United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2007 No. 33

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 27, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN T. SALAZAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

O Creator of the heavens and Earth, You have endowed this planet, the ground for all our living, with innumerable gifts of nature held in delicate balance.

So many resources have been given by You to Mother Earth so that life for Your people all over the globe may be sustained and developed.

May this great Nation, led by gratitude and imagination in government, study with sincerity the laws of nature and share with others its discoveries so that a just distribution of all Earth's resources may be assured according to principles of justice and solidarity. Then will the poor and the hungry over all the Earth be given voice and sing praise and thanksgiving to You both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 20, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 20, 2007, at 12:00 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 171.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 67.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 577.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 514.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 433

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 521.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 335.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 49.

Appointments:

United States-China Economic Security Review Commission.

United States Commission on Civil Rights.

Japan-United States Friendship Commission.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki).

National Council on the Arts.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

THE TRUCKS ARE COMING, THE TRUCKS ARE COMING

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the next sound you hear will be the rumble of thousands of Mexican trucks streaming across our southern border. The U.S. Government has agreed to allow 100 Mexican trucking companies to send trucks on the highways and byways of America. Presently, Mexican trucks may only go 20 miles inside the U.S. border. The U.S. Government says they will inspect the trucks for safety and inspect the drivers as well. Yeah, right. There are already 6,000 trucks a day crossing in each direction just between Laredo, Texas, and Nuevo Laredo, Mexico; and only a fraction of these are inspected.

This country has no way of inspecting each and every Mexican truck for safety, and there is no telling what could be in them, whether it is legitimate cargo, narcotics or contaminated food. Not to mention, Mexican trucks are not up to the standards of the U.S. trucking industry. Overweight, polluting Mexican trucks driven by low paid, unqualified drivers that may not even be able to read highway signs is a dangerous policy for the citizens of this country.

Once again, our government seems to be more concerned about Mexico than it is about our Nation, our highways or our people.

And that's just the way it is.

Printed on recycled paper.

OUR COUNTRY MUST APOLOGIZE FOR SLAVERY

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, today I am going to introduce a bill to call on the United States Government to apologize for the history in this country of having a slave system and for Jim Crow laws that went on for a hundred additional years.

The State of Virginia is to be commended for its action this past week in making, in essence, an apology saying they regretted a system of slavery in this country.

For 246 years, our Constitution and our laws allowed a system that made people slaves, that divided people from their families and treated them as property. And for 100 years thereafter, a system of laws in many States throughout the country had Jim Crow laws that deprived people of the opportunity for equal access to education, health care, public facilities, and other types of programs. These ended by law in the sixties somewhat through the efforts of Thurgood Marshall and other attorneys in Brown v. Board of Education, but the effects are lingering.

This country needs to apologize for a brutal, inhumane system of slavery and Jim Crow laws. President Bush has made remarks similar to this in Senegal; President Clinton also in the State of Virginia most recently.

I hope we will have all our colleagues sign on and pass this unanimously, as the State of Virginia did, and make a proper apology for a harmful and unfortunate part of our history.

DIANE E. SUMPTER RECOGNIZED FOR SUCCESS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during Black History Month, Diane Sumpter has earned front-page cover status in the Greater Columbia Business Monthly of South Carolina for developing one of the most prestigious minority business firms. DESA, Inc., has grown to be a nationally recognized management consultant firm.

Ms. Sumpter is a native of Jacksonville, Florida. She later moved to Columbia, where she graduated from Booker T. Washington High School and then attended the University of South Carolina, where she obtained both a B.A. in English and a master's degree in social work.

Ms. Sumpter's dedication to the growth and success of minority- and women-owned businesses is evidenced in her efforts with the South Carolina Minority Business Development Center, which is operated by her company. The center has assisted businesses by acting as a liaison to facilitate business growth for over 10 years.

Since DESA was started in 1986, it has been awarded service contracts from HHS, the Department of Commerce, the Minority Business Development Agency, the Army, the Air Force, the Small Business Administration, as well as various contracts from the private sector. DESA works with companies from the very beginning of projects until their completion.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11 and the courageous service of Army Chief Warrant Officer II, Jason De Frenn of Barnwell, South Carolina.

ILLEGALS USING FED TO WIRE MONEY

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. You know, the United States is a Nation founded on the rule of law. Those who do not follow the law are held accountable, except when you are an illegal immigrant.

We have already learned that a few of our major banks are issuing credit cards to illegal immigrants, but a recent article in the L.A. Times uncovered a program through our own Federal Reserve Bank that makes it easier for illegal entrants to send money back to Mexico, direct to Mexico. A federally sponsored program allows illegal immigrants without a Social Security number to wire money through the Federal system for a fee.

What is even more shocking is that the Fed expanded the program that allows anyone, illegal or not, to open accounts at participating banks. This is a big business. We have learned it is 27,000 transfers from illegal immigrants every month, totaling $23 billion a year, all with the help of our Federal Government.

We are sending mixed messages, Mr. Speaker. We say we want to stem the tide of illegal immigration, but once again, here we go. We will not only turn a blind eye; we will make it easy for illegal immigrants to send money back to Mexico.

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 after 6:30 p.m. today.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF A NATIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR DAY

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 47) supporting the goals and ideals of a National Medal of Honor Day to celebrate and honor the recipients of the Medal of Honor.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 47

Whereas the Medal of Honor is the highest award that can be bestowed to a member of the Armed Forces for valor in action against an enemy force;

Whereas the Medal of Honor is awarded by the President, in the name of the Congress, to members of the Armed Forces who have distinguished themselves conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of their lives above and beyond the call of duty;

Whereas the United States will forever be in debt to the recipients of the Medal of Honor for their bravery and sacrifice in times of war or other armed conflict;

Whereas the Medal of Honor was first awarded on March 25, 1863, during the Civil War;

Whereas, of the millions of men and women who have served in the Armed Forces in war, military operations, or other armed conflicts, only 3,443 members have thus far been awarded the Medal of Honor;

Whereas 111 Medal of Honor recipients are still living as of January 1, 2007;

Whereas it is appropriate to commemorate and honor the recipients of the Medal of Honor and to recognize their bravery and sacrifice for the United States;

Whereas the designation of a National Medal of Honor Day would raise the awareness of the American people regarding the significance and meaning of the Medal of Honor and help focus the efforts of national, State, and local organizations striving to foster public appreciation and recognition of Medal of Honor recipients; and

Whereas March 25 would be an appropriate date to observe National Medal of Honor Day: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) recognizes the heroism and sacrifice of Medal of Honor recipients for the United States;

(2) recognizes the educational opportunity that a National Medal of Honor Day would present to the American public; and

(3) supports the goals and ideals of a National Medal of Honor Day to celebrate and honor the contributions of Medal of Honor recipients.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Today I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 47, which I introduced to recognize the extraordinary heroism and sacrifice of the Nation's

Medal of Honor recipients and to increase America's awareness of the significance and meaning of the Medal of Honor among our American citizens.

I want to thank my colleague on the House Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for being here in support of this issue this afternoon.

The Congressional Medal of Honor is our Nation's highest military award for valor in action against an enemy that can be bestowed on any member of the Armed Forces.

Since the medal was created in 1861, more than 3,400 individuals who have served our Nation in uniform have been awarded the Medal of Honor.

The first medal was established by the United States Navy to recognize sailors and marines who distinguish themselves in war. President Abraham Lincoln signed Public Resolution 82 into law, and thus the first medal of valor was created. The Army shortly followed in 1862 by establishing a Medal of Honor to recognize commissioned officers and privates who distinguished themselves by their gallantry in action. The Medal of Honor became a permanent decoration in 1863. The first award was given to Army Assistant Surgeon Bernard J.D. Irwin for his bravery in rescuing 60 soldiers at Apache Pass, Arizona, in 1861.

It is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that a Medal of Honor was awarded a Union soldier years after the 1861 Battle of Lexington, Missouri, my hometown, for his gallantry in helping to retake the Anderson House, which was the hospital at the time of that battle, September 18, 19 and 20, 1861. His name was Palmer.

The current conflict in Iraq sadly has posthumously added two heroic and courageous individuals to the rolls, Sergeant First Class Paul Smith of the United States Army, and Corporal Jason Dunham of the United States Marines. These two individuals continue to epitomize the recipients of the Medal of Honor, whose uncommon valor and extraordinary bravery are standard characteristics.

□ 1415

It is interesting to note also, Mr. Speaker, that in the history of the medal, 19 men received a second award. 14 of them received two separate medals for separate actions, and one was awarded to a woman. Of the more than 3,400 medals awarded, 266 of those were awarded for action during World War II, and 154 were awarded for action during the Vietnam conflict. Today there are only 111 living recipients of the Medal of Honor. America is rapidly losing its greatest and true heroes.

It is also important to note that when Missouri's President, Harry Truman, awarded the Medal of Honor to a soldier at the end of the Second World War, he said he would rather have this medal than being president.

The resolution before the House seeks to recognize the heroism and sacrifice of the Nation's Medal of Honor recipients, and to urge the establishment of a National Medal of Honor Day to ensure that all Americans continue to celebrate and to honor the contributions and ideals that the Medal of Honor recipients exemplify.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of this resolution.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman SKELTON for giving me this great privilege of honoring these fine Americans.

Today we join together in support of H. Con. Res. 47, as the United States House of Representatives, to honor what is arguably the most select group of Americans to ever wear the uniform of this great Nation.

The Medal of Honor is this Nation's highest award bestowed on a member of the United States Armed Services who distinguishes himself or herself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while engaged in an action against an enemy of the United States.

The Medal of Honor confers special privileges on its recipients, both by tradition and by law.

By tradition, all other soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen, even higher ranking officers up to the President of the United States, initiate the salute of the Medal of Honor and its recipient.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss briefly the history of the Medal of Honor. The first award of the Medal of Honor was made March 25 of 1863 to Private Jacob Parrott and five others. Since then, there have been 3,463 Medals of Honor awarded for 3,456 separate acts of heroism performed by 3,443 individuals, including nine unknowns.

Today there are 112 living recipients of the Medal of Honor, out of a population of more than 301 million Americans. Forty-six percent of the living earned their medals more than 50 years ago while serving in World War II, 36, or Korea, 15. There are 61 living who performed actions in Vietnam. The youngest recipient is Gordon R. Roberts, age 56. He was born June 14, 1950. He was 19 years old when he earned this high honor.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield to Dr. BURGESS, the gentleman from Texas, for 4 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Missouri, for bringing this concurrent resolution to the floor.

This is a resolution that honors the bravest of the brave, the men and women who have gone above and beyond the call of duty, who have risked their lives in fighting for our Nation, indeed, fighting for our basic freedom.

Today's resolution pays homage to the basic principles of our military, duty, honor, country. The Medal of Honor recognizes and is emblematic of great courage, selflessness and sacrifice.

It is with great pride that I stand here on the floor of Congress today, as Congress is recognizing these extraordinary members of our Armed Services by establishing March 25 as the National Medal of Honor Day. This national day of observance and remembrance is long overdue, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution, to vote in favor of our Armed Forces.

While a National Medal of Honor Day is a wonderful way to honor these great citizens, I would be remiss if I did not also mention another great endeavor that seeks to honor Medal of Honor recipients. The city of Gainesville, Texas established the Medal of Honor Host City Program in 2001 with this simple mission statement: It shall be the privilege and the responsibility of the city of Gainesville, Texas, to welcome our Nation's Medal of Honor recipients at every available opportunity. The Local Veterans of Foreign Wars, post number 1922, along with the community volunteers and community members, welcome all Medal of Honor recipients with open arms and provides a stipend to cover lodging, food and fuel expenses during their visit.

The recipients are invited to attend schools, clubs and local organizations, thereby imparting their own views of patriotism and duty throughout the community. It is truly a remarkable program, and the true beauty of it is that other cities can establish their own Medal of Honor Host City program to further honor and recognize those heroic recipients.

Mr. Speaker, to take a line from the Gainesville, Texas mission statement, I feel that it is Congress's privilege and Congress's responsibility to honor the Medal of Honor recipients at every opportunity. With this resolution, and with programs like the Medal of Honor Host City Program, we take a step in fulfilling that most noble and honorable of all missions.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Congress, America has presented this award on behalf of an extremely grateful Nation a total of 22 times, 13 of which were presented posthumously.

Some recent heroes include Tibor ''Ted'' Rubin for actions in Korea, between 1950 and 1953. He received the award on September 23, 2005.

Before that, the medal was awarded posthumously to the family of SFC Paul R. Smith on April 4 of 2005. For his actions in Iraq in 2003, bravely holding the enemy at bay so that the wounded could be safely carried out.

Before that, the Medal of Honor was awarded posthumously to Army MSG Gary I. Gordon and SFC Randall D. Shughart for action in Somalia in 1993.

Most recently, Cpl Jason Dunham, U.S. Marine Corps, was posthumously

recognized with the Medal of Honor on Thursday, January 11, 2007 for sacrificing his life for his fellow Marines. Corporal Dunham bravely fought hand-to-hand with the enemy and selflessly hurled himself on a live grenade to protect fellow Marines.

Just yesterday, President Bush awarded LTC Bruce P. Crandall the Medal of Honor in a White House ceremony. It was just this morning when several members of the DAV, Disabled American Veterans from my district, stated very simply, after meeting Colonel Crandall, and they said this was his comment when they said congratulations; thank you for what you did for our Nation. His comment was this, he just did what his country asked him to do. He was a volunteer.

Throughout the history, there have been 19 double recipients who have twice received this high honor.

Mr. Speaker, as this resolution so clearly states, the designation of a National Medal of Honor Day will raise the awareness of the American people regarding the significance and the meaning of the Medal of Honor, and help focus the effort on our national, State and local organizations striving to foster public appreciation and recognition of Medal of Honor recipients.

Mr. Speaker, the Medal of Honor has touched the lives, directly or indirectly, of millions of Americans, but there are many more firsts or lone recipients of this award. For example:

Douglas Munro was the only Coast Guard recipient. He was awarded the Medal of Honor for his actions at Point Cruz, Guadalcanal, on September 27 of 1942.

Mary Walker was the only woman awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor at Bull Run on July 21 of 1861.

Today, Mr. Speaker, there are four Medal of Honor recipients currently living in the State of North Carolina. Throughout its history, there have been 19 Medal of Honor recipients from my great state of North Carolina.

Before I close, I would like to take just a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker. There are many who have won this award, Medal of Honor, who are the heroes of this great Nation. One I would like to bring to mind is a friend of mine whose name is Walter Joseph Marm, Jr.

I will not read the entire citation. I just want to read part of it before I close.

Joe Marm, First Lieutenant, Army Company A, First Battalion, 7th Cavalry, 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile). Place: Vicinity of la Drang Valley, Republic of Vietnam, 14 November 1965. Entered service at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Born 20 November 1941.

And I want to read just two or three paragraphs from the citation, Mr. Speaker, as he received the Medal of Honor.

Realizing that his platoon could not hold very long, and seeing four enemy soldiers moving into his position, he moved quickly under heavy fire and annihilated all four.

Quickly, disregarding the intense fire directed at him and his platoon, he charged 30 meters across open ground and hurled grenades into the enemy position, killing some of the eight insurgents manning it.

Although severely wounded, when his grenades were expended, armed with only a rifle, he continued the momentum of his assault on the position and killed the remainder of the enemy.

Lieutenant Marm's selfless action reduced the fire on his platoon, broke the enemy assault, and rallied his unit to continue toward the accomplishments of this mission.

Lieutenant Marm's gallantry on the battlefield and his extraordinary risk of his life are in the highest traditions of U.S. Army and reflect great credit upon himself and the Armed Forces of this country.

With that, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for this privilege to be part of this debate.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are able to bring this resolution to the floor. It is highly important that we recognize those very special individuals who received the Medal of Honor and will bear the recognition throughout their lives, as well as their family receiving recognition should they be awarded posthumously.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 47, supporting the goals and ideals of a National Medal of Honor Day to celebrate and honor the recipients of the Medal of Honor. The Medal of Honor is the highest award that can be bestowed on a member of the Armed Fores for his or her valiant acts of bravery while engaged in combat against an enemy of the United States.

The Medal of Honor is awarded by the President, in the name of the Congress, to members of the Armed Forces who have distinguished themselves conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity and risked their lives above and beyond the call of duty. The first Medal of Honor was awarded on March 25, 1863 during our country's Civil War to PVT Jacob Parrott during the American Civil War for his role in Andrews Raid. He was the first of only 3,443 members in war, military operations and other armed conflicts of our Armed Forces who have received this great honor.

There are 111 Medal of Honor recipients still living and serving our country in their own capacity and I, as well as the entire Nation, will forever be indebted to all recipients of this award for their valor during armed conflict.

It is appropriate and necessary to commemorate and honor the recipients of the Medal of Honor and to recognize their valiant sacrifices for our country. That is why I support the designation of a National Medal of Honor Day which would heighten the understanding and appreciation of the American people regarding the significance and meaning of the Medal of Honor.

It is essential that our Nation celebrate and salute those members of the Armed Forces who have risked their lives to ensure our safety and the safety of our country. Designating this day will also help to focus the efforts of national, State, and local organizations striving to foster public appreciation and recognition of Medal of Honor recipients.

I sincerely appreciate the sacrifices the members of our Armed Forces make each and every day on behalf of our country. I support the designation of March 25 as National Medal of Honor Day in honor of all those members of the Armed Forces who performed valiant acts of bravery during combat against an enemy of the United States.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 47—a resolution establishing a national day of remembrance, reflection, and celebration for those citizens who so valiantly defended our Nation and protected their fellow servicemembers through extraordinary feats of courage and achievement—recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

I extend a thank you to my colleagues from the House Armed Services Committee for leading the effort to commemorate the recipients of our Nation's highest military honor. As a Nation, we can never forget the sacrifices these men and women have made to keep America free.

The first Medal of Honor was awarded on March 25, 1864. As we approach this anniversary, let us reflect on the lives and deeds of those brave soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines who have received this honor throughout our Nation's history.

In 1782, General George Washington started the tradition of recognizing the valiant actions of American soldiers by establishing what became known as the Badge of Military Merit. Washington presented a heart of purple cloth to three of his soldiers in August of that year, an act that was largely lost in history as the Revolutionary War came to a close. This honor was the predecessor to what we now know as the Purple Heart.

Though the Badge of Military Merit faded into the past, the idea of awarding a decoration to recognize the gallant efforts of our soldiers never died. In 1847, not long after the outbreak of the Mexican-American War, a "certificate of merit" was established to recognize troops who distinguished themselves in battle. No medal accompanied the certificate and the award was again discontinued at the end of that conflict.

During the Civil War another proposal arose to establish a medal, but the idea was rejected by then General-In-Chief of the Army Winifield Scott. The Navy, however, adopted this concept, and in December 1861, President Abraham Lincoln signed legislation that established a Navy medal for valor. Not to be outdone by their friendly rival, the Army quickly followed suit with their own resolution to establish a similar award, signed into law in July 1862.

In 1863, Congress established the Medal of Honor as a permanent means to recognize our Nation's most gallant warriors. Since then, it has been awarded to almost 3,400 of our Nation's bravest citizens.

Today, the number of living Medal of Honor recipients is at its lowest point in history—there remain only 111 as of February 1. This resolution is a lasting tribute to those 111 men and women, the recipients who are no longer with us, and to those to come in the future who stood up and answered the call to protect and defend this land.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 47.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SKELTON. 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.

PROMOTING TRANSPARENCY IN FINANCIAL REPORTING ACT OF 2007

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 755) to require annual oral testimony before the Financial Services Committee of the Chairperson or a designee of the Chairperson of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Financial Accounting Standards Board, and the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, relating to their efforts to promote transparency in financial reporting.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 755

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Promoting Transparency in Financial Reporting Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Transparent and clear financial reporting is integral to the continued growth and strength of our capital markets and the confidence of investors.

(2) The increasing detail and volume of accounting, auditing, and reporting guidance pose a major challenge.

(3) The complexity of accounting and auditing standards in the United States has added to the costs and effort involved in financial reporting.

SEC. 3. ANNUAL TESTIMONY ON REDUCING COMPLEXITY IN FINANCIAL REPORTING.

The Securities and Exchange Commission, the Financial Accounting Standards Board, and the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board shall annually provide oral testimony by their respective Chairpersons or a designee of the Chairperson, beginning in 2007, and for 5 years thereafter, to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives on their efforts to reduce the complexity in financial reporting to provide more accurate and clear financial information to investors, including—

(1) reassessing complex and outdated accounting standards;

(2) improving the understandability, consistency, and overall usability of the existing accounting and auditing literature;

(3) developing principles-based accounting standards;

(4) encouraging the use and acceptance of interactive data; and

(5) promoting disclosures in ''plain English''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material therein.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 755, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1430

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this Promoting Transparency in Financial Reporting Act is a bipartisan bill that the House considered last year and passed on a voice vote. The legislation, however, failed to become law during the 109th Congress; and as a result, we now must consider these matters anew in the 110th Congress.

H.R. 755 has a simple premise, Mr. Speaker. For the next 5 years, it would require annual testimony before the House Financial Services Committee by those entities most involved in establishing and implementing our Nation's financial reporting system. These parties include the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Financial Accounting Standards Board, and the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board.

Since the 1930s, the Securities and Exchange Commission has required public companies to file financial reports like income statements and balance sheets. Today, companies also rely on the generally accepted accounting principles developed by the Financial Accounting Standards Board to prepare these reporting documents. This independent accounting standard-setter came into existence in the 1970s. The tidal wave of accounting scandals at the start of this decade led Congress to reassess our Nation's financial reporting system and adopt further reforms in the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. Among other things, this landmark law created the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board. This body establishes the auditing standards used to examine public company accounting statements. It also registers and inspects the auditors of public companies.

Even without this legislation, the Financial Services Committee is already working to examine accounting and auditing issues and the work of each of these parties. Earlier this month we approved an oversight plan for the 110th Congress. Several of the action items in that plan address accounting issues. For example, the oversight plan calls for the committee to review the efforts of the Financial Accounting Standards Board to improve financial accounting standards. It also calls for us to study the progress being made on establishing international accounting standards. The plan further calls for the committee to examine the work of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board as it implements the auditing improvements made by the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. This legislation, therefore, builds on what we had already planned to do in the 110th Congress and what other sessions of Congress should plan to do.

These proposed annual hearings over the next 5 years will help us to reassess complex accounting standards. It will help us improve the understandability of financial statements, and it will encourage the acceptance of interactive data. Even though it seems highly likely that the parties subject to this legislation would testify before the Financial Services Committee on these matters if asked, this bill will make certain that the committee remains focused on these important issues in the immediate future.

In addition, the adoption of H.R. 755 will help to encourage our regulators and standard-setters to fulfill their own roles and initiatives to achieve greater transparency, promote greater uniformity, and reduce complexity in financial reporting not only at home but also around the world.

In recent years, our financial reporting standards have become more and more complex and complicated, especially as we have sought to address more difficult issues like the accounting treatment of derivatives and hedging instruments. This complexity has created difficulties not only for the companies that operate in the United States or that access our capital markets but also the investors and advisers who read and use financial statements.

For our Nation to remain competitive, we need to have robust capital markets. For our capital markets to be strong, we need to have transparent, clear, and understandable financial reporting. We also need to ensure that the entities responsible for accounting and auditing issues continue to work smoothly together. H.R. 755 will help us to stay focused on achieving these important and desirable goals.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the hard work of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS), who is the primary sponsor on this bill. And I want to commend Mr. DAVIS for introducing this measure, and I am proud to work with him as the lead cosponsor over these last years. And, hopefully, this time will be the charm.

This bill is aimed at ensuring that individuals have access to the information that they truly need to make better investment decisions. And I urge support for H.R. 755.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 755, the Promoting Transparency in Financial Reporting Act. And I also would like to thank the gentleman from Georgia for his hard work on this bill. We started nearly 18 months ago, and it is, I think, a true credit to bipartisanship in a way that it is going to help the American people, help small business, and ultimately help to create jobs and give people the opportunity to see clearly into the operation of the financial markets.

In the post-Enron financial era, transparent reporting has become an increasingly important component of promoting a healthy corporate environment. Financially stable and accountable corporations are essential for expanding the U.S. business sector, promoting investor confidence, and strengthening the economy.

However, it is important to examine ways in which such accountability and reporting standards can become both more efficient and more transparent. A cumbersome, costly system will only reduce our competitiveness in a connected world economy and ultimately cost us jobs.

I regularly hear complaints from business owners and executives in Kentucky about the costs and complexities of financial reporting requirements mandated by the Federal Government. As a former small business consultant, I know firsthand the difficulties faced during the time-consuming and costly processes of accounting and financial disclosure. Unfortunately, financial reporting remains an arduous task with too many opportunities for error and for manipulation. Reassessing outdated accounting standards and improving the ability of the average investor to understand and utilize financial documents are essential to the livelihood of American business and the protection of America's investors.

Requiring annual congressional testimony by the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Financial Accounting Standards Board, and the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board stresses that simplification, cost reduction, and transparency in accounting standards and financial reporting are public priorities. H.R. 755 will help hold the SEC, FASB, and PCAOB, as well as Congress, accountable for making progress on these important issues. H.R. 755 will give Congress a way to measure progress on the efforts of these organizations over the next 5 years and ensure they are working to streamline and to modernize the process of financial reporting.

As stated in the bill, we would like to direct attention to several areas of interest: first, we would like to reassess outdated and complex accounting standards; improve the understandability, consistency, and overall usability of the existing accounting and auditing literature; develop principles-based accounting standards; and encourage the use and acceptance of interactive data or extensible business reporting language, also known as XBRL; and, finally, to promote disclosures in plain English. I think it would be great ultimately for investors not to need a CPA and a lawyer to understand their own financial statements or the reports that they receive from companies they invest in.

H.R. 755 isn't intended to imply that these organizations have yet to move towards these goals. In fact, there are many examples of progress already. Each organization has already taken strides to improve financial reporting and the implementation of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, and I applaud these efforts.

For example, in December, 2006, PCAOB proposed new standards for auditing of internal controls designed to focus auditors on the most important issues. The proposed standards eliminate unnecessary audit requirements and, most importantly, provide guidance on how to adjust the audit for a smaller, less complex company. I appreciate the willingness of the PCAOB to respond to feedback from Congress and the investment community.

Another example is the SEC's encouragement of the use of interactive data. Interactive data uses ''tags'' for key facts in financial statements so investors can quickly extract and analyze information in an easily understandable format. The SEC recently announced the expansion of the voluntary test program, which already includes two dozen companies representing more than $1 trillion of market value. Participating companies are rewarded with expedited reviews of SEC filings. In turn, the test group will help the SEC to decide how interactive data can be of most use to investors. These kinds of public and private partnerships will ultimately serve the American people best and keep our markets robust and strong.

Many have criticized the burden and cost of Sarbanes-Oxley, and particularly section 404, on small public companies. It is critical that we strike the right balance between requiring financial reporting to bolster investor confidence and keeping our markets open to both domestic and foreign investment. H.R. 755 will help Congress maintain an active and essential role in this balancing act.

Modernizing reporting processes, increasing transparency, and reducing the costs of financial reporting will help ease the regulatory burden on businesses and strengthen the ability of individual investors to make educated financial decisions. To quote SEC Chairman Chris Cox, this process is going to be ''a long one, but it is worth it to make sure that the capital markets remain strong and vibrant.''

The Promoting Transparency in Financial Reporting Act will hold the SEC, FASB, and PCAOB, as well as Congress, accountable for making progress on these important issues.

Let's pass this bill as a first step towards creating a process for continuous improvement that will simplify our financial reporting regulatory framework.

I would like to thank in particular Ranking Member BACHUS, Chairman FRANK, and Chairman KANJORSKI for their support and my friend from Georgia for his hard work on this to bring this to the floor now.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is, as we mentioned, a very important bill that will certainly increase the confidence of the American people in our financial systems and make it smoother and with less complexity.

And I want to also thank the leadership of the Financial Services Committee, Chairmen BARNEY FRANK and KANJORSKI, for their excellent leadership on this very, very important and timely issue. And, again, I want to commend the hard work of my colleague Mr. DAVIS in providing leadership on this.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 755, Promoting Transparency in Financial Reporting Act of 2007.

H.R. 755 is a simple, but important measure. It requires the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Financial Accounting Standards Board, and the Public Company Accounting Board to provide annual testimony by their respective chairpersons or designees of the chairperson starting next year and for five subsequent years to the Committee on Financial Services on their efforts to reduce the complexity of financial reporting to provide a more accurate and clear financial information to investors, including:

Reassessing complex and outdated accounting standards; improving the understandability, consistency, and overall usability of the existing accounting and auditing literature; developing principles-based accounting standards; encouraging the use and acceptance of interactive data; and promoting disclosures in plain English.

In view of the different accounting standards being used in the private sector and government, it is clear that we need to have information that is reliable and credible. Financial information that does not meet rigorous and acceptable standards sends the wrong signals to investors as well as to the public about the real the financial condition of a business.

As we have witnessed over the past several years, the quality of financial information can make the difference between the true value of a company and what the public perceives to be its condition. H.R. 755 is an important first step towards making sure that the information being reported to investors and to the public is believable. As such, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr.

SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 755.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. 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.

DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENTS ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1066) to increase community development investments by depository institutions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1066

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Depository Institution Community Development Investments Enhancement Act''.

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) NATIONAL BANKS.—The first sentence of the paragraph designated as the ''Eleventh'' of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (12 U.S.C. 24) (as amended by section 305(a) of the Financial Services Regulatory Relief Act of 2006) is amended by striking ''promotes the public welfare by benefiting primarily'' and inserting ''is designed primarily to promote the public welfare, including the welfare of''.

(b) STATE MEMBER BANKS.—The first sentence of the 23rd undesignated paragraph of section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 338a) (as amended by section 305(b) of the Financial Services Regulatory Relief Act of 2006) is amended by striking ''promotes the public welfare by benefiting primarily'' and inserting ''is designed primarily to promote the public welfare, including the welfare of''.

SEC. 3. INVESTMENTS BY FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS AUTHORIZED TO PROMOTE THE PUBLIC WELFARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(c)(3) of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1464(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) DIRECT INVESTMENTS TO PROMOTE THE PUBLIC WELFARE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A Federal savings association may make investments, directly or indirectly, each of which is designed primarily to promote the public welfare, including the welfare of low- and moderate-income communities or families through the provision of housing, services, and jobs.

''(ii) DIRECT INVESTMENTS OR ACQUISITION OF INTEREST IN OTHER COMPANIES.—Investments under clause (i) may be made directly or by purchasing interests in an entity primarily engaged in making such investments.

''(iii) PROHIBITION ON UNLIMITED LIABILITY.—No investment may be made under this subparagraph which would subject a Federal savings association to unlimited liability to any person.

''(iv) SINGLE INVESTMENT LIMITATION TO BE ESTABLISHED BY DIRECTOR.—Subject to clauses (v) and (vi), the Director shall establish, by order or regulation, limits on—

''(I) the amount any savings association may invest in any 1 project; and

''(II) the aggregate amount of investment of any savings association under this subparagraph.

''(v) FLEXIBLE AGGREGATE INVESTMENT LIMITATION.—The aggregate amount of investments of any savings association under this subparagraph may not exceed an amount equal to the sum of 5 percent of the savings association's capital stock actually paid in and unimpaired and 5 percent of the savings association's unimpaired surplus, unless—

''(I) the Director determines that the savings association is adequately capitalized; and

''(II) the Director determines, by order, that the aggregate amount of investments in a higher amount than the limit under this clause will pose no significant risk to the affected deposit insurance fund.

''(vi) MAXIMUM AGGREGATE INVESTMENT LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding clause (v), the aggregate amount of investments of any savings association under this subparagraph may not exceed an amount equal to the sum of 15 percent of the savings association's capital stock actually paid in and unimpaired and 15 percent of the savings association's unimpaired surplus.

''(vii) INVESTMENTS NOT SUBJECT TO OTHER LIMITATION ON QUALITY OF INVESTMENTS.—No obligation a Federal savings association acquires or retains under this subparagraph shall be taken into account for purposes of the limitation contained in section 28(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act on the acquisition and retention of any corporate debt security not of investment grade.

''(viii) APPLICABILITY OF STANDARDS TO EACH INVESTMENT.—The standards and limitations of this subparagraph shall apply to each investment under this subparagraph made by a savings association directly and by its subsidiaries.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 5(c)(3)(A) of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1464(c)(3)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) [Repealed]''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1066.

It does occur to me on reflection that we should have asked the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Washington, Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. HASTINGS, to join in supporting this bill given its number. But in their absence, I will note that this is a bill that passed the House last year unanimously as part of a larger regulatory relief bill that came out of the Committee on Financial Services. It went to the Senate, and the Senate passed much of what we sent them but not all of it.

□ 1445

The Senate deleted some provisions. We, in the interest of getting some legislation through, accepted the Senate's proposal, and so much of what we sent originally did become law. Some pieces did not.

This is a piece that provides more flexibility for banks that are engaging in what is called, and it is a particular legal term here, public welfare investments. Banks are allowed to spend, invest up to 15 percent of their capital in what are called public welfare investments. This would allow that very good policy some more flexibility.

I would note, that, for instance, the Association of Affordable Housing Lenders, people who build subsidized housing, are in favor of this change. What it does is it broadens the definition. It doesn't change the 15 percent, but it gives more flexibility.

We have this situation where we do want these investments to be for the benefit of low and moderate income people. But it is one thing to say that they should generally be for the benefit of low and moderate income people, and another to strictly confine them to areas that have this direct benefit. What you do is you lose the flexibility we would like.

Mr. Speaker, I will include in the record at this point letters from John Reich, the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, and John Dugan, the Comptroller of the Currency.

OFFICE OF THRIFT SUPERVISION,
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, DC, February 23, 2007.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.
Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
Ranking Member, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK AND RANKING MEMBER BACHUS: I am writing to provide my support for H.R. 1066, the ''Depository Institution Community Development Investment Enhancements Act,'' legislation that you recently introduced and that I understand will soon be considered by the House. H.R. 1066 will enhance the ability of savings associations to support important public welfare initiatives. I encourage Congress to take swift action on this bill.

Similar to Section 202 of H.R. 3505, the ''Financial Services Regulatory Relief Act of 2005,'' which passed on a bipartisan basis in the full House of Representatives and H.R. 6062, the ''Community Development Investment Enhancements Act of 2006,'' which also passed on a voice vote by the full House, H.R. 1066 will enable savings associations to support important community development programs.

Specifically, H.R. 1066 will increase the ability of federal savings associations to make investments primarily designed to promote the public welfare of low- and moderate-income communities and families through the provision of housing, services, and jobs. Your bill accomplishes this by raising the limits on the ability of federal thrifts to invest in entities primarily engaged in making these public welfare investments.

Thank you for your leadership in sponsoring this important legislation and your continued interest is this issue. I applaud your efforts to remove barriers to the growth and stability of low- and moderate-income communities and urge immediate consideration of H.R. 1066. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or

Kevin Petrasic, Managing Director of External Affairs, at 2012–906–6452.

Respectifully yours,

JOHN M. REICH,
Director.

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY ADMINISTRATOR OF NATIONAL BANKS,
Washington, DC, February 26, 2007.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK: Thank you for having introduced H.R. 1066, the Depository Institution Community Development Investments Enhancement Act, which would restore the preexisting, longstanding authority of national and state member banks to make investments ''designed primarily to promote the public welfare, including the welfare of low- and moderate-income communities or families.''

Returning to this standard will restore several major categories of public welfare investments in areas determined by federal, state and local governments to be in need of such investments. These categories of investments, which were eliminated with passage of The Financial Services Regulatory Relief Act of 2006, include investments that:

Revitalize or stabilize designated disaster areas, including areas devastated by hurricanes.

Revitalize or stabilize underserved or distressed middle-income rural communities.

Utilize New Markets Tax Credits to promote development in middle-income census tracts with greater than 20 percent poverty rates.

Finance mixed-income affordable housing in government targeted areas for revitalization.

Since 1992, the preexisting standard has been implemented by the OCC in a transparent manner to generate national bank community development investments in every state of the nation amounting to over $16 billion. Every approved public welfare investment made by a national bank is posted by the OCC on our public website. Further, all public welfare investments made by national banks have been, and will continue to be under the provisions of H.R. 1066, subject to key controls designed to protect against risks to the safety and soundness of the bank and to the deposit insurance fund.

Restoring the previously qualifying categories of investments, in combination with the recent increase in allowable investments to 15 percent of capital and surplus, can potentially generate as much as $30 billion in national bank investment to help revitalize local ommunities across the nation—without the use of any taxpayer funds. I urge prompt passage of H.R. 1066 to help achieve this significant impact.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. DUGAN,
Comptroller of the Currency.

Mr. Speaker, in Mr. Dugan's letter, for example, he says giving this flexibility would allow ''finance mixed-income affordable housing in government targeted areas for revitalization.'' It maintains the purpose of helping low and moderate income people, but it provides the flexibility in doing it, which we would all support.

I know of no opposition to the bill. People might have raised the question, well, the groups that are the primary advocates, the low and moderate income people, do they think it might hit them? No, the answer is they do not. And several groups that try to promote this kind of mixed economic benefit development think this would be useful.

As I said, it is a bill the House passed last year. It is supported by banks. We have banks that want to be socially responsible, within the context of making a profit and meeting their safety and soundness requirements. We should not unduly burden them when they try to do that.

So I hope that the House will once again pass this, and that this time, looking at them alone with a little more leisure, the Senate will go along.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1066, the Depository Institution Community Development Investments Enhancement Act, and I want to commend Chairman FRANK for introducing this legislation.

The regulatory relief legislation that was signed into law last October increased the authority of banks to invest in projects that benefit low and moderate income communities. The legislation increases the allowable percentage of public welfare investments from 10 to 15 percent of a thrift's capital and surplus. Banks currently have this authority.

H.R. 1066 would expand this authority in allowing thrifts to invest in distressed areas, as well as the low and moderate income communities. This enhanced authority is important because the need for investment in government-designated disaster areas may not necessarily be confined to low to moderate income areas.

H.R. 1066 also would make it easier for banks to invest in projects in devastated and abandoned communities on the gulf coast or to revitalize rural areas that are underserved or distressed. This legislation allows greater opportunities for banks and thrifts to provide housing, community services and jobs to communities throughout our Nation. It also helps these institutions meet their obligations under the Community Reinvestment Act. Since the law was enacted in 1992, existing authority has already generated more than $16 billion of investments.

Twice last year legislation similar to H.R. 1066 passed the House overwhelmingly. H.R. 6062, the Community Development Investment Enhancement Act of 2006 passed the House by voice vote in September. The same language also was included in the House passed version of regulatory relief legislation, H.R. 3505, which cleared this body last March by a vote of 415–2, as Chairman FRANK noted.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1066.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1066.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 644) to facilitate the provision of assistance by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the cleanup and economic redevelopment of brownfields.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 644

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) returning the Nation's brownfield sites to productive economic use could generate more than 550,000 additional jobs and up to $2,400,000,000 in new tax revenues for cities and towns;

(2) redevelopment of brownfield sites and reuse of infrastructure at such sites will protect natural resources and open spaces;

(3) lack of funding for redevelopment is a primary obstacle impeding the reuse of brownfield sites;

(4) the Department of Housing and Urban Development is the agency of the Federal Government that is principally responsible for supporting community development and encouraging productive land use in urban areas of the United States;

(5) grants under the Brownfields Economic Development Initiative of the Department of Housing and Urban Development provide local governments with a flexible source of funding to pursue brownfields redevelopment through land acquisition, site preparation, economic development, and other activities;

(6) to be eligible for such grant funds, a community must be willing to pledge community development block grant funds as partial collateral for a loan guarantee under section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, and this requirement is a barrier to many local communities that are unable or unwilling to pledge such block grant funds as collateral; and

(7) by de-linking grants for brownfields development from section 108 community development loan guarantees and the related pledge of community development block grant funds, more communities will have access to funding for redevelopment of brownfield sites.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to provide cities and towns with more flexibility for brownfields development, increased accessibility to brownfields redevelopment funds, and greater capacity to coordinate and collaborate with other government agencies—

(1) by providing additional incentives to invest in the development and redevelopment of brownfield sites; and

(2) by de-linking grants for brownfields development from community development loan guarantees and the related pledge of community development block grant funds.

SEC. 3. BROWNFIELDS DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE.

Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 123. BROWNFIELDS DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants under this section, on a competitive basis as specified in section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 3545), only to eligible public entities (as such term is defined in section 108(o) of this title) and Indian tribes for carrying out projects and activities to assist the development and redevelopment of brownfield sites, which shall include mine-scarred lands.

''(b) USE OF GRANT AMOUNTS.—Amounts from grants under this section—

''(1) shall be used, as provided in subsection (a) of this section, only for activities specified in section 108(a);

''(2) shall be subject to the same requirements that, under section 101(c) and paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 104(b), apply to grants under section 106; and

''(3) shall not be provided or used in a manner that reduces the financial responsibility of any nongovernmental party that is responsible or potentially responsible for contamination on any real property and the provision of assistance pursuant to this section shall not in any way relieve any party of liability with respect to such contamination, including liability for removal and remediation costs.

''(c) AVAILABILITY OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall not require, for eligibility for a grant under this section, that such grant amounts be used only in connection or conjunction with projects and activities assisted with a loan guaranteed under section 108.

''(d) APPLICATIONS.—Applications for assistance under this section shall be in the form and in accordance with procedures as shall be established by the Secretary.

''(e) SELECTION CRITERIA AND LEVERAGING.—The Secretary shall establish criteria for awarding grants under this section, which may include the extent to which the applicant has obtained other Federal, State, local, or private funds for the projects and activities to be assisted with grant amounts and such other criteria as the Secretary considers appropriate. Such criteria shall include consideration of the appropriateness of the extent of financial leveraging involved in the projects and activities to be funded with the grant amounts.

''(f) DEFINITION OF BROWNFIELD SITE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'brownfield site' has the meaning given such term in section 101(39) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(39)). Such term includes a site that meets the requirements under subparagraph (D) of such section for inclusion as a brownfield site for purposes of section 104(k) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)).

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under this section such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.''.

SEC. 4. CLARIFICATION OF BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT AS ELIGIBLE CDBG ACTIVITY.

(a) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Subsection (a) of section 105 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (24) and all that follows through the end of the subsection and inserting the new paragraph (24) inserted by section 2(3) of Public Law 108–146 (117 Stat. 1883);

(2) by adding at the end (after the paragraph added by paragraph (1) of this subsection) the new paragraph (20) added by section 907(b)(1)(C) of Public Law 101–625 (104 Stat. 4388) and redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (25); and

(3) by adding at the end (after the paragraphs added by paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection) the new paragraph (21) added by section 1012(f)(3)) of Public Law 102–550 (106 Stat. 3905) and redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (26).

(b) BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.—Section 105(a) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)), as in effect pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (24) (as added by subsection (a)(1) of this section), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (25) (as added by subsection (a)(2) of this section), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in paragraph (26) (as added by subsection (a)(3) of this section), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(27) economic development and redevelopment activities related to projects for brownfields sites (as such term is defined in section 123(f)), in conjunction with the appropriate environmental regulatory agencies, except that assistance pursuant to this paragraph shall not be provided in a manner that reduces the financial responsibility of any nongovernmental party that is responsible or potentially responsible for contamination on any real property and the provision of assistance pursuant to this paragraph shall not in any way relieve any party of liability with respect to such contamination, including liability for removal and remediation costs.''.

SEC. 5. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT TO ALLOW USE OF CDBG FUNDS TO ADMINISTER RENEWAL COMMUNITIES.

Section 105(a)(13) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(13)) is amended by inserting ''and renewal communities'' after ''enterprise zones''.

SEC. 6. APPLICABILITY.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to amounts made available for fiscal year 2008 and fiscal years thereafter for use under the provisions of law amended by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to give more flexibility to our municipalities. They are allowed to use Community Development Block Grant funds for cleaning up brownfields.

By the way, I do want to comment for a minute on brownfields. We hear a great deal about public sector-private sector, and I believe that people have unwisely seen this as if there was an opposition. In fact, we need to cooperate, and I particularly here want to call attention to an aspect of this bill that is relevant to those who tend to see the private sector as the fountain of all benefits and the public sector as somehow a source of negative activity.

What we are doing here is giving local governments the right to use Federal money to clean up messes that were left behind by the private sector. Brownfields overwhelmingly are the result of industrial activity that was once profitable and no longer is. That doesn't mean that the people that did it were bad people, necessarily. It does mean given the change in economics, private sector entities walked away in many cases and left the public sector responsible for these cleanups.

What we are doing here is giving more flexibility to local communities so that they don't have to take out a section 108 loan, which can tie up their Community Development Block Grant funds for a long time. It does give in to local judgment.

I do want to note one very important point that the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, has stressed, and a point on which I am in complete agreement with him, namely that the funding flexibility here should be for brownfields, not for Superfund sites.

In the Superfund situation, we have provisions for those who polluted to have to pay in to cleaning up the messes they left behind. We do not want the brownfields money here to be used in any way to diminish that liability.

So I very much agree with the point that was made by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). In fact, when we sent this bill previously to the Senate, they removed the restriction that we had put in there that would have prevented this from happening, and we then would not pass the bill. We will send this again to the Senate and we hope they will accept that this is for brownfields, it is not for Superfund. It should be used in this very strict way so as to not become a substitute for private contributions that ought to be coming.

If we limit this to CDBG money for the brownfields situation, we will be doing it right. This bill is entitled the Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act. We want moneys that are freed up here to be used only for that purpose.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 644, the Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act of 2007. I want to commend Congressman MILLER of California for introducing this legislation for the fourth time.

This bill aims to provide local communities greater access to the Department of Housing and Urban Development's brownfields program to clean up and redevelop contaminated sites. More importantly, the bill will help local communities create new jobs and expand their tax base.

The revitalization of brownfields sites has always been a familiar topic in Illinois, as my home State has thousands of these underused or vacant

properties. Brownfields are those sites where redevelopment is complicated by potential environmental contamination. They are less seriously contaminated than those covered under the Superfund Act, and there are an estimated 500,000 of them across the country.

HUD administers a brownfields program called the Brownfields Economic Development Initiative, or BEDI. The main purpose of BEDI is to spur economic and community development of the brownfields sites. The problem is that due to a loan guarantee requirement, the program has been underutilized. Over the past 5 years, the Financial Services Committee has sought to make HUD's program more effective, specifically the BEDI program.

At hearings, we learned that many communities had been shut out of the BEDI program because they can't get a grant without going through the cumbersome process of applying for a section 108 loan. That is very hard on those smaller communities.

Under current law, HUD's brownfields redevelopment projects must be backed by those section 108 guaranteed loans. The section 108 loans require a local community to provide loan security by collateralizing its BEDI project with that community's current and future CDBG allocations. Therefore, many small communities have been hesitant to reply for BEDI because they are unwilling or unable to pledge their block grants as collateral for the guaranteed loans. In short, H.R. 644 amends the HUD Act of 1974 to permit HUD to issue BEDI grants independent of the section 108 loan guarantees.

This bill does not create a new program and would not trigger new spending or receipts. This bill will facilitate brownfields redevelopment in thousands of communities across the country, thereby encouraging economic development, expanding communities' tax bases and, most importantly, creating new jobs.

I applaud the bill's sponsors for introducing H.R. 644. I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the chair of the Housing Subcommittee, from which this bill came.

Ms. WATERS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 644, the Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act, a bill of which I am an original cosponsor. I certainly applaud the distinguished chairman of Committee on Financial Services, Mr. FRANK, for working to get this bill to the floor. I also want to thank Mr. GARY MILLER, who introduced the bill and who has been working on this subject for quite some time, as well as all of the other cosponsors of this bill.

The House passed a bill identical to H.R. 644 in the 109th Congress because many of us recognized the importance of preserving a means of remedying the numerous hazardous sites that remain in this country.

Under the Brownfields Act, the Environmental Protection Agency awards grants for the assessment and cleanup of sites that pose a serious threat to human health and the environment than sites addressed by the Superfund.

Many of these sites thwart the development and revitalization of communities in distressed areas of the country, including the City of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County. In fact, it is these sites that make development efforts impossible because of the potential risks.

The Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act becomes a powerful economic development tool when used in conjunction with other Federal economic redevelopment resources, CDBG and section 108 loan guarantees. It is precisely the kind of leveraging tool that we must utilize to spur development in places where development costs are uncertain given the presence of hazardous materials.

The Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act, if passed, will continue to provide four types of competitive grants: Assessment grants used as planning tools by grantees to conduct due diligence related to the affected sites; revolving loan fund grants to capitalize the loans for the cleanup of the sites; cleanup grants that provide for the recipient to undertake cleanup activities; and job training grants made available to nonprofits and educational entities to develop environmental job training programs.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to postpone passage of this bill any longer. It sends a bad signal to the communities across the Nation who are trying to rebuild, reinvest and strengthen their economic local economies. Any Federal tool to leverage private investment must be preserved, particularly in this pay-as-you-go economic environment. The Brownfields Enhancement Act is a tool, and therefore I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1500

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 644. As a former mayor of the third largest city in New Jersey, Paterson, the first planned industrial city in the Nation and home to some of the country's oldest brownfield sites, I know this bill will be beneficial to our Nation's communities.

H.R. 644 authorizes HUD to offer much-needed grants for the environmental cleanup and economic development of brownfield sites, places we drive by every day of our lives. We want to rehabilitate those sites, including inactive factories, gas stations, salvage yards, abandoned warehouses.

This bill also makes brownfield-related environmental cleanup and economic development activities eligible for Community Development Block Grants assistance. These sites drive down property values, provide little or no tax revenue, and contribute to community blight.

Since the inception of brownfield programs, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has allocated over $800 million in brownfield assessment and cleanup funds. In addition, this investment has leveraged over $8 billion in cleanup and redevelopment dollars, a better than 10 to 1 return on investment. It has resulted in the assessment of more than 8,000 properties and helped create over 37,000 jobs. It is a winner.

This is because the EPA and HUD grants work in conjunction with funds that come from both the State and local governments, and of course private sources, to address cleanup of brownfield sites. If we don't do this, those sites will remain abandoned and barren for years ahead of us.

This is an exciting time in the brownfields marketplace. Federal brownfields programs have provided the foundation on which State initiatives have flourished. Throughout the country, there are thousands of abandoned structures that were once thriving businesses, often part of large industrial centers. Economic development matched with environmental cleanup has resulted in the rebirth of many industrial and commercial properties and surrounding neighborhoods.

Anyone who cares about our Nation's cities celebrates these successes. HUD's particular expertise in incorporating brownfields remediation into a larger strategy for economic development and community revitalization is essential to the success we have had and will continue to have in the future. This is a stimulant to the economy, a real stimulant.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very worthwhile legislation.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to make any comments for the RECORD that they wish, and also to include extraneous material on H.R. 644 and H.R. 1066.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker and Chairman FRANK, on behalf of New York City, which I represent, I am pleased that the House is considering the Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act.

I am proud to have been an original cosponsor of this legislation in every session since it was first introduced in the 107th Congress.

As you know, the primary purpose of the bill is to increase the flexibility of the Housing and Urban Development Department's Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) and to make the program available to more local Governments.

The legislation eliminates the requirement that communities applying for BEDI grants must pledge their Community Block Development Grant (CBDG) funding as security for the loan—a rule that puts local Governments between a rock and a hard place.

Since its inception, the larger brownfields program has proven an effective Government response to a serious environmental problem, and it is important that we maximize its use.

Brownfields are abandoned, or under-used industrial and commercial facilities where further redevelopment is impeded by environmental contamination. They spot our country from coast to coast, especially in areas with high or formerly high levels of industrial activity, such as older urban areas. New York City, including my district, is full of them.

These locations have potential for economic development but are held back by the environmental problems created by former or current users. The program has successfully used a variety of financial and technical assistance to restore these sites which would otherwise be doomed to further decay.

I am very pleased to support this legislation and thank Representative GARY MILLER for introducing it again this year and Chairman BARNEY FRANK and Ranking Member BACHUS for their leadership on this bipartisan issue.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, as a coauthor of the original legislation which created the Brownfields program, I rise in support of H.R. 644, which makes Brownfield Economic Development Initiative, BEDI, grants far more accessible to smaller communities by eliminating a requirement for communities to guarantee their BEDI grant with their Community Development block grant funds.

I believe the Brownfields program is one of the most successful programs the Federal Government has to help revitalized urban areas. These sites, typically in the heart of urban areas, lie idle because no one wants to incur the large costs associated with Superfund cleanups.

This, in turn should encourage more-environmental cleanup and economic development of brownfield sites. As a result, cities are marked by abandoned buildings and vacant lots while developers construct new buildings on what was previously open space in the suburbs.

Though small, these grants serve as seed money, enabling dozens of communities to leverage millions of State and private dollars to move into the actual cleanup phase.

By reusing Brownfields sites, we not only rebuild blighted communities, but also target development in city centers and avoid unnecessary urbanization on the fringes of metropolitan areas.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 644.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING ANTITERRORISM COOPERATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENCE ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we have a bill, but in our traditional, bipartisan way, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 884) to provide for the establishment of the Science and Technology Homeland Security International Cooperative Programs Office, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 884

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Promoting Antiterrorism Cooperation through Technology and Science Act'' or the ''PACTS Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The development and implementation of technology is critical to combating terrorism and other high consequence events and implementing a comprehensive homeland security strategy.

(2) The United States and its allies in the global war on terrorism share a common interest in facilitating research, development, testing, and evaluation of equipment, capabilities, technologies, and services that will aid in detecting, preventing, responding to, recovering from, and mitigating against acts of terrorism.

(3) Certain United States allies in the global war on terrorism, including Israel, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and Singapore have extensive experience with, and technological expertise in, homeland security.

(4) The United States and certain of its allies in the global war on terrorism have a history of successful collaboration in developing mutually beneficial equipment, capabilities, technologies, and services in the areas of defense, agriculture, and telecommunications.

(5) The United States and its allies in the global war on terrorism will mutually benefit from the sharing of technological expertise to combat domestic and international terrorism.

(6) The establishment of an office to facilitate and support cooperative endeavors between and among government agencies, for-profit business entities, academic institutions, and nonprofit entities of the United States and its allies will safeguard lives and property worldwide against acts of terrorism and other high consequence events.

SEC. 3. PROMOTING ANTITERRORISM THROUGH INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after section 313 (6 U.S.C. 193) the following:

''SEC. 314. PROMOTING ANTITERRORISM THROUGH INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION PROGRAM.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) DIRECTOR.—The term 'Director' means the Director selected under subsection (b)(2).

''(2) INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE ACTIVITY.—The term 'international cooperative activity' includes—

''(A) coordinated research projects, joint research projects, or joint ventures;

''(B) joint studies or technical demonstrations;

''(C) coordinated field exercises, scientific seminars, conferences, symposia, and workshops;

''(D) training of scientists and engineers;

''(E) visits and exchanges of scientists, engineers, or other appropriate personnel;

''(F) exchanges or sharing of scientific and technological information; and

''(G) joint use of laboratory facilities and equipment.

''(b) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY HOMELAND SECURITY INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS OFFICE.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Under Secretary shall establish the Science and Technology Homeland Security International Cooperative Programs Office.

''(2) DIRECTOR.—The Office shall be headed by a Director, who—

''(A) shall be selected by and shall report to the Under Secretary; and

''(B) may be an officer of the Department serving in another position.

''(3) RESPONSIBILITIES.—

''(A) DEVELOPMENT OF MECHANISMS.—The Director shall be responsible for developing, in consultation with the Department of State, understandings or agreements that allow and support international cooperative activity in support of homeland security research, development, and comparative testing.

''(B) PRIORITIES.—The Director shall be responsible for developing, in coordination with the Directorate of Science and Technology, the other components of the Department of Homeland Security, and other Federal agencies, strategic priorities for international cooperative activity in support of homeland security research, development, and comparative testing.

''(C) ACTIVITIES.—The Director shall facilitate the planning, development, and implementation of international cooperative activity to address the strategic priorities developed under subparagraph (B) through mechanisms the Under Secretary considers appropriate, including grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts to or with foreign public or private entities, governmental organizations, businesses, federally funded research and development centers, and universities.

''(D) IDENTIFICATION OF PARTNERS.—The Director shall facilitate the matching of United States entities engaged in homeland security research with non-United States entities engaged in homeland security research so that they may partner in homeland security research activities.

''(4) COORDINATION.—The Director shall ensure that the activities under this subsection are coordinated with those of other relevant research agencies, and may run projects jointly with other agencies.

''(5) CONFERENCES AND WORKSHOPS.—The Director may hold international homeland security technology workshops and conferences to improve contact among the international community of technology developers and to help establish direction for future technology goals.

''(c) INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) AUTHORIZATION.—The Under Secretary is authorized to carry out international cooperative activities to support the responsibilities specified under section 302.

''(2) MECHANISMS AND EQUITABILITY.—In carrying out this section, the Under Secretary may award grants to and enter into

cooperative agreements or contracts with United States governmental organizations, businesses (including small businesses and small and disadvantaged businesses), federally funded research and development centers, institutions of higher education, and foreign public or private entities. The Under Secretary shall ensure that funding and resources expended in international cooperative activities will be equitably matched by the foreign partner organization through direct funding or funding of complementary activities, or through provision of staff, facilities, materials, or equipment.

''(3) LOANS OF EQUIPMENT.—The Under Secretary may make or accept loans of equipment for research and development and comparative testing purposes.

''(4) COOPERATION.—The Under Secretary is authorized to conduct international cooperative activities jointly with other agencies.

''(5) FOREIGN PARTNERS.—Partners may include Israel, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, Singapore, and other allies in the global war on terrorism, as appropriate.

''(6) EXOTIC DISEASES.—As part of the international cooperative activities authorized in this section, the Under Secretary, in coordination with the Chief Medical Officer, may facilitate the development of information sharing and other types of cooperative mechanisms with foreign countries, including nations in Africa, to strengthen American preparedness against threats to the Nation's agricultural and public health sectors from exotic diseases.

''(d) BUDGET ALLOCATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to be derived from amounts otherwise authorized for the Directorate of Science and Technology, $25,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2011 for activities under this section.

''(e) FOREIGN REIMBURSEMENTS.—Whenever the Science and Technology Homeland Security International Cooperative Programs Office participates in an international cooperative activity with a foreign country on a cost-sharing basis, any reimbursements or contributions received from that foreign country to meet its share of the project may be credited to appropriate current appropriations accounts of the Directorate of Science and Technology.

''(f) REPORT TO CONGRESS ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Under Secretary, acting through the Director, shall transmit to the Congress a report containing—

''(A) a brief description of each partnership formed under subsection (b)(4), including the participants, goals, and amount and sources of funding; and

''(B) a list of international cooperative activities underway, including the participants, goals, expected duration, and amount and sources of funding, including resources provided to support the activities in lieu of direct funding.

''(2) UPDATES.—At the end of the fiscal year that occurs 5 years after the transmittal of the report under subsection (a), and every 5 years thereafter, the Under Secretary, acting through the Director, shall transmit to the Congress an update of the report required under subsection (a).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by adding after the item relating to section 313 the following new item:

''Sec. 314. Promoting antiterrorism through international cooperation program.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation, and insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, let me thank the gentleman from Mississippi, Chairman THOMPSON, for his cooperation, not just in the previous Congress on putting this legislation together, but also today in his generosity in allowing me to go forward on it. To me, this is typical and symbolic of the bipartisanship which he has brought to the committee both as ranking member and now as chairman. I thank him for that. And more than his personal kindness and generosity, let me also say that it is so vitally important that on issues such as this that there be bipartisan cooperation working across the aisle because all of our lives changed on September 11. All of us realized we had to change the way we did business, whether it was creating the Department of Homeland Security, whether it was creating the law enforcement agencies at all levels of government to cooperate, whether it meant adopting specific legislation on chemical plants or port security, or any of the other areas included within the umbrella of Homeland Security.

But it also requires us to establish firmer relationships with our allies, finding areas of common ground among us and our allies, and that is what H.R. 884 will do. H.R. 884 is the Promoting Antiterrorism Cooperation through Technology and Science Act, PACTS.

It is an effort by us to have our Department of Homeland Security and our government work with our allies and friends around the world to find common ways to confront terrorism, to use technology to confront terrorism, and it does that initially by establishing the International Cooperation Programs Office within the Science and Technology Directorate of the Department of Homeland Security.

It also authorizes $25 million a year in fiscal years 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. So $25 million for each of the next four fiscal years. It specifies by name Great Britain, Singapore, Israel, Canada, and Australia as countries that we should especially work more closely with to exchange technology and research, and to work together on a common effort at the government level, at the university level, private foundations, to put aside any technical differences that may separate us, to try to work through any legal impediments there may be to the type of cooperation that we believe is absolutely essential.

This legislation did pass our committee in the last Congress and passed the House. Unfortunately, it was blocked in the Senate. We certainly hope that under the leadership of Chairman THOMPSON it will again pass the House this year, and hopefully the Senate will do the right thing this year and we can get this legislation to the President's desk.

The war on terrorism will involve many of us for many years. The more allies and partners and friends we can have working with us, the more we can share our expertise and technology that make us stronger and make the enemy weaker.

I urge the adoption of H.R. 884 and thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his cooperation.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 884, Promoting Antiterrorism Cooperation through Technology and Science Act, a bill considered in one form or another since the 108th Congress.

There is an old saying we tell school children: if at first you don't succeed, try, try again.

Although these words of encouragement may have originally applied to the grade school study of algebra or Latin, they are equally motivational to those of us serving in the 110th Congress.

I first raised the idea of this bill in January of 2005, soon after I became the ranking member. I know my Democratic colleagues had pushed for it in the 108th Congress at well.

Well, after years of trying, this Congress will succeed in sending this legislation to the President's desk. I know the other body will be taking up a similar provision attached to their bill seeking to fulfill the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. I am very pleased that they will soon join the House in passing this legislation.

Why is this bill so important? The answer lies in the nature of the terrorist threat. Terrorism is an international threat to the democratic way of life. Though we have experienced terrible tragedies of our own, terrorist attacks occur all over the world.

Terrorists have attacked buses in London; hotels in Israel; trains in Mumbai; embassies in Indonesia; resorts in Bali; and schools in Russia. As the global threat of terrorism is evident, so too is the solution to limiting those attacks. By promoting international cooperation, we will defeat the efforts of our enemies. Cooperation in developing antiterrorism technologies should be a top priority. The different challenges faced by our friends around the world have resulted in new approaches that the United

States should leverage to protect our citizens.

International cooperation is nothing new for our country. In fact, the United States has a history of productive scientific and technical collaborations with Israel, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and others.

The Department of Homeland Security has participated in some of these partnerships with foreign governments and other entities.

This legislation will encourage and strengthen those efforts and direct the Department to look for new partners beyond those we already have. This includes working with folks in the small business community who can bring exciting technologies to the table.

I am especially heartened that the bill will strengthen the means for protecting our Nation from exotic diseases. Active collaborations with scientists in Africa, where many of these diseases originate, should be promoted. This bill encourages that collaboration.

Too often, the United States presents a posture of unilateralism to the world. I hope that through programs like the ones authorized in this legislation, we encourage a more cooperative approach to fighting terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 884. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 884, the Promoting Antiterrorism Cooperation through Technology and Science Act, a long name for a great bill and an idea whose time clearly has come.

The world knows that we changed on the morning of September 11, 2001. We found ourselves raw, exposed, attacked on our own soil, and mourning friends and loved ones killed that tragic morning. We learned the true nature of Islamic militants and the extent of their indiscriminate hatred of Americans.

But we did not sit by silently, waiting for another attack. We acted, molding our government into a new security-focused body, willing and able to help protect our citizens. And, Mr. Speaker, we partnered with other countries in the global war on terror working to weed out terrorist cells across the globe and stop them before they have a chance to harm anyone else.

This bill today builds on our partnership with international allies, directing the Department of Homeland Security to coordinate international research programs and strategic planning coalitions.

H.R. 884 enhances these cooperative tools to improve our interactions with great allies like Israel, Canada, Australia, Japan, the United Kingdom, and Singapore.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot fight the war on terror alone. We need our international partners to stand with us to stop the murderous terrorist groups wherever they spring up.

Today's bill supports and enhances these partnerships, and I am very proud to support it. I urge my colleagues to do the same. I want to commend the chairman of the committee and the ranking member of the committee for their great work on this bill.

□ 1515

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. I thank the chairman and ranking member. I really commend the work that you have done, both Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. KING, in this area of reaching across the aisle and not just speaking about it, but doing something about it.

This is a very important piece of legislation, H.R. 884. It has been a product of bipartisan effort and collegial dedication by a lot of people on both sides of the aisle, the staffs of both sides of the aisle, and I am heartened at the process by which the bill has moved forward.

The commitment of Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. KING to this vitally important legislation has been unwavering, and the collaboration offered epitomizes the very best of what the homeland security can and should be. I was honored to serve on that committee for 4 years, and this is a tremendous achievement to see this proposal move forward.

This legislation will help to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security works with our allies in the war on terror to develop and share the best homeland security technologies possible, and we will all be better off because of it.

In fact, it was not that long ago that several of us went to Europe, to various capitals of Europe, to see what they were doing in terms of homeland security. That proved to be a very productive trip, and we learned from the Brits and from the Spanish and from the Italians, and they learned from us. This is a true collaboration here.

Specifically, H.R. 884 will establish what we call the Science and Technology Homeland Security International Cooperative Programs Office. Its objective will be to facilitate international cooperative activities throughout the Directorate of Science and Technology within the Department of Homeland Security.

These international cooperative activities will be supported through grants and cooperative agreements, contracts with the U.S. governmental organizations, businesses, federally-funded research and developmental centers, institutions of higher education, and foreign public and private entities.

This bill seeks to strengthen ongoing partnerships, as well as encourage new ones. As has been mentioned by both the chairman and the ranking member, the global war on terrorism is one we have joined with with Israel and the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and Singapore and many other countries.

To be sure, the United States could greatly benefit from joint international homeland security development programs between the U.S. and our allies in this war on terror.

The fact is this: Many of our allies have substantial experience dealing with terror, and by necessity, they have become op-eds for counterterrorism research.

The bill would authorize $25 million for international cooperative activities for each of the fiscal years of 2008 to 2011. Now, that is not a lot of money when we consider the vast array of benefits that such cooperative agreements can produce.

Forming these partnerships, Mr. Speaker, and working together in a way that will ultimately help secure America is the main objective of the bill, and it should always be the main objective of this whole body. Passage of this legislation today shows that the House takes this austere responsibility seriously.

A final point, Mr. Speaker, if I may, the point of global strategy was at the center of the 9/11 Commission Report, Chapter 12. The Commission made recommendations about global strategy. The kind of partnership and cooperation at the heart of our port security, for instance, is determined by how well the other country where goods and services are coming from will cooperate with us. We can't check every ship that comes into our ports, but we certainly could get the cooperation of other countries with state-of-the-art science and technology to do that.

Once again, I commend, and I do not speak empty or hollow of the work that both Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. KING did.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, first let me tell the gentleman from New Jersey that we miss him on the committee. We miss his charm and his insights and his lively personality and his dedication.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID DAVIS), a member of the committee.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 884. I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for bringing this important piece of legislation.

The development and implementation of technology to combat terrorism is critical. The United States and our allies in the war on terror share a common interest in furthering research and development of homeland security-related technology.

As such, this legislation directs the Department of Homeland Security's research and development arm, the

Science and Technology Division, to coordinate international cooperative programs with our allies in the war on terror to advance this important homeland security research.

This legislation implements a 9/11 Commission recommendation that the United States should engage other Nations in developing a comprehensive coalition strategy against Islamic extremists.

H.R. 884 establishes the Science and Technology Homeland Security International Cooperative Programs Office within the Science and Technology Division to promote cooperation between entities of the United States and its allies to engage in cooperative endeavors focused on the research, development and commercialization of high-priority technologies directed at countering acts of terrorism and other high consequence events to address the homeland security needs of Federal, State and local governments.

This bill enables the Science and Technology Division within DHS to coordinate with our allies. By encouraging joint research studies, the sharing of scientific and technological information, the training and exchange of scientists and engineers, as well as the joint use of laboratory equipment and facilities, H.R. 884 further directs DHS to collaborate with their strongest allies that include Israel, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and Singapore in the development of homeland security technologies.

This legislation is modeled after a partnership created by Congress in 1977 between the United States and Israel. That was called the Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation, also known as the BIRD Foundation. In 29 years, the BIRD Foundation has invested $225 million in 690 cooperative research and development projects mutually beneficial to the United States and to Israel.

H.R. 884 will facilitate collaboration with countries which have extensive experience in combating terrorism and will enable us to benefit and tailor their technology solutions to address our needs.

Israel is a country that has developed successful models to mitigate security threats. Most notably, Israel has pioneered efforts and behavioral pattern recognition, also known as BPR. The United States has begun adopting BPR at airports and is now training police and security officers to detect people who are behaving in a suspicious manner.

It is for these reasons that I support H.R. 884, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I would like to basically thank the gentleman from New York for working with me on the bill, and I encourage all Members to vote ''aye'' for its passage.

I also submit the following exchange of letters for the RECORD.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, February 26, 2007.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN, I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Science and Technology in H.R. 884, the Promoting Antiterrorism Cooperation through Technology and Science Act. The Committee on Science and Technology has jurisdictional interest in this bill based on the Committee's jurisdiction over the Department of Homeland Security Science and Technology Directorate (''DHS S&T'') and other DHS research and development. [See Rule X(o)(14) which grants the Committee on Science and Technology jurisdiction over ''Scientific research, development, and demonstration, and projects therefor.'']

This bill would amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a ''Science and Technology Homeland Security International Cooperative Programs Office.'' All of the international cooperative activities authorized by the bill relate to homeland security research (e.g., ''coordinated research projects, joint research projects, or joint ventures;'' ''joint studies or technical demonstrations;'' ''coordinated field exercises, scientific seminars, conferences, symposia, and workshops;'' ''training of scientists and engineers;'' ''visits and exchanges of scientists, engineers, or other appropriate personnel;'' ''exchanges or sharing of scientific and technological information;'' and ''joint use of laboratory facilities and equipment''). In addition, the funding for such activities is to be derived from amounts otherwise authorized to DHS S&T.

The Committee on Science and Technology acknowledges the importance of H.R. 884 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over this bill, I agree not to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forgo a sequential referral waives, reduces, or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and Technology, and that a copy of this letter and of your response will be included in the Congressional Record when the bill is considered on the House Floor.

The Committee on Science and Technology also expects that you will support our request to be conferees during any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

BART GORDON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, February 26, 2007.

Hon. BART GORDON,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your recent letter expressing the Science and Technology Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 884, the ''Promoting Antiterrorism Cooperation through Technology and Science Act.'' The Committee on Homeland Security acknowledges your claim to jurisdiction over provisions contained in this bill, as amended, and appreciates your agreement not to request a sequential referral. The Committee on Homeland Security understands that nothing in the legislation or your decision to forgo a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Science and Technology Committee, and that a copy of this letter and of our response will be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when the bill is considered on the House Floor. The Committee on Homeland Security will also support your request to be conferees during any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

Thank you for your cooperation as we work toward the enactment of H.R. 884.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2007.

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 884, the ''Promoting Antiterrorism Cooperation through Technology and Science Act.'' There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, including provisions relating to programs that may provide appropriated funds to foreign governments and entities.

In the interest of permitting your Committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive this Committee's right to sequential referral on this legislation. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not waive, reduce or otherwise affect any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I request that you support our efforts to have Members of this Committee named to any conference committee which is formed to consider any such provisions either in this bill or in any other legislation that includes this legislation.

Please place this letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have addressed this matter and I look forward to working with you as H.R. 884 proceeds through the legislative process.

Cordially,

TOM LANTOS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2007.

TOM LANTOS,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your recent letter expressing the Committee on Foreign Affairs' jurisdictional interest in H.R. 844, the ''Promoting Antiterrorism Cooperation through Technology and Science Act.''

The Committee on Homeland Security appreciates your willingness to work cooperatively on this important legislation. The Committee on Homeland Security recognizes your jurisdictional interest over provisions contained in this bill, as amended, and appreciates your agreement not to request a sequential referral. The Committee on Homeland Security acknowledges that your decision to forgo a sequential referral on this legislation does not waive, reduce or otherwise affect the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Accordingly, the Committee on Homeland Security will support your efforts to participate as conferees in any House-Senate conference on this legislation or in any other legislation that includes this legislation.

A copy of this letter, together with the letter you sent on this matter will be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when the bill is considered on the House floor.

Thank you for your continued cooperation and I look forward to working with you as H.R. 884 proceeds through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

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

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, let me again thank Chairman THOMPSON for his efforts and his cooperation and for his generosity as far as moving this bill forward, and I, again, thank him for that. I think it speaks volumes as to the quality of leadership that he has brought to the committee.

I would also be remiss if I did not thank staff on our side, Dr. Diane Berry, Colleen O'Keefe and Adam Paulson for their work in bringing this together, and again, bring it to fruition today.

Also, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing today is really a very important continuation of what our governments and other governments have been trying to do. Just several weeks ago, the Secretary of Homeland Security signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Israel's minister of public security, again pledging cooperation. This is codifying that and making clear we want to do more; we want to keep going forward on that.

Again, I thank the chairman for his support and his cooperation, and I urge the adoption of H.R. 884.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 884, which establishes the Science and Technology Homeland Security International Cooperative Programs Office. H.R. 884 is an improved version of a similar bill, H.R. 4942, passed by the House during the 109th Congress. The purpose of these minor, non-substantive changes is to align the House bill more closely with its Senate counterpart, S. 1554, which will be considered when the Senate takes up H.R. 1, which implements the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

The purpose of H.R. 884 and S. 1554 is to establish an office charged with promoting cooperation between entities of the United States and its allies in the global war on terrorism in the areas of research, development, and commercialization of high-priority technologies intended to detect, prevent, respond to, recover from, and mitigate against acts of terrorism and other high consequence events. The bill also addresses the homeland security needs of Federal, State, and local governments.

The House bill authorizes $25 million per year for international cooperative activities for the fiscal years 2008 through 2011 and establishes an International Cooperative Programs Office within the Science and Technology Directorate of the Department of Homeland Security, DHS, headed by a Director. The Director is responsible for:

Promoting cooperative research between the U.S. and its allies on homeland security technologies;

Developing strategic priorities for international cooperative activity and addressing them through agreements with foreign entities;

Facilitating the matching of U.S. entities—including small businesses—engaged in homeland security research with appropriate foreign research partners;

Ensuring that activities of the office are coordinated with other relevant research agencies; and

Planning and executing conferences and workshops to improve contact among technology developers and to help establish direction for future technology goals.

H.R. 884 also establishes a Science and Technology Homeland Security International Cooperative Programs Office to facilitate international cooperative activities throughout the Directorate of Science and Technology.

The United States currently participates in similar bilateral programs such as the Bi-National Industrial Research and Development—BIRD Foundation—in which the United States and Israel cooperate on defense-related R&D. The office would conduct similar activities, but they would be run by the Department of Homeland Security rather than a private foundation.

The Director of the Office reports directly to the Under Secretary for Science and Technology and is responsible for developing understandings and agreements that allow and support international cooperative activity in support of homeland security research, development, and comparative testing. The legislation also makes the Director responsible for developing strategic priorities for international cooperative activity in support of homeland security research, development, and comparative testing.

Mr. Speaker, facilitating international cooperative activity to address strategic priorities through appropriate mechanisms such as grants, cooperative agreements or contracts with foreign public or private entities is another important objective that this legislation prudently vests in the Director. The Director shall also be mandated to identify and match domestic entities engaged in homeland security research with foreign entities so that they may partner in homeland security research activities.

Finally, the Director is obligated to work toward bringing about the coordination of the Department's international cooperative activities with the activities of other relevant research agencies and to holding international homeland security technology workshops and conferences. These international cooperative activities are to be supported through grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts with Federal governmental organizations, businesses—including small businesses, federally funded research and development centers, institutions of higher education, and foreign and private entities.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would encourage equal partnership by requiring that the foreign partner equitably match U.S. funding expended through direct funding or funding of complementary activities, or through provision of staff, facilities, material, or equipment. It strengthens ongoing partnerships and encourages new ones.

In addition, partnerships are encouraged with the nations of Africa to facilitate the development of information sharing and other types of collaboration to strengthen American preparedness against threats to our Nation's agricultural sector and public health from exotic diseases.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 884 and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 884, and I commend the gentlemen from New York and Mississippi for moving this legislation forward.

In the war on terrorists, we are often racing against our enemies as they develop new threats and we develop new countermeasures. This has been true throughout the history of warfare and it remains true today, whether we are talking about improvised explosive devices, shoe bombs, or attacks using chlorine gas.

In this competition to combat new threats, cooperation on science and technology with our allies is a key force multiplier, and I commend the gentlemen for moving forward with this legislation.

But we have to make sure that these cooperative programs are properly coordinated and consistent with existing programs and law. I believe that before the Department of Homeland Security initiates a new program, the Secretary of State should be in full agreement with the proposed cooperation to ensure that there is no duplication of efforts with State Department anti-terrorism efforts. In addition, this new framework should recognize that:

In accordance with section 622(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Secretary of State is responsible "for continuous supervision and general direction" of U.S. foreign assistance;

In accordance with section 504 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal year 1979, the Secretary of State shall have primary responsibility for coordination and oversight with respect to all major science or science and technology agreements and activities between the United States and foreign countries; and

In accordance with the Case-Zablocki Act, no international agreement may be signed or otherwise concluded without prior consultation by the Secretary of State.

While I do not believe that H.R. 844 is inconsistent with coordination with the Secretary of State or with these authorities and requirements, I look forward to working with the gentleman from Mississippi and gentleman from New York as H.R. 844 moves forward on legislative language to provide for a specific role for the Secretary of State in this process and to reflect these existing authorities. And I appreciate the gentlemen's willingness to work with me on these issues.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 884 to establish a Science and Technology Homeland Security International Cooperative Programs Office. In an ongoing effort to promote effective methods of addressing antiterrorism, this legislation would establish a Science Technology Homeland Security International Cooperative Programs Office to facilitate international cooperative activities throughout the Directorate of Science and Technology.

Terrorism is no longer confined to one country. It is now a threat to international security. The means, missions and motives of terrorism have changed, forcing the counter-terrorism community to react accordingly. Our strategies and implementations, in order to be more effective, need to be global. The most disturbing developments have been a growing partnership in organized crime between countries. As a result, and since the 9/11 attacks, the international community has focused on the issue of terrorism with renewed intensity. Gathering,

coordinating and sharing of information among the international community is a critical effort to prevent and combat terrorism. H.R. 884 creates this opportunity by facilitating international cooperative activity that encourages international partnerships in the fight against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we join our allies on and off the battlefield. Terrorism is a global phenomenon that requires a coordinated global response. H.R. 884 provides a global response to terrorism. This legislation was passed in the House during the 109th Congress and I urge my colleagues to support it again.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 884, the PACTS Act, I am pleased we are moving quickly and considering this legislation, which implements a key 9/11 Commission recommendation that "the United States should engage other nations in developing a comprehensive coalition strategy against Islamist terrorism."

The bill enables the Department of Homeland Security to join forces with our closest international allies to develop homeland security technologies and share scientific information to help prevent terrorist attacks.

As co-chairman of the bipartisan 9/11 Commission Caucus, I know how important it is to implement the core recommendations of the 9/11 Commission and to hold the administration and relevant Federal agencies accountable to implement them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 884.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. 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.

RECOGNIZING ANN RICHARDS' EXTRAORDINARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO TEXAS AND AMERICAN PUBLIC LIFE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 42) recognizing Ann Richards' extraordinary contributions to Texas and American public life.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 42

Whereas Dorothy Ann Willis Richards, the First Lady of Texas politics, an American icon and patriot, who touched the lives of Texans and Americans across the Nation, passed away September 13, 2006, after a valiant fight with esophageal cancer;

Whereas her political philosophy was one of government openness and she was a forceful champion for economic and social justice for all Americans, opening Texas government to all Texans, including African Americans, Hispanics, women, and the disadvantaged;

Whereas, before her service ended, of her nearly 3,000 appointments, 46 percent were female, 15 percent were black, 20 percent were Hispanic and 2 percent were Asian American;

Whereas her service to Texas and the Nation included teaching Texas schoolchildren, serving as County Commissioner in Travis County, serving 2 terms as Texas State Treasurer, and finally serving as the Governor of Texas;

Whereas Richards raised 4 incredible children, and 8 "almost perfect" grandchildren and touched the lives of countless friends throughout her life;

Whereas Governor Richards revitalized the Texas economy, yielding 2 percent growth when the United States economy was shrinking; she streamlined Texas's government and regulatory institutions for business and the public; she revitalized and positioned Texas's corporate infrastructure for the explosive economic growth it experienced later in the decade, and she saved Texas taxpayers more than $6 billion;

Whereas Richards reformed the Texas prison system by establishing a substance abuse program for inmates, reducing the number of violent offenders released, and increasing prison space to deal with a growing prison population;

Whereas Richards instituted the Texas lottery to supplement school finances and she sought to decentralize control over education policy to districts and individual campuses, instituting site-based management;

Whereas Richards inspired an entire generation of young women, admonishing them with the words "well-behaved women rarely make history";

Whereas, in 1989, with co-author Peter Knobler, she wrote her autobiography "Straight from the Heart", inspiring Texans with her personal story and folksy humor;

Whereas, in 2004, she authored "I'm Not Slowing Down, Winning My Battle with Osteoporosis" and became an international spokesperson for women battling the disease;

Whereas, after her diagnosis with esophageal cancer, Richards inspired all of us with her determination to win against all the odds, and her fearless battle until the very last day in her beloved Austin, Texas;

Whereas her sense of humor, delivery, and understanding of Texas's "old boy" politics was legendary, charming, and disarming; and

Whereas Governor Dorothy Ann Willis Richards was an American original, an irreplaceable public servant, a patriot who loved the Nation and its expansive land, ideas, and the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes and commends Ann Richards' extraordinary contributions to Texas and American public life.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. 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. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, at the memorial service of Ann Richards, the former mayor of Dallas, Texas, Ron Kirk, the mayor's lifelong friend said, "Ann Richards was as fierce a warrior and advocate for justice as any public servant I've ever known. She embraced every person she met, no matter their station in life, with dignity, and love, and compassion."

The former Governor of Texas was a witty, flamboyant and outspoken homemaker who captured the hearts and minds of the people of Texas, as well as the Nation. She burst into national prominence as a keynote speaker to the 1988 Democratic National Convention when she uttered the famous line about the wealthy, then-Vice President George H.W. Bush, and she said, "Poor George, he can't help it; he was born with a silver foot in his mouth." The speech set the tone for her political future as the first woman elected to treasurer, a statewide office, in Texas in 50 years.

In 1990, Ann Richards won the Democratic gubernatorial nomination against attorney general and former Congressman Jim Mattox and former Governor Mark White. Her Republican opponent was multimillionaire rancher Clayton Williams, Jr. The campaign between the two was brutal, but Richards prevailed in the election on November 6, 1990, by a margin of 49–47 percent.

As Governor, Ann Richards wanted a more inclusive Texas. She called it the "New Texas," where she made nearly 3,000 appointments, 46 percent were female, 15 percent were African American, 20 percent were Hispanic and 2 percent were Asian Americans. Among Governor Richards' appointment of firsts are: the first African American to the University of Texas regent; the first crime victim to join the State criminal justice board; the first disabled person to serve on human services board; and the first teacher to lead the State board of education. During her tenure, she oversaw the fabled Texas Rangers pin stars on their first African American and female officers.

Richards implemented an economic revitalization program to address the Texas economy that was in a slump since the mid-1980s, compounded by a downturn in the U.S. economy. Her policy initiatives yielded a 2 percent growth in 1991 for the Texas economy, while the U.S. economy as a whole shrank.

Ann Richards reformed the Texas prison system by establishing a substance abuse program for inmates in prison and reduced the number of violent offenders released back into society. She was a supporter of proposals to reduce the sale of semiautomatic

firearms and cop killer bullets in the State.

□ 1530

She vetoed legislation that would allow people to carry concealed handguns and automatic weapons inside public establishments without the owner's permission. Some political analysts believe that this veto cost her her reelection bid for Governor in 1994. Richards lost her reelection bid to George W. Bush. After her unsuccessful bid for reelection, someone asked her, ''What would you have done differently if you knew you would be a one-term Governor?'' Richards grinned and said, ''Oh, I would probably have raised more hell.''

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my fellow Members of Congress in recognizing Dorothy Ann Willis Richards' really extraordinary contribution to Texas and to American public life.

A steadfast political activist who first entered the political arena as a student at the University of Texas, Ann Richards rose through the political ranks first as a volunteer in State and local political campaigns and ultimately to a national figure.

A feminist icon, Ann Richards first came to national attention to many as the Texas State treasurer, when she delivered the keynote address at the 1988 National Democratic Convention. Serving as the Governor of Texas from 1991 to 1995, Governor Richards was widely acknowledged as an inspirational national leader, civil rights advocate, and role model. Her political philosophy was one of government openness and was noted for her unprecedented appointments of women and minorities to important positions.

Throughout her life, Governor Richards had a particular interest in social interests such as advancing women's rights and equality for all groups and individuals. She believed, if given a chance, all women could perform as well or better than men, and I would emphasize she probably thought better than men. She once offered a memorable salute to the achievements of women by reminding her audience, and I love this quote, ''Ginger Rogers did everything that Fred Astaire did. She just did it backwards and in high heels.''

Always willing to use her upbringing as an example for others, she once said that, ''Where I grew up, there wasn't much tolerance for self-importance, people who put on airs,'' and she lived by that philosophy.

During her tenure as Governor, she not only expanded the State's economic base through a program for economic revitalization, but created one of the most inclusive and representative governments in the history of Texas.

Soon after becoming Governor, she sought government efficiency by authorizing comprehensive audits of every State agency, that ultimately saved the taxpayers of Texas reportedly $6 billion.

As a result of her interest in law enforcement and her own personal battles with alcoholism, Governor Richards reformed the Texas prison system by establishing a substance abuse program for inmates, decreasing the number of violent offenders released, and increasing prison space.

Governor Richards was always tireless in her efforts on behalf of children and education. While Governor, she instituted the Texas lottery as a means of supplementing school funding.

After leaving office, in her final year of life, the Austin Independent School District announced, ''The Ann Richards School For Young Women Leaders.'' Opening in the fall of 2007, this institution will serve as a college preparatory school for girls in grades 6 through 12. The curriculum will focus on math, science, and technology. This initiative is one of many lasting tributes to Governor Richards' all-encompassing devotion to the citizens of Texas.

Sadly, Ann Richards passed away from cancer on September 16, 2006. She was 73 years old, leaving behind a legacy of political achievement and a record of championing equality and justice.

I ask all Members to join by supporting this resolution.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas and the author of this legislation, Representative SOLOMON ORTIZ.

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, today we are here to pay tribute to the life of the late Governor of Texas, Dorothy Ann Willis Richards. And I want to thank Chairman WAXMAN, the majority leader, and my good friend, DANNY DAVIS, for bringing this bill to the floor, and my colleagues for taking time from their busy schedule to do what we are doing today.

America and the State of Texas both suffered a great loss on September 13, 2006, when Ann Richards met our Maker after a brave struggle with cancer.

Growing up as the son of migrant workers in segregated South Texas, I was painfully aware of the power dynamics in place that placed those of privilege high above the working poor. Ann Richards sought to turn that tide around. During her service as Governor of Texas, she appointed more females and minorities than any Governor by far.

It was Ann's spunk and her dedication to the people of our beloved State, all the people, that earned her love and admiration of millions of Americans.

Following her philosophy of life in public service, ''well-behaved women rarely make history,'' Ann's charm and passion for life propelled her far in the history books.

A lifelong public servant, Ann began her career as a Texas school teacher. She later served in Austin as Travis County Commissioner and Texas State Treasurer prior to being elected State Governor in a historic campaign.

During her entire public service career, Ann remained a teacher, teaching Texans that the advantage of working together benefited the economy of our State. Even today she still teaches us.

Ann Richards is remembered today and always not only for her accomplishments, but also for the way she carried them out. Her disarming wit and wisdom won opponents time and time again. Her big as Texas hair, hearty laugh, piercing blue eyes, and smiling face are unforgettable. She was one of those people you just couldn't help but like, and today I am so happy that they gave us time to honor a great American, a great Governor, and a great friend, Ann Richards.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas with whom I had the good fortune to spend Saturday with at Paul Quinn College where we were discussing the issues related to African American males, Representative EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the legacy of an exceptional public servant, the late Governor Ann Richards.

When Governor Richards passed away in September, I not only lost an esteemed colleague, but a dear and trusted friend. I am proud to say that our friendship endured for more than 40 years.

First, we are from the same hometown. But I didn't meet her there, I met her in Dallas, Texas when she lived there in the 1960s. And then she moved to Austin, and the first thing that she did, she always helped in everybody's campaign, but the first thing she did in Austin was manage Sarah Weddington's campaign for the Texas House, and we won at the same time. Sarah Weddington is the young lawyer that defended Rowe v. Wade before the Supreme Court.

As women in politics, and especially Ann, we shared some of the same views and many of the same colleagues, and I did encourage her that she had come to her time that she can maybe serve in elective office herself. And we knew that Texans were not that supportive of women running for office, but she ran for the County Commissioner's Court and won.

She was not afraid to be herself, and she really listened to people and she was supportive of people. Her independent spirit and charm not only won

her votes, but it really generated a great deal of respect. And she often used humor to get her point across, but she did get her point across. People respected her, and they knew that she would work hard on their behalf and there was never a question about that.

She took pride in her accomplishments as Governor. First she won as Treasurer, and I had the pleasure of running her campaign in Dallas County during that time. But when she won as Governor, it was a very male-dominated situation, and she right away appointed more women and minorities to important boards than anyone else ever had done in history.

For the first time there were women and minorities on the board of regents of Texas universities all over the State and many other women positions that was on the medical examiners board. Those medical examiners didn't know what had taken place. But she was not afraid to do it.

She utilized the latest technology as Texas Treasurer. When she came into office there was a big deficit, and she hired a consultant to come down and help, and that consultant was Franklin Raines. That is when I first met him.

We did so much together. And when she was in office and was able to see how to get through those many problems, she earned the support of the business community, which was mostly white men of course. Ann broke her way from the mold.

I rise today to pay tribute to the legacy of an exceptional public servant, the late Governor Ann Richards.

When Governor Richards passed away in September, I not only lost an esteemed colleague, but a dear and trusted friend.

I'm proud to say that our friendship endured for more than 40 years.

I first met Ann Richards in the sixties when she lived in Dallas and was running for Travis County Commissioner.

As women in politics, Ann and I shared many of the same views and also many of the same challenges.

Texas in the 1970's wasn't very supportive of women running for political office, so you really had to earn each and every vote.

Ann wasn't afraid to be herself, and she compelled people to listen to her.

Her independent spirit and charm not only won her votes, but it garnered respect.

People respected her, and they knew that she would work hard on their behalf.

Ann took pride in her accomplishments in the male dominated Texas politics. She had hoped that her success may serve as inspiration to young women.

She certainly served as inspiration to me.

In 1982 Ann successfully ran for Texas State Treasurer.

As State Treasurer she utilized the latest technology to transform the Texas Treasury into a modern operation.

Along the way, Ann earned the respect of the business community who appreciated her foresight and vision.

In 1990 Ann became the first woman Governor of Texas elected in her own right.

Ann broke away from the mold of previous Governors. She wasn't afraid to shake things up and speak her mind.

In her tenure as Governor she was adamant about appointing minorities on state boards and commissions.

Ann wanted the Texas Government to reflect the diversity and culture of the people of the State.

Ann was a hands-on Governor, and she didn't let much get by her.

She did her best to eliminate inefficiency and waste within the government.

She demanded that the Texas government fully serve the people, and she did everything in her power to realize that.

She had a strong will for justice and fairness for all.

Governor Richards was one of the finest of Texans that I've ever known.

She dedicated herself to the State and the people of Texas.

She broke down barriers for women, and made us believe that anything was possible.

She was truly an original, and her absence is immensely felt.

The recognition she is receiving today is very well deserved.

Her many contributions to the State of Texas and to America will not be forgotten.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure now to yield 3 minutes to an individual who had the good fortune to be a close neighbor of Governor Richards, Representative LLOYD DOGGETT of Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman and my colleagues for this resolution honoring our friend, Ann Richards.

Despite the great sense of loss that so many of us continue to feel, I must say that the wonderful gathering that we had last year in Austin for Ann Richards was about the most joyous memorial service that I have ever participated in. There was so much to celebrate about this person, about this life.

Ann came to Austin in the 1970s. She was a true life force. She became our County Commissioner and our State Treasurer before becoming Governor. And during most of my tenure in Congress, I had the good fortune to have her as a next-door neighbor.

She had a quick wit, but she also had a very warm smile. And it was her smile, her warmth, and her sense of humor that could win over even the most ardent foe.

She believed in straight talk. Her candor about her personal life enabled her to tell hard truths in her political life. And in her waning months, she faced her battle with cancer with the same fighting spirit and the same sense of humor that defined her life.

I think that there are two places not often the focus of reflecting on Ann Richards' life where her effect is particularly notable. One is in our schools. Until January, I represented Ann Richards Middle School in La Joya, Texas. I could see how those young people from a poor economic area were enriched by their contact with Ann Richards and the inspiration that she provided them with her continued participation long after she completed her tenure as Governor. And, now in Austin, we are starting the Ann Richards School For Young Women. Its purpose is one that Ann devoted much of her personal life to—inspiring and serving as a mentor for young women. And now, in this school, many middle school girls will find that they too can fulfill their dreams and fully participate in all sectors of our society.

□ 1545

A former teacher, Ann knew what a difference quality public education could make in the lives of young women and young men, and these institutions serve to remind us of what she accomplished.

But the second place is with her family. She has two daughters, two sons, who are active participants in the life of our community and of our country. I think that they speak volumes about the kind of mother and the kind of family person that Ann Richards is, and they continue to live the legacy that she established.

She set high standards and inspired countless Americans to do the same. Her loss means that all of us who share her values must redouble our efforts.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been able to call Ann Richards a friend of mine and of my family. Just like she inspired millions of young women in Texas and across this Nation, she inspired my oldest daughter, Hillary, who I often took along with me to meetings in Austin.

At one meeting with the Governor, Hillary pulled out this yellowed copy of Ann's keynote address to the 1988 Democratic National Convention and proceeded to quote lines back to her. Hillary's favorite line from that speech was one that Ann had popularized in her famously wry tone: ''Ginger Rogers did everything that Fred Astaire did. She just did it backwards and in high heels.'' To me, that line epitomizes Ann Richards: skillful, determined, and equal to any man's task.

She was a woman in what had been a man's rough and tumble world of Texas politics, but she never let anything or anyone hold her back. She believed education was the great equalizer. She believed redemption was possible, and she believed that a woman's place was in the dome. She aimed to create a new Texas; and when she broke through that glass ceiling, she reached her hand out to pull women, minorities, and the disadvantaged up with her.

Like the yellow rose of Texas, Ann was a beautiful and classic lady. She could also be thorny, though. She told you exactly what you needed to hear, using wit and candor to make her point. Her presence and her laughter could fill a room, even if all you could see was that big white hairdo peeking above the crowd.

Dorothy Ann Willis Richards is a Texas giant, and I am proud that my

daughters grew up knowing such a strong, independent, and caring woman.

I want to leave you with some words from Ann, words that all of us here today should take to heart.

She said: ''The public doesn't like you to mislead or represent yourself to be something you're not . . . They don't ask their public officials to be perfect. They just ask them to be smart, truthful, honest, and to show a modicum of good sense.''

Ann, we'll miss you.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it will come as no great surprise that on any issue of policy Ann Richards and I were probably 180 degrees out of phase; but last year, when she received her diagnosis, I sent her a little note telling her that we were thinking about her and praying for her. She sent me a little note back, and I wanted to share that with the House today.

She said: ''Thank you for being so thoughtful.

''For someone who has cancer, I'm in great shape. Patience has never been my long suit, but I am learning. I am in my third week of treatment and am taking it one day at a time. The M.D. Anderson Hospital is fabulