their primary care.

He says take a tax deduction. The problem is that so many people are just getting by. They are right there at the poverty level. That is $9,000 for an individual, about $20,000 for a family of four. Imagine trying to live off $20,000 for a family of four. They do not pay taxes. They do not pay income taxes. They pay sales tax, but that tax deduction that President Bush wants you to get to get your health care is not going to do anything for those hardworking families.

The second part of his plan is equally troubling because he wants to sock it to the hospitals in this country that are providing charity care. In Tampa, Tampa General Hospital provides millions of dollars in charity care, and they are able through Federal law to send up some money, match it and bring home some dollars, especially in Hillsboro County, a county of about 1.3 million people. We have an award-winning health care program where the citizens of the county and a lot of our tourists pay a sales tax, and we devote that to a system of clinics throughout our community. We also send up that money to the Federal Government, and they say you are doing such a good job on the local level, taking care of your citizens in a network of clinics and not in the ER, that we will give you further incentives through ''disproportionate share money'' they call it.

What the President would do is take those incentives away from local governments like mine, like in Hillsboro County, this network of doctors and

hospitals that we have built up, and say, you know what we are going to do with that stream of money, we are going to probably turn it over to the HMOs and privatize the system.

This, I think, is another attempt by the Bush administration to embark on a privatization scheme which sounds awfully similar to what he proposed for Social Security.

My locals, my hospitals, doctors and, most importantly, the hardworking families in my district are not going to be well-served by the President's health care proposals. What do you think this will do to hospitals in your area?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to either one of you. I see the gentleman from Wisconsin has something to say.

Mr. KAGEN. I have a lot to say about this subject, a lot of feelings. I would say it this way:

Medicare part D has already been privatized because no longer is the benefit money going to go to a constituent, to a Medicare enrollee. It goes to the insurance company. In fact, all of us taxpayers paid money to private insurance companies for the marketing of this most fiscally irresponsible program ever to be rolled out by the Federal Government to help them to be successful to privatize the Medicare patients.

Ms. CASTOR. You are right. Add the Medicare part D privatization, all of those moneys going to HMO profits and pharmaceutical companies' profits, to Social Security privatization attempted by the Bush administration, why are hospitals' charity care next? Why the foundation of the last resort for so many families? Why do they want to take away resources from the hardworking doctors and our charity hospitals?

Mr. PALLONE. I would just say, you know, a lot of people will say, well, why would the President want to do this? Why does he privatize? Why does he give money to the HMOs? What is the reason? Because you would like to think he would make the right decisions and do the right things.

There are two things I have to point out: one is that he is often driven by ideology, and I think it is a mistake. You have to be practical. You have to look at what actually works and not just look and say, well, government is not good and privatizing is better. Sometimes government is better. Sometimes privatizing is better. But just do not be stuck in this ideology that it is always better to privatize.

The other thing, unfortunately, is the special interests. I mean, the bottom line is that the drug companies traditionally gave a lot of money to the Republican candidates and his own campaign, and the same with the HMOs. The HMOs were always the darling of the Republicans and the President, and they contributed a lot to their campaigns. So there is a special interest reason here, as well as an ideological reason unfortunately.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KAGEN. I want to make it perfectly clear to everyone in this room and beyond that we Democrats are very much in favor of profits. We believe in capitalism, and the problem that your hospitals have in Florida or Pennsylvania or New Jersey or Wisconsin, the problem we have in large part is this thing called ''cost shifting.'' The cost of providing a service to a Medicare enrollee does not cover the overhead, does not cover the operating expense to provide that service. So someone has to make up that difference. It takes so much money to run a business, to run a hospital or a clinic or a drug company, but we want people to be profitable. So we are not against profits, but we are against the idea of privatization of what is an essential service, one of the greatest social programs ever rolled out by this Nation being Medicare.

Now, I would be the first to admit that Medicare is a mess. I do not know of any doctor or administrator that really understands all the 44,000 pages of the rules, but it does not mean that it cannot be fixed. It does not mean that we cannot take a positive attitude toward it and address it and fix it.

Now, I am also a small businessman. I want everyone in this room and beyond to understand, the Democrats are pro-small business. Every small business in this country is facing a crisis because they cannot afford their health insurance premiums. Whether you are a farmer, a photographer or an employer of 50 or fewer people, health care is out of reach. The cost is out of reach, and this Congress needs to step up, not with the President's idea of tax benefits, but we should take part of the good from his policy and bring it to the floor with a new idea.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I would say if you were going to use the tax policy or the tax system as a way of addressing this in some meaningful way, it would be a lot more meaningful to a low-income person if it was a refundable tax credit than as a tax deduction, simply because they really cannot take advantage of the tax deduction.

At some point, I think we should also talk in the next 20 minutes or so about some of the alternatives that we would like to see instead of the President's plan, but I did not give the gentleman from Pennsylvania an opportunity. So I go back to him at this point.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I did want to talk about some of the out-of-pocket costs that individuals and families are going to be facing with this plan.

I did want to say how happy I am to see the gentlewoman from Florida, a very distinguished graduate from the Florida State University School of Law, here to join us tonight. I was excited to hear your remarks as well.

Something that has not been talked about but I want Members to think about this when they go home and talk to especially their seniors, but also folks who maybe are just starting in the workforce and have years, maybe decades left ahead of them to pay into the Social Security system and look forward to their Social Security benefits, I want those Members to talk to their constituents about the fact that this plan, as proposed by the President, does the tax deduction up to $15,000 of taxable income.

So what that does, as we have talked about it, is it taxes your health care benefits above that level, but more importantly, from the perspective of Social Security, it reduces your income subject to the calculation of Social Security year after year after year, compounding itself, and that is going to reduce the Social Security benefits, your monthly check, for millions of Americans. That is something that is not even being discussed in this debate.

We all know the out-of-pocket costs on our health care, and I am going to talk about that in a moment, but I want folks who have years ahead of them to pay into the Social Security system to think what that would do to have $15,000 removed from your calculatable income for the purposes of determining your Social Security benefits. That is a direct hit on working-class Americans.

I also want folks to think about the fact that that $15,000 is going to be subject to a cost-of-living-type adjustment, inflation adjustment each year, but the cost of health care rises often three and four times greater annually than the cost of living in this country. So if you are a younger worker paying into this system year after year, you are going to lose money year after year after year in inflation-adjusted dollars because it is adjusted on the $15,000 based on the cost of living, not the actual cost of increases in the health care. That is a real hit to working Americans and working families in this country.

Lastly, I spoke earlier about the fact that this provides an incentive to younger and healthier workers to opt-out of this system and maybe opt for catastrophic, high-deductible plans, hoping that they will not get sick. What young families do not realize, the exact people that I am talking about is often in almost every case, maternity care is not covered under those types of plans. So for those Members who want to go back and talk to some of their young families in their district, I would ask them to consider how expensive that would be if they had to pay out of pocket for the costs of their maternity care.

I know Dr. KAGEN could certainly comment on what those costs would be. We are talking about a real hit to working-class Americans. This does not benefit the majority of Americans, and, in fact, this makes the cost of health care more unaffordable for individuals. It raises costs on small businesses, employers, and it especially

hurts the self-employed because it removes the current deduction on health care for our self-employed.

So, again, the President has moved us in exactly the wrong direction that we need to be going.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate your comments because I think it is very important and I know it is a little detailed, but the fact of the matter is these points need to be made.

I just wanted to lead us, if I could, we have about 15, 20 minutes left, maybe not quite 20, into what we would do as an alternative. As I said, if you wanted to use tax policy as a way of trying to address the problems here, and I am not saying that that is the most effective way to do it, but if you did, certainly a refundable tax credit would be more useful to that lower-income person than this deduction that may not even be able to take advantage of.

But I just wanted to also point out that if you look at the problem with the uninsured right now, first is the employer-sponsored insurance which increasingly fewer and fewer people are able to take advantage of, even though they are working, because the employer simply does not provide either any coverage or a meaningful coverage that they can afford with their copayment.

What employers tell me is that we have to provide some sort of incentive for them if they are going to cover those people that work for them that they do not cover now, and that either means, again, if you are going to use tax policy, some kind of tax benefit to them or, alternatively, getting rid of some of the cost of the coverage.

For example, when Senator KERRY was running for President, he had proposed taking catastrophic insurance off the table. In other words, having the government in some way provide for catastrophic coverage because that is a big part of the cost and so the employers, if they did not have to pay for catastrophic coverage because the government was subsidizing that in some way, they would be a lot more likely to offer a health insurance plan with a relatively low copayment.

□ 1930

This is something the President hasn't mentioned.

The other thing, I think, and even more important, is that you have to realize there are a lot of people that are just never going to get employer-sponsored coverage, either because of the situation with their employment, whether it is full-time or part-time, or because they are not working and they are not, for some reason, eligible for existing government programs.

We also need to look at the government programs which the President completely ignores, whether it be, you know, Medicaid or Medicare or the SCHIP, you know, program for kids, and look at ways to expand eligibility and provide funding for those programs to sort of take up the gap.

I just want to throw those out as the types of things that the Democrats will be looking at in addition to the tax policy.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR. I thank the gentleman.

There is good news now that we have the new Democratic Congress, and this year we are going to reauthorize that children's health insurance program. The gentleman from New Jersey has been a true leader in this effort, and I look forward to working with you in that effort.

But here is a real success story over the years where, under President Clinton, out of a program that grew out of the State of Florida, so I have a bit of pride in that, children of working families, and we are not talking about the low-income, impoverished, we are talking middle-class families that don't have any other way to take their son or daughter to the doctor in an affordable way.

Well, this year is our opportunity to look at what has worked across the country. There are programs in many States. Many States have been very aggressive, and they understand how important it is for children to be immunized, for them to make sure that a cold doesn't turn into pneumonia, because ultimately we will pay those higher costs on the back end if we don't treat them on the front end.

Unfortunately, in the State of Florida, we are not living up to the initiation of the program and the grant, the pride that comes from that originating in Florida. I am going to have to get one of these nice fancy charts one day. But I have got one here that shows what a success it was in Florida when we started, but because of bureaucratic barriers created under another Bush, under former Governor Bush, we have lost hundreds of thousands of children off the rolls, which doesn't mean that all children in Florida are healthier, we are still a growing State, but they have created such a costly bureaucracy for parents and for doctors and for all health care providers that we are not able to serve kids like we should.

So that is one of the critical solutions that I think we have got to work on.

Let us cut out this bureaucracy. What is wrong with allowing parents to take their child to the doctor's office, just take them to the doctor's office and get the health care they need without creating all of this paperwork and bean counters in Tallahassee and bean counters in Washington that are having to spend a lot of time and a lot of our resources that could be going into the health care for our kids?

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate your comments. I think they are right on point. We, in our Health Subcommittee, the Energy and Commerce Committee, in about 2 weeks, are going to have hearings on the SCHIP, the kid care program. One of the things we will be looking at is how we can get kids, now eligible, enrolled, because there are too many barriers.

I mean, in my home State of New Jersey, I really believe in our State we have been doing everything we can to try to get kids enrolled who are eligible. But we still have the majority, we have more kids that are eligible for SCHIP that are not enrolled than we had kids that are actually enrolled.

So something has to be done, whether it is outreach, whether it is getting rid of the bureaucracy, streamlining the application process. These are some of the things that we as Democrats are going to take up here, because this is a major way of covering the uninsured.

The biggest group of uninsured continues to be children, so I appreciate the gentleman's comment.

I see the good doctor from Wisconsin.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KAGEN. I agree with you that many people get very confused when you start talking about bean counting and you get into the numbers. It gets very confusing. We might be better off for everyone to understand health care and simplify it if we talk about trying to identify the essential elements that should be in any successful universal health care initiative.

Those essential elements that I don't think anyone would disagree with would be that if you are a citizen, you should be in the risk pool. Because in every State, what they are trying to do now as they seek to find a solution to this urgent problem, every State is trying to form a larger buying group, a larger insurance pool. That is really their only game plan to leverage down the costs. But if we have 300 million in an insurance risk pool with regional modifiers, we can really begin to leverage down insurance costs.

I would ask this question, what is the purpose of having health insurance? Health insurance is a form of delayed income. You put your hard-earned money into the insurance company's hands so that when you or a member of your family becomes ill, you get it back. But unfortunately today, when the money goes into the insurance company, you have to fight like heck to get it back, and it may not come back in total.

Health insurance should be available to everyone at an openly disclosed price, so everyone has an opportunity to buy something that is affordable.

Let us look at the numbers. In 1989, 83 percent of Americans had health insurance coverage from work; in 2004, 56 percent. It was because employers couldn't afford to pay the price. The cost was impossible to pay. If we had numbers today, it might be below 50 percent. More and more people that are watching tonight are falling into this category, going to bed at night knowing that if anyone in the family is ill, they are going to lose their house.

What insurance ought to be all about is guaranteeing, if you do become ill or anyone in your family becomes ill, you

are still in your house and not the poorhouse. If we identify the essential elements that need to be in any solution that is universal, I think there are several. First, openly disclose the prices.

Second, every citizen should be allowed to pay the lowest price.

Third, I think we need that insurance risk pool to be nationwide. If you are a citizen, you are in with no cherry-picking.

Fourth, we need to have a deductible that is 3 percent of a household's Federal taxable income.

If Mr. ALTMIRE were to make $100,000 a year, he and his family could afford $3,000 on health care. But then give it to him as a tax deduction at the end of the year, up to that 3 percent limit.

Fifth, most importantly, I believe the measure of any nation is in how we treat those who are in need. So I would say it this way, that local, State and national governments must provide for those in need.

I think it is up to us here as Democrats and Republicans to come together and decide who is in need and what is it we should provide for them? If we can agree on the essential elements that should be in any national solution, the next step will be much more easy to take.

Mr. PALLONE. I wanted to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I think we have about 7 minutes left, but I did want to mention one other thing. I know the gentleman from Florida brought up community health centers and that type of thing. That has got to be an important part of this as well.

It is unfortunate, because a few years ago in his budget message or State of the Union, the President actually said he wanted to prioritize community health centers and create a lot more, but he never provided the funding to do that, which is often the case. We get the rhetoric, but we don't get the funding.

To the extent that you can, take a lot of the people who are uninsured and who will go to an emergency room, and become part of that uncompensated care that is a big burden on the hospital, and you can, instead, set up community health centers, whether in a fixed place or in a mobile van or whatever, and have people go there as they would go to a doctor, as you said, and get the preventive care they would get from a doctor, as opposed to an emergency room later. That is a big factor in this, as well, that we have to look at. I wanted to commend the gentlewoman for what she said in that regard.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania again.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I wanted to comment on what the gentleman from Wisconsin was discussing with regard to community rating, which means there are approximately 160 million people in this country that are privately insured, get their insurance through their employer, pay for it themselves, but they participate in the private market.

What the gentleman is recommending, which I think would be a good step, is to put those people, or at least a large portion of those people, in the same community-rated risk pool for the purposes of setting their insurance rates. You are still getting your insurance from the same people. You still have the same freedom of choice in the market and to choose your own health plan with this initial step, but the difference is, instead of you being viewed as an individual for the purposes of setting your rates, or small business, only your 10 employees being viewed together, you have 160 million people that are in the same pool.

So if you or a member of your family, or one of your employees in the case of a small business, has the misfortune to get sick or injured, you don't get that phone call from the insurance company saying, we are going to raise your rates, because you have your rates set by the health status of the pool at large, 160 million people, not just you as an individual or your employees.

I would commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for recommending that. I do think that would be a step in the right direction.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR. Well, under the new Democratic Congress, I think we now can show some leadership when it comes to health care solutions. We have such expertise out in our country in the various universities and the medical schools and with the researchers, and it is time for a little leadership on wellness care and preventive medicine.

I was listening very intently to President Bush last week, hoping that he would be true to his conservative principles and say we need to conserve energy and you need to be conservative in how you take care of yourself.

I think now is the time for Democrats to provide this kind of leadership on diabetes, obesity prevention that is running rampant among our children.

How do you prevent heart disease? Show how important it is to exercise, eat well and sleep. These are simple things that if we commit as a country to wellness and preventive care, we are sure to save millions of dollars later when it comes to funding Medicare and those types of programs.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate what the gentlewoman is saying. You can look at every government program, whether it is Medicare, Medicaid, NIH, whatever it is, and you can try to look at those or reinvent them so that there is more of an emphasis on prevention and wellness. This is a theme that we can look at and try to make some changes, and I think it really would make a difference.

I appreciate your comments.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KAGEN. It is a tremendous concept, and it will work. It is an old saying, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. It works in health care. It works across the country, works on your automobile and will work on your body as well.

Here is another sentinel idea. Right now the insurance companies write their own policies that benefit them. I think it is time for Congress to consider writing a Federal standard, a basic health insurance policy. It becomes a Federal standard. We have Federal standards in automobile manufacturing. We have Federal standards in construction, in health care, in every industry that you can name. But we don't have a basic health care policy that each and every insurance company should have to sell.

You see, if every insurance company was selling the same piece of paper, then we could compare them based on the quality of their services and their price.

I think it is time to take that step. It is time for us in Congress to decide what should be covered. If it is in your body, head to toe, I think it should be covered. I think it is time to start writing a basic, standard health insurance policy, not mandating prices, but allow the insurance industry to set their own prices and compete for us.

Right now, back home in Wisconsin, my patients are on their hands and knees crawling to the insurance companies hoping to get in. Farmers will have their wife or themselves working on the farm during the daytime, working a nighttime job, just to get the health care benefits.

Mr. PALLONE. I know that we only have a couple of minutes left, if that, and I just wanted to thank all of you for joining with me tonight. Other than me, it was all new Members, and I think that gives us new, fresh insights into what we need to do that is really so crucial. Thank you.

If I could just say, Madam Speaker, in summing up, that, number one, we do commend the President for prioritizing health care in his State of the Union address, but essentially what he has suggested as a way of dealing with the problems is not a good start. In fact, it is very much the privatization and ideological answers that I don't think are going to work.

Democrats do have alternatives. We certainly intend, now that we are part of this majority, to move forward on those alternatives. But I know that with the input from the new Members we are going to make a difference.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. Res. 20, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2007

Mr. ARCURI, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–6) on the resolution (H. Res. 116) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 20) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other

purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1945

ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, this is the 22nd time, I believe, that I have come here to the well of the House to talk about a subject which I think will be the overarching concern of our world for the next decades and several decades beyond that. That subject is energy and specifically the energy that we get from oil.

As an illustration of the problems we face, I have here a map of the world as it would be drawn if each country was sized relative to the amount of oil reserves that it had. So this is the world according to oil. And you see here Saudi Arabia, and it would swallow up the United States. How many times would it swallow us up, a dozen, 15 times?

Notice the incredible wealth of oil in the Middle East. Venezuela looms, what, two, three times the size of the United States as far as reserves of oil are concerned. The little United Arab Emirates, you can hardly find them on a map. They are kind of a little pinpoint on a usual map, and there they are six, eight times larger than the United States with their reserves of oil. The famed reserves of Russia up there. Notice that the United Arab Emirates have more oil than Russia has. And Saudi Arabia, of course, and Iraq. And little Kuwait, a little province that Saddam Hussein thought ought to belong to Iraq when he invaded it more than a decade ago, has many times as much oil as the United States and more oil than Russia has.

Remember this map when we put the next map of the world up here because this is an interesting map. And this is a map with the continents, the countries drawn relative to their actual size. And you will notice here the little symbols that represent several things, and one of them is oil that China has bought around the world. And this is Unocal, which they almost bought in our country. Everywhere you see this little symbol, the Chinese have bought rights to oil. They are scouring the world for oil.

And the next chart shows a statement by Condoleezza Rice, who recognized this. And this is a pretty interesting statement made by our Secretary of State: ''We do have to do something about the energy problem.''

Thank you. I am pleased that you recognize that.

''I can tell you that nothing has really taken me aback more as Secretary of State than the way that the politics of energy is. I will use the word wharping diplomacy around the world. We have simply got to do something about the wharping now of diplomatic effort by the all-out rush for energy supply.'' And, of course, China has been preeminent in this.

Several days ago I came upon an article. I have no idea why it took so long to come to light. It really is not an article. It really is the script of a speech that was given by Rear Admiral Hyman Rickover, the father of the nuclear submarine. And he gave this speech, it will be 50 years this coming May 14, 1957. He gave this speech to a banquet of the Annual Scientific Assembly of the Minnesota State Medical Association in St. Paul, Minnesota. And we will recognize, celebrate the 50th anniversary of that here in a relatively few months. That speech, by the way, was just 14 months and 6 days after a really famous speech that was given by M. King Hubbert in San Antonio, Texas, to a group of oil people in which he made a prediction that we will be talking about this evening, and that is that the United States would reach its maximum oil production just 14 years after that in 1970.

And right on target, that is exactly what happened. And no matter what we have done since then, we have pumped less oil than before until now we are pumping about half the oil that we pumped in 1970. He predicted that the world would be peaking about now, and that is the subject that brings us here tonight. I have a few excerpts here from this speech that he gave:

''High energy consumption has always been a prerequisite of political power. The tendency is for political power to be concentrated in an ever smaller number of countries. Ultimately the nation which controls the largest energy resource will become dominant. If we give thought to the problem of energy resources, if we act wisely and in time to conserve what we have and prepare well for necessary future changes, we shall ensure this dominant position for our own country.''

He said this 50 years ago: ''If we act wisely and in time,'' he says 50 years ago, ''to conserve what we have and prepare well for the necessary future changes, we shall ensure this dominant position for our own country.'' We have done nothing in the last 50 years except try to find more and more gas and oil and coal and use more and more of what we have found.

Another quote from this very interesting speech: ''In the 8,000 years from the beginning of history to the year 2000 A.D., world population will have grown from 10 million to 4 billion . . .''

Now, he missed it a little because we are at nearly 7 billion now.

'' . . . with 90 percent of that growth taking place during the last 5 percent . . . ''

Way more than 90 percent taking place during the last 5 percent of that period.

'' . . . in 400 years. It took the first 3,000 years of recorded history to accomplish the first doubling of population, 100 years for the last doubling, but the next doubling will require only 50 years.'' And it occurred well before that because we are now at nearly 7 billion people.

The next chart shows what he says in chart 4. If you were to plot population on this chart, it would pretty much follow the curve here for the increased use of gas and oil. This is only about 400 years of the 8,000 years that he spoke of, of recorded history. So you can move this way, way back a great long distance here to see the whole history of the world. In the long history of the world, 8,000 years of recorded history, the Age of Oil will last but about 300 years. We are about 150 years into the Age of Oil from when we started to where we are now. And if M. King Hubbert was correct, and he was correct about the United States, but if he is correct about the world, for the next 150 years there will be less and less oil pumped at higher and higher prices until finally, roughly 150 years from now, there will be little or no more gas, oil, and coal which is economically recoverable.

This is an astounding picture, and future generations looking back at this Age of Oil may very well ask themselves how could they have done that, this incredible wealth?

In a few minutes I am going to read a fascinating history, a very brief history of the world and energy that Hyman Rickover gave to those lucky physicians that night nearly 50 years. They will ask themselves how could they have done that when they found this incredible wealth under the ground? Couldn't they have understood that it couldn't last forever? Wouldn't they have asked themselves what can we do with this to provide the most good for the most people for the longest time? But instead of that, we simply have used that energy as rapidly as we could with little or no thought for the future.

Another quote from this very interesting talk: ''I suggest that this is a good time to think soberly about our responsibilities to our descendants, those who will ring out the Fossil Fuel Age.'' And he recognized 50 years ago that there would be a Fossil Fuel Age. ''We might give a break to these youngsters by cutting fuel and metal consumption so as to provide a safer margin for the necessary adjustments which eventually must be made in a world without fossil fuels.''

Less than a month ago I came back from China. Nine of us went there, nine Members of Congress. We went there primarily to talk about energy. We met with a number of relatively high officials in the Chinese Government. I was surprised in our discussions first with the energy people and then with others that they began their discussion of energy by talking about post-oil. Hyman Rickover 50 years ago anticipated that there would be a world without fossil fuels when we had gone through the Age of Oil.

The next chart is another quote from this very interesting speech: ''There is nothing man can do to rebuild exhausted fossil fuels reserves. They were created by solar energy.'' He says: ''500 million years ago it took eons to grow to their present volume. In the face of the basic fact that fossil fuel reserves are finite, the exact length of time these reserves will last is important in only one respect. The longer they last, the more time that we have to invent ways of living off renewable or substitute energy sources and to adjust our economy to the vast changes which we can expect from such a shift.''

What a speech. Fifty years ago when the United States was king of oil, the biggest consumer in the world, biggest producer in the world, and he recognized, as I think any rational person would recognize, that gas and oil and coal cannot be forever. It is finite. It one day will be gone. The only question is when, which is what we are here to talk about.

And this is a great quote here: ''Fossil fuels resemble capital in the bank. A prudent and responsible parent will use his capital sparingly in order to pass on to his children as much as possible of his inheritance. A selfish and irresponsible parent will squander it in riotous living and care not one whit how his offspring will fare.'' I will suggest that this is precisely what our offspring will accuse us of doing.

You know, there are only a few places that we believe there are any meaningful amounts of oil left. One of those is in ANWR and the other is in offshore drilling. The vast majority of experts in the world believe that we have probably found 95 percent of all the oil we will ever find. And notice that the new finds of oil are way out there, difficult to get, expensive to get. That big find in the Gulf of Mexico under 7,000 feet of water, roughly 50,000 feet of rock and dirt under that. I am told, and I don't know whether this is true or not, you can hear a lot of things, that when oil is $211 a barrel, they will be able to develop that because it will cost that much to get that oil out.

What I would like to do now is to take a look at some of the thoughts in this speech given by Hyman Rickover. I wish I had been a physician 50 years ago. I would have been 30 years old at that time sitting in that audience. He predated me by about 10 years in thinking about this problem. It was probably 40 years, and maybe because I am a scientist that I started asking myself the question: you know, Roscoe, oil and gas and coal are finite. They are not an inexhaustible supply. At some point in time, we will have to be concerned about those supplies. Is that 1 year, 10 years, 100 years, 1,000 years? I had no idea, when I first asked myself this question, how long that time would be, but I knew that a time had to come when we would be asking ourselves the question isn't it time that we should start thinking about this.

Just a few excerpts from this really interesting speech: ''Each American has at his disposal each year energy equivalent to that obtainable from eight tons of coal.'' Then coal was the primary energy source, a primary energy source, much less important now. Eight tons of coal, that is a lot of energy.

''With high energy consumption goes a high standard of living. Thus enormous fuel energy which we in this country control feeds machines which makes each of us master of an army of mechanical slaves.''

And notice these numbers, and these were 50 years ago. You decide how much this has changed today. ''Man's muscle power is rated at 35 watts continuously, or one twentieth horsepower.''

Now, you can do more than that in working, but you can't do it 24 hours a day, and this is a 24/7 figure.

''Machines therefore furnish every American industrial worker with energy equivalent to that of 244 men, while at least 2,000 men push his automobile along the road, and his family is supplied with 33 faithful household helpers. Each locomotive engineer controls energy equivalent to that of 100,000 men; each jet pilot of 700,000 men. Truly, the humblest American enjoys the services of more slaves than were once owned by the richest nobles and lives better than most ancient kings.''

□ 2000

''In retrospect'', he says, and this is 50 years ago, ''and despite wars, revolutions and disasters, the 100 years just gone by'', 150 now, ''just gone by may well seem like a Golden Age.'' And well they will when we look back on this.

''Whether this Golden Age will continue depends entirely upon our ability to keep energy supplies in balance with the needs of our growing population.'' He thought it would grow to 4 billion by this time. It is nearly 7 billion.

Before I go into this question, let me review briefly the role of energy resources in the rise and fall of civilizations. And I found this part of his speech just captivating, fascinating. ''Possessant of surplus energy is of course a requisite for any kind of civilization, for if man possesses merely the energy of his own muscles, he must exhaust all of his strength, mental and physical, to obtain the bare necessities of life.

''Surplus energy provides the material foundation for civilized living: A comfortable and tasteful home, instead of a bare shelter; attractive clothing instead of mere covering to keep warm; appetizing food instead of anything that suffices to appease hunger. It provides the freedom from toil without which there can be no art, music, literature or learning.

''There is no need to belabor this point. What lifted man, one of the weaker animals'', an interesting observation. We are really weak in muscle power. A chimpanzee the size of a man has four or five times the strength of a man. A dog has enormously better smell than you, the eagle infinitely better eyesight than you. Man is indeed one of the weaker animals.

''What lifted man, one of the weaker animals above the animal world was that he could devise with his brain ways to increase the energy at his disposal, and use the leisure so gained to cultivate his mind and spirit. Where man must rely on the energy of his own body he can sustain only the most meager existence.

''Man's first step on the ladder of civilization dates from the discovery of fire and his domestication of animals. With these energy resources, he was able to build a pastoral culture. To move upward to an agricultural civilization, he needed more energy. In the past this was found in the labor of the pendent members of large patriarchal families, augmented by slaves obtained through purchase or as war booty.

There are some backward communities which to this day depend on this type of energy, less today thankfully than there were 50 years ago. ''Slave labor was necessary for the city states and the empires of antiquity. They frequently had slave populations larger than their free citizenry. As long as slaves were abundant and no moral censure attached to their ownership, incentives to search for alternative sources of energy were lacking.

''This may well have been the single most important reason why engineering advanced very little in ancient times. A reduction of per capita energy consumption has always in the past led to a decline in civilization, and a reversion to a more primitive way of life.''

I would like to pause for just a moment to reflect on that. If all of the energy available to the United States was the energy from the United States, we would now be living on half of the energy that we had available in 1970. If you believe that the United States is a microcosm of the world, and if you believe that M. King Hubbert's analyses, which were so right on for the United States, are probably pretty good for the world, then the world now or very shortly will reach its maximum oil production.

After that, no matter what we do, there will be less and less oil available. And finally over the next 150 years, if the second half of the age of oil is as long as the first half, and M. King Hubbert found a bell curve in the exploitation and exhaustion of each of these oil fields, then we will have available to us less and less fossil fuel energy.

Now, unless we can contrive to replace that fossil fuel energy by alternative energy sources, we will have available to us year by year less energy than we had the year before.

And I was fascinated by Hyman Rickover's discussion of how energy contributed to the development of civilizations. And then he notes here, ''That a

reduction of per capita energy consumption has always in the past led to a decline in civilization and a reversion to a more primitive way of life.''

Will we be able to avoid that? Will we be able to create enough energy sources, other than fossil fuels, that we can replace the energy that will not be available from fossil fuels as we exhaust, slowly exhaust their supplies in the world?

For example, exhaustion of wood fuel is believed to have been the primary reason for the fall of the Mayan civilization on this continent, and of the decline of once flourishing civilizations in Asia. India and China once had large forests, as did much of the Middle East. Deforestation not only lessened the energy base but had a further disastrous effect. Lacking plant cover, soil washed away, and with soil erosion the nutritional national base was reduced as well.

It is a sobering thought to recognize that life on this planet is largely dependent on about the upper, on average, 8 inches of our soil. That is the top soils which grow our crops. And then he notes something that few people want to talk about, I am glad he had the courage to mention, that another cause of declining civilization comes with pressure of population on available land.

No matter how clever we are at developing other energy sources, if population continues to grow, and I will say that I am a 100 percent pro-life person. I think there are ways to control population without killing the preborn. And so when I read this, do not think that I am advocating that we need abortion to control population.

''A point is reached where the land can no longer support both the people and their domestic animals. Horses and mules disappear first. Finally, even the versatile water buffalo is displaced by man, who is 2½ times as efficient an energy converter as are draft animals. It must always be remembered that while domestic animals and agriculture machines increase productivity for man, maximum productivity per acre is achieved only by intensive manual cultivation.

''It is a sobering thought that the impoverished people of Asia—'' now this is less true today with a booming economy in China and a good economy in India, but this was true in that day. ''It is a sobering thought that the impoverished peoples of Asia who today seldom go to sleep with their hunger completely satisfied,'' 20 percent of the world will go to bed tonight hungry, ''were once far more civilized and lived much better than the people of the west.''

And not so very long ago either. It was a story brought back by Marco Polo of the marvelous civilization in China which turned Europe's eyes to the riches of the East and induced the adventurous sailors to brave the high seas in their small vessels searching for direct routes to the fabulous Orient, which, of course, brought Columbus to our shores.

The wealth of the Indies is a phrase still used. But whatever wealth may be there is certainly not evident in the lives of the people today. Now, the last 50 years have seen meaningful industrialization in that part of the world, which just has consumed increasing amounts of energy.

Asia failed to keep technological pace with the needs of her growing populations and sank into such poverty that in many places man has become again the primary source of energy. That was true then, it is still true in rural areas in these countries.

Since other energy convertors have become too expensive, this might be obvious to the most casual observer. What this means is quite simply a reversion to a more primitive stage of civilization, with all that implies for human dignity and happiness.

Anyone who has watched a sweating Chinese farm worker strain at his heavily laden wheelbarrow creeping along a cobblestone street, or who has flinched as he drives past an endless procession of human beasts of burden moving to market in Java, the slender women bent under mountainous loads heaped on their heads.

Anyone who has seen statistics translated into flesh and bone realizes the degradations of man's stature when his muscle power becomes the only energy source he can afford. Civilization must wither when human beings are so degraded.

Let me skip now to a little later in this very interesting talk. I think no further elaboration is needed to demonstrate the significance of energy resources for our own future. Our civilization rests on the technological base which requires enormous quantities of fossil fuels.

True 50 years ago, truer today. And then this statement. Now, underline this. Use red ink. What assurance do we then have that our energy needs will continue to be supplied by fossil fuels? The answer is, in the long run, none. The earth is finite. Fossil fuels are not renewable. In this respect our energy base differs from that of all earlier civilizations, which is why the Hirsch report says that man has never faced, the world has never faced a problem like this. There is no precedent in history.

In this respect our energy base differs from that of all earlier civilizations. They could have maintained their energy supply by careful cultivation. We cannot. Fuel that has been burned is gone forever. Fuel is even more effervescent than metals. Metals too are nonrenewable resources, threatened with ultimate extinction, but something can be salvaged from scrap. Fuel leaves no scrap. And there is nothing that man can do to rebuild exhausted fossil fuel reserves. They were created by solar energy, he says, 500 millions years ago and took eons to grow to their present volume.

I might pause here to note that those who belief in a literal flood believe that all of this occurred with the upheavals that occurred during the flood and the time since then. But most people believe that it took a very, very long time. In the face of the basic fact that fossil fuel reserves are finite, the exact length of time these reserves will last is important in only one respect.

The longer they last, and I am repeating one of the charts I had. But you know we need to hear this again because this is so significant. The longer they last the more time do we have to invent ways of living off renewable or substitute energy sources, and to adjust our economy to the vast changes that we can expect from such a shift.

Fossil fuels resemble capital in the bank. And I am going to repeat this again. This needs to be heard again too. A prudent and responsible parent will use his capital sparingly. Now have we been using this energy capital sparingly? Anything but. In order to pass onto his children as much as possible of his inheritance. A selfish and irresponsible parent will squander it in riotous living and care not one whit how his offspring will fare.

I am afraid that that is exactly what our children and our children's children will say of us when they recognize how little attention we paid to the warnings that we have been given for a very long time. This is Hyman Rickover 5 years ago, and just a year before that, M. King Hubbert and his prediction.

Engineers whose work familiarizes them with energy statistics, far-seeing industrialists who know that energy is the principal factor which must enter into all planning for the future, responsible governments who realize that the wellbeing of their citizens and the political power of their countries depend on an adequate energy supply, all of these have begun to be concerned about energy resources. Gee, I wish that were true.

If they began, then they stopped. Because I notice hardly anybody today is concerned about this problem. In this country especially, many studies have been made in the past few years. 50 years ago, seeking to discover accurate information on fossil fuel reserves and foreseeable fuel needs.

Now he may have been referring to the studies that were made by M. King Hubbert just the year before when he predicted that the United States would peak in oil production in 1970.

The chart that I have here kind of indicates to us the dimensions of the problem that Hyman Rickover was talking about and the problem we face.

□ 2015

The little analogy I use for this is that we are very much like a young couple whose grandparents have died and left them a big inheritance. And they have established a lifestyle where 85 percent of all the money they spend

comes from their grandparents' inheritance and only 15 percent from their income. And they look at how old they are and how large the inheritance is and they recognize, gee, it is not going to last till we retire, so, obviously, we have got to do something. Either we have got to spend less or we have got to make more.

I use that analogy because that is precisely where we are. Today, 85 percent of all the energy we use comes from coal and oil and natural gas, and just 15 percent of it from other sources. Now, you may lump all of those as renewables, but they are not quite because a bit over half of that, 8 percent of the 15, comes from nuclear power. In this country, that is 8 percent of our energy, but it is 20 percent of our electricity, so as you drive home tonight, imagine that every fifth home and every fifth business and every fifth street light was dark. That is what our country would be without nuclear power.

Now, we have had not a single death, no meaningful accidents. By the way, 3–Mile Island, and I lived within the drift zone of that, that worked. The containment facility worked. Too bad we had the accident, but good that we had prepared for it.

A lot of people are concerned about nuclear energy. But they really don't reflect on how many people die from coal, all the black lung disease. I remember a number of years ago when I worked for NIH and had a contract to look at respiratory support devices, and one of the places I went to was West Virginia, where they had a lot of black lung disease. And I talked to the physicians there that were dealing with these patients, and each year thousands died from black lung disease. It wasn't so much, and this is not really related to energy, but the real problem there was silicosis. But the lungs were black from the coal, and so it was called black lung disease, but it was really rock dust primarily which was the offender there.

How many miners are killed when the mine caves in or when it explodes? How many people are killed at the railroad crossing when the coal train goes by? We just seem to accept that as a part of the cost of having coal to use.

There have been no injuries, I remind the listeners, from our use of nuclear. We have had no Chernobyls, aren't going to have any because we have designed them much better, so this could and probably should grow.

Then we come to the true renewables. And there we see them, solar, and I am a big supporter of solar. I have a second home beyond the grid and we have only solar power. We are shortly putting up a wind machine because very frequently when the sun is not shining, the wind is blowing and so they complement each other very nicely.

But notice how tiny they were. This was 2000. Now we are better today because they have been growing very rapidly. So they are several times bigger today. But that was 1 percent of 7 percent, .07 percent. Suppose it is four times bigger today, .28 percent. Big deal. We have a long, long way to go.

Notice the contribution of wood. That is the timber industry and paper industry wisely using that waste product.

Conventional hydro. We have pretty much peaked out on that. There is maybe as much as we could get from unconventional hydro, microhydro, small streams where it wouldn't have the environmental effect that big dams have.

The waste to energy here, that is 8 percent of the 7 percent. That could certainly grow. It is probably a whole lot better to burn it than it is to put it in the land fill.

But note that this is really kind of recycling fossil fuel energy because, in an energy deficient world, there would be no enormous piles of municipal waste. They are all produced with energy; and as we have less and less energy, we will be able to live with less and less waste. So that will be a diminishing source of energy in an energy deficient world.

I want to take just a moment here to talk about ethanol. There are a couple of bills, and I will have it up here in a few moments, that look at developing ethanol. The price of corn, from which most ethanol is made in this country, was $2.11 a bushel in September. It was $4.08 a bushel in December. And that was because of the pressure of the demand for corn for producing ethanol.

Now, I didn't read it in this speech, but Hyman Rickover cautioned that if you are going to get energy from agriculture, please note that you will be competing with two things for that energy. One, you will be competing with food.

We eat some corn meal. Most of the corn goes to our animals, and our dairy farmers are really hurting now, because milk has not gone up much and their feed has gone up enormously because of the pressures put on corn by ethanol.

Every gallon of ethanol that we burn represents at least three-quarters of a gallon of fossil fuel to produce it. Almost half the energy in producing corn comes from the natural gas that produces the nitrogen fertilizer.

If we were to grow corn with energy from corn, which is the only fair way to look at corn as an energy source, otherwise you are simply recycling fossil fuels and growing the corn and making ethanol from it.

If we were to grow corn with energy from corn, and if you wanted to replace just 10 percent of our current gasoline consumption, I checked these figures with CRS, I think they are correct, you would have to double our corn crop and use it all for ethanol to displace just 10 percent of our gasoline.

What is very likely to happen now that corn has doubled in price is that farmers, recognizing that, gee, if I planted more corn I would make more money, they are going to take land out of agricultural preserve where it has been reserved by putting it in a bank, and it is land that probably shouldn't have been farmed anyhow, which is why they took it out, and the government helps pay them for that, which I am supportive of, by the way, because it helps preserve that land.

If they take that out and plant it to corn, corn is one of the worst crops for erosion. It is one of the heaviest feeders that we have, demanding more fertilizer than almost anything else. The insult to our environment by the erosion and so forth of this land as the result of more corn cropping, may offbalance, offset the benefit we get from the small decreased production of carbon dioxide, which is the primary reason most people are thinking about ethanol today, because of global warming and greenhouse gases.

And if you are simply releasing the carbon dioxide that the plant picked up, you have not increased the amount of carbon dioxide up there, because the plant took it out of the air. You are burning it and putting it back into the air. So it is a balance.

Hyman Rickover also cautioned, be careful about your expectations for energy from biomass. And today you will hear a lot of hype about energy from cellulosic ethanol. And this is a fascinating pursuit. Cellulose is made up of a lot of glucose molecules, simple sugar, half of the sucrose which is your table sugar. But they are so tightly bound together that there are no enzymes in our body which will separate them. In fact, the cow and the goat don't have any either. But they harbor in their gut some little critters that do have enzymes that do that. And so this is a great example of symbiosis. They both benefit from that relationship. These little microbes split the cellulose into the glucose molecules, and then they are absorbed by the host animals.

Hyman Rickover cautioned, be careful how much of this biomass you think you can take from the soil because it is biomass, organic material, which makes top soil different from subsoil.

There were three men from the Department of Agriculture in my office several months ago talking excitedly about the potential for cellulosic ethanol. And I asked them if our top soils were increasing in quantity and quality. And the answer is obviously, no.

We are really good today compared to how we were 20, 30 years ago. But I am told that for every bushel of corn you grow in Iowa, three bushels of Iowa top soil go down the Mississippi River, which is why we have such a big delta down in Louisiana.

Well, these little microbes that exist in the gut of these animals we have now learned to bioengineer so we can do this in the laboratory. So we can now turn newspaper into alcohol and run your car on newspaper. That is doable. But be careful how much energy

you expect to get from that because for a few years you may mine the top soil, but soon you will decrease the product activity of the top soil. So there is a limit to that.

So what do we do? The next chart, we buy time. How do you do that?

I mentioned that I have been to China, came back 3 or so weeks ago. And they begin all of their discussions by talking about post-oil. And they have a 5-point plan. And it is not just the energy people. It is every member of government we talked to talked about this 5-point plan. So they recognize that energy is a real challenge for them.

The 5-point plan begins with conservation. You see, today there is no surplus oil. There is no surplus energy to invest in developing alternatives. If there was any surplus oil, it wouldn't be $55 a barrel.

So we have run out of time. We have run out of energy, but we can buy some time and free up some energy if we have an aggressive program in conservation. This is where they began their 5-point program: conservation.

Two and three were produce as much of your own energy as you can, and diversity will help. Don't put all your eggs in one basket. And the fourth one, a really good one, especially for them, be kind to the environment. They were apologetic. They are not kind to the environment, but they have 1.3 billion people who are clamoring for the kind of life style we have and want to go climb up that economic ladder and they aren't using energy very efficiently, and we need to help them.

The fifth point, a really interesting one, international cooperation. They recognize that this isn't a U.S. problem or a Chinese problem. This is a global problem because oil moves on a global marketplace. It doesn't really matter who owns the oil. The person who has the highest bid gets the oil. It sells to the people who have the money to buy it. And when it is in short supply, there is more demand for it, so the price goes up.

Once we have bought some time and freed up some energy, then we need to use it wisely. I think one of the things that we need is an ARPA-E. Many people know what DARPA is. It is an agency in our Defense Department that looks at far-out, really interesting things. They developed the Net, for one thing. And they invest in things that industry couldn't invest in because there is no imminent payoff, not even certain there will be any long-term payoff. You are running down a lot of dead roads. But, boy, when you hit it, you hit it big. And DARPA has been very creative. And we need something like that in the energy world because there are some things that may be big, big producers tomorrow, which may not be attractive to investors today.

I am a big fan of the marketplace, but the marketplace is neither omniscient nor omnipotent, and there is a role for government here. And I am one of the biggest small government people in Washington. But, you know, we ought to get the government out of things that are not productive and put them into things where they are productive.

And looking ahead and wisely deciding what some reasonable risk is and investing the taxpayer money has paid big dividends in DARPA, and I think it would in ARPA-E. Big benefits to this. We are now an incredible importer. I think this year the trade deficit we were $800 billion or something like that. We could again become a major exporter. The world is going to be clamoring for these renewable technologies, and we could be a leader in this.

□ 2030

Whether we like it or not, we are a role model. We are one person out of 22 in the world, and we use one-fourth of the world's energy. So we are a witness, we are a role model whether we like it or not.

There are a couple of bills that I wanted to mention. This is our bill, and I am proud of this bill because if we can't do this, we are in for a really rough ride. This is a bill that encourages our farms to become energy independent. Not just energy independent, because if that is all they did, then the people who live in the cities would be in a world of hurt when we run out of fossil fuels.

But the farmer must be able not only to produce enough energy to run his farm, but have some leftover energy, and I think this challenges him to produce as much leftover energy as he uses on his farm. And there are some rewards for farmers who can do this. There are a lot of creative ways we can do this, and we hope that these awards will challenge people to be as creative and innovative as Americans have always been, and I am looking forward to some very exciting developments here.

The next chart has some data on it that I referred to previously. There is nothing like seeing it in a pretty colored chart. We can look at the top part of the chart. And petroleum, of course, if you start out with 1 million Btus, you won't have 1 million Btus to burn because you have got to pump it and refine it and transport it and put it in your car and so forth. So to get 1 million, you must start out 1.23 million.

Here we look at ethanol, and there is a big advantage here because you get solar energy. These, I am told, are very optimistic figures. Dr. Pimental believes that if you look at all the energy input into producing corn, that more energy goes into producing corn than you get out of corn. I hope that is not true. Most people believe that it is energy positive.

You know, even if it were just balanced, once you have taken the ethanol out, you have left some really good feed. Tragically, many of the ethanol plants today carry that to the landfill. What a shame, almost a crime, because all the fat is left, all the corn oil is left, and all the protein is left. All we have taken out is the carbohydrate.

What this says is, as I have mentioned previously, for every gallon of ethanol you burn, you are burning at least three-fourths of a gallon of fossil fuels. That is a fossil fuel input. Now, this down here depicts the fossil fuel input. I mentioned that almost half of it, this big purple area here, comes from the natural gas that produced the nitrogen fertilizer.

Before we learn how to do that, by the way, the only nitrogen fertilizer—as a little kid I remember that pretty much the only nitrogen fertilizer was barnyard manures and guano. And you took the manure out of your barnyard, you spread it out on your fields, and the fertilizer attachment on your tractor was about three times as big as the seed, the corn bin. You put very little fertilizer on it. But now we have learned to make enormous—we mine the phosphate rock and the potash and we make nitrogen fertilizer as incredibly energy intensive, as you can see. All of these are other fossil fuel energy inputs, making the tractor, fueling the tractor, putting the tires on the tractor, harvesting the grain, hauling it to market, drying it, the chemicals that go into killing the bugs and so forth on it.

An incredible amount of energy goes into producing a bushel of corn. And if you were going to grow corn with energy from corn—I gave you the statistics a little bit earlier—I believe that you would have to double your corn and use it all for ethanol to displace just 10 percent of our gasoline.

That is an illustration of the huge challenge that we face. We use 21 million barrels of oil a day in this country, 70 percent of it in transportation. Each barrel of oil, as Hyman Rickover so graphically described, represents an enormous amount of human energy. One barrel of oil represents the work of 12 people working all year. For less than $10 you can hire a guy who is going to work all year for you. These are part of those 33 faithful household servants that Hyman Rickover said our energy use provided to the average family.

The next chart shows another energy bill, the DRIVE bill. This was dropped just very recently. We love acronyms down here, and this is a bill that has to do with transportation fuels, Dependable Reduction through Innovation and Vehicles and Energy Act, H.R. 670. I didn't sign on to any energy bills last year. There were some pretty good bills, but somewhat, not just somewhat, enormously exaggerated claims were made for them; and I did not want to give credibility to unrealistic expectations from these bills.

The next chart here quotes several people: Petroleum expert Colin Campbell. By the way, he kind of inherited the mantle from M. King Hubbert. He is kind of the godfather today of all of these scientists. Jean Laherrare, Ryan

Fleeley, Roger Blanchard, Richard Duncan, Albert Bartlett, no relative of mine. But if you put Albert Bartlett, do a Google search for Albert Bartlett and Energy, and you will put out the most fascinating 1-hour lecture I have ever listened to. He has given it more than 1,600 times. I will tell you, there will be no thriller on television that will be as interesting as Albert Bartlett's 1-hour lecture on energy. You will be captivated by it. They have all estimated that a peak in conventional oil production will occur at around 2005. This is now 2007.

By the way, the world oil production has been roughly 84 million, 85 million barrels a day for the last several years. That may or may not mean we have reached peak, but at least there has been a plateau. And if it weren't for a fact that there has been a 40 percent reduction of gasoline use in many South American countries, for instance, because it has just gotten too expensive, the price of oil would be far greater than roughly $55 a barrel today.

This has been what they call demand destruction. If you can destroy demand, you can reduce the price. And when it got too expensive to use, they just quit using it, so the price of oil has dropped because there is less pressure.

The next chart shows a number of experts and what they have predicted, and here are some of them there, Campbell and Goldstein and Deffeyes, Skrebowski, Simmons. Matt Simmons is an investment banker, a personal energy adviser to the President. They all believe that it is going to occur very shortly. The previous list had it in roughly 2005, these in the next decade and these further down. Now, CERA is one here that says it is going to be after 2020.

I want to show you the next chart here, and this is a CERA chart; and CERA believes that we will find maybe several times as much more energy as all the energy that now is known, all the oil that we now know is out there. They think we will find two or three times that much more oil.

Now, if we find only 5 percent more oil, then this will be when it peaks. If we find as much more oil as all that exist out there, this will be when it peaks. It still is not forever, it still is about 2040. And if we now are able to get enormous amounts of oil from these unconventional sources, the Canadian tar sands; and don't call it oil, please, it is tar, and the oil sands out in our west, and I don't know that we will ever achieve this, by the way. The Canadians are getting 1 million barrels a day, just a little over 1 percent of production, using incredible amounts of energy, incredible amounts of water, producing a big lake that they call tailing water; it is really toxic water, and they know that what they are doing is not sustainable because they don't have enough natural gas to produce the energy.

They are thinking about putting in a power plant. The vein, I understand, dips under an overlay so they will have to develop in situ, and they don't know how to do that. Enormous reserves, more than all the oil in the world potentially, are out in our West. Shell Oil Company had a little experiment out there. They said it would be 2013, I think, before they said they could even make a decision as to whether it was economically feasible to get that. So this is a huge ''if'' here.

The next chart is an interesting one. One of the world's experts in this, Jean Laherrare, made an assessment of the USGS report. What I was looking at was not a USGS report, but they were basing their prognosis on USGS data, so this comment is appropriate to that chart as well. The USGS estimate implies a fivefold increase in discovery rate and reserve addition through which no evidence is presented.

Such an improvement in performance is, in fact, utterly implausible given the great technical achievements of the industry over the past 20 years, the worldwide search, and the deliberate efforts to find the largest remaining prospect. We have computer modeling in 3–D seismic and enormously improved techniques for finding oil, and still every year we find on the average less oil than we found the year before.

This is a very heartening chart. As we face an energy-deficient world, I often think of this chart and the promise that it gives us. On the abscissa here we have energy consumption per capita here, and on the ordinate we have perception of how good life is. Now, it is not perfect for anybody, but there are a whole bunch of people who think that it is about 85 to 95 percent as good as paradise can be.

And notice where we are. We are the biggest users of energy. Little Switzerland is close behind us. But what this chart tells me is that you can use far less energy and be pretty happy with where you are. These many people, by the way, use less energy than we and are happier with their lives than we are, everybody above this imaginary line.

And notice that if you have very little energy, it is tough to feel good about life. As soon as you reach 25 percent, as much as we use, then you can feel pretty good, 80 percent compared to 90 percent, not much improvement for an incredibly large increase in energy. So this gives us hope.

Europe uses per capita about half as much energy as we use, and if you have traveled to Europe, nobody who has traveled to Europe believes that they live less well or are less content with their life than we are.

The next chart shows an interesting, and this is one of many, many, opportunities for efficiency, but this is such a dramatic one. This is the efficiency of getting light. And this is the old incandescent bulb, a red hot hairpin hung up in a bottle is the way one old farmer described it. And this is the amount of heat you produce, which is why you use it as a brooder for fish and to keep them warm, and baby chickens, and this is the light you get, 90 percent heat, 10 percent light.

This is fluorescence, which is why you have the little screw in fluorescence. A great Time magazine article that showed that each one of those bulbs saved a quarter of a ton of coal. And here is the light-emitting diode. I have a light-emitting diode flashlight; I have forgotten when I put the batteries in. They just last and last.

I have a couple of charts here, and we have only a few minutes remaining, and I just want to show a couple of them to refer you to very big studies paid for by our government, ignored by our government. One is the Corps of Engineers, and this is the Corps of Engineers study, and the other is the big Hirsch Report. You can find all of those on the Web. In fact, you can go to our Web site and either find these or find the link to it.

In general, all nonrenewable resources follow a natural supply curve. Production increases rapidly, slows, reaches a peak, and then declines at a rapid pace, remember, to its initial increase.

The major question for petroleum is not whether production will peak but when. There are many estimates of recoverable petroleum reserves giving rise to many estimates of when peak oil will occur and how high the peak will be. A careful review of all the estimates leads to the conclusion that world oil production may peak within a few short years.

This was paid for by the Army, essentially ignored by everybody.

The next one, a bigger study, paid for by our Department of Energy, SAIC, a big, prestigious organization: We cannot conceive of any affordable government-sponsored crash program to accelerate the normal replacement schedules to fill the gap created by a decline in oil production.

I won't use any more of these charts because the others, I have a dozen or so more, simply say the same thing, that one way or the other, in different words, we are either at or shortly will be at peak oil with potentially devastating consequences.

There is hope with leadership. We are an enormously creative society. I think that we can meet the challenge, but it is going to require a program I believe that has a total commitment of World War II, I lived through that, that has the technology challenge of putting a man on the moon and the urgency of the Manhattan Project. We can do that. It needs the help of every American, and leadership; our children and grandchildren are counting on it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WOLF (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of testifying before the Virginia State Corporation Commission on the proposed tolling for the Dulles Greenway.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CAPPS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. KUHL of New York) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 31, 2007, at 10 a.m.

RULES AND REPORTS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(d), executive communications [final rules] submitted to the House pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1) during the period of May 18, 2006, through January 4, 2007, shall be treated as though received on Janaury 30, 2007. Original dates of transmittal, numberings, and referrals to committee of those executive communications remain as indicated in the Executive Communication section of the relevant CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

470. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the Fiscal Years 2002-2004 Family Violence Prevention and Services Act Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 10405; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

471. A letter from the Inspector General, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the results of an audit of the U.S. House of Representatives' annual financial statements for the year ending December 31, 2005; to the Committee on House Administration.

472. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Arizona Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

473. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for the Army for Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting an interim report on the status of the comprehensive plan examining the deauthorization of the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet (MRGO), pursuant to Public Law 109-234; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

474. A letter from the Director, Legislative Affairs, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting the Office's report entitled, ''An Overview of the United States Intelligence Community''; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 116. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 20) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–6). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 718. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and the enhancement of the functions of the National Guard Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. LAMPSON):

H.R. 719. A bill to require convicted sex offenders to register online identifiers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H.R. 720. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DAVIS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. BAKER):

H.R. 721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for qualified timber gains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 722. A bill to increase the maximum Pell Grant; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mrs. DRAKE):

H.R. 723. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize programs to improve the quality of coastal recreation waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. PAUL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. CARTER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LINDER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. FORBES, Mr. PITTS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SALI, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. POE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 724. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit Federal court jurisdiction over questions under the Defense of Marriage Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PENCE, Mr. NORWOOD, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HAYES, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PITTS, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. SALI, Mr. RENZI, Mr. POE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 725. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States to prevent the use of the legal system in a manner that extorts money from State and local governments, and the Federal Government, and inhibits such governments' constitutional actions under the first, tenth, and fourteenth amendments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 726. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restrict the application of the windfall elimination provision to individuals whose combined monthly income from benefits under such title and other monthly periodic payments exceeds a minimum COLA-adjusted amount of $2,500 and to

provide for a graduated implementation of such provision on amounts above such minimum amount; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 727. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to add requirements regarding trauma care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HERSETH (for herself and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 728. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish certain protections for preference eligibles selected for involuntary geographic reassignment; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. FARR, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. HOOLEY):

H.R. 729. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to promote energy independence and self-sufficiency by providing for the use of net metering by certain small electic energy generation systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JINDAL:

H.R. 730. A bill to provide funds to certain State and local governments to pay for utility costs resulting from the provision of temporary housing units to evacuees from Hurricane Katrina and other hurricanes of the 2005 season; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 731. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a program to provide regulatory compliance assistance to small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 732. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 10 to 5 the number of years of marriage prior to divorce required for a divorced spouse to be eligible for benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 733. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to eliminate all Federally-imposed mandates over the local budget process and financial management of the District of Columbia and the borrowing of money by the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 734. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow additional transit systems greater flexibility with certain public transportation projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 735. A bill to designate the Federal building under construction at 799 First Avenue in New York, New York, as the ''Ronald H. Brown United States Mission to the United Nations Building''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOODE, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida):

H.R. 736. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to exclude from creditable wages and self-employment income wages earned for services by aliens illegally performed in the United States and self-employment income derived from a trade or business illegally conducted in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 737. A bill to correct an inequity in eligibility for military retired pay based on nonregular service in the case of certain members of the reserve components completing their reserve service before 1966; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SKELTON (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. FILNER):

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a National Medal of Honor Day to celebrate and honor the recipients of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLAY:

H. Res. 105. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a National Orthodontic Health Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H. Res. 106. A resolution calling upon the President to ensure that the foreign policy of the United States reflects appropriate understanding and sensitivity concerning issues realted to human rights, ethnic cleansing, and genocide documented in the United States record relating to the Armenian Genocide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H. Res. 107. A resolution calling for the immediate and unconditional release of Israeli soldiers held captive by Hamas and Hezbollah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida:

H. Res. 108. A resolution supporting the Weed and Seed and COPS programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. HONDA):

H. Res. 109. A resolution recognizing the historical significance of the Pinedale Assembly Center, the reporting site for 4,823 Japanese Americans who were unjustly interned during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H. Res. 110. A resolution honoring the life and achievements of George C. Springer, Sr., the Northeast regional director and a former vice president of the American Federation of Teachers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Res. 111. A resolution establishing a Select Committee on POW and MIA Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H. Res. 112. A resolution recognizing and congratulating Guardian Industries and its 75th anniversary of commitment and leadership in the United States and global glass, automotive, and building products industries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H. Res. 113. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a postage stamp should be issued in commemoration of Diwali, a festival celebrated by people of Indian origin; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 114. A resolution expressing support for a National Week of Reflection and Tolerance; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H. Res. 115. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should maintain a land-based intercontinental ballistic missile force of not less than 500 Minuteman III missiles; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H.R. 738. A bill for the relief of Manuel Bartsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 739. A bill for the relief of Kadiatou Diallo, Laouratou Diallo, Ibrahima Diallo, Abdoul Diallo, Mamadou Bobo Diallo, Mamadou Pathe Diallo, Fatoumata Traore Diallo, Sankarela Diallo, and Marliatou Bah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. SULLIVAN.

H.R. 40: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 45: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 82: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BOREN, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 98: Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. BONO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 119: Mr. FORBES, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 133: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 137: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 159: Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 172: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 207: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 211: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 213: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LEE, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 216: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 271: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 279: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. AKIN, and Mrs. DRAKE.

H.R. 297: Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 319: Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 404: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 446: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 458: Mrs. MALONEY of New York and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 471: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 473: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 488: Ms. KILPATRICK and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 489: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H.R. 503: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. STARK, Mrs. BONO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 506: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 508: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 511: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. HAYES, Mr. WAMP, Mr. AKIN, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mrs. BONO, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. KELLER, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 526: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 549: Mr. WYNN, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HAYES, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 563: Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 566: Ms. CASTOR, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. WATT.

H.R. 569: Ms. NORTON, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 579: Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 583: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 589: Mr. RENZI and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 600: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 620: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 622: Ms. CARSON and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 645: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 652: Mr. REHBERG and Mr. WALSH of New York.

H.R. 653: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 661: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 663: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. STARK, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 670: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 678: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 684: Mr. RUSH and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 689: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 695: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 697: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 711: Mr. PAUL, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 714: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.J. Res. 18: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. COHEN.

H. Con. Res. 7: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 9: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Ms. LEE.

H. Con. Res. 22: Mr. TAYLOR.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. NORWOOD.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H. Res. 18: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Res. 53: Mr. CLAY, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HULSHOF, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. CUELLAR.

H. Res. 55: Mr. NADLER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H. Res. 72: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. CASTOR, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. FEENEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MACK, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H. Res. 79: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H. Res. 84: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. DENT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H. Res. 90: Ms. WATERS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WATT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. BOREN.

H. Res. 101: Mr. COHEN and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 102: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BACA, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Kent Gneiting, a citizen of Fort Collins, Colorado, relative to petitioning the Congress of the United States for an appeal for redress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2. Also, a petition of Mr. Jabbar Magruder, a citizen of Los Angeles, California, relative to petitioning the Congress of the United States for an appeal for redress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3. Also, a petition of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, relative to resolutions adopted by the membersip of the International Association of Chiefs of Police at its 112th Annual Conference; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4. Also, a petition of the Union County Board of Chosen Freeholders, New Jersey, relative to Resolution No. 982-2006 calling for the resignation of Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House of Representatives from his position as speaker and as a Congressman; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.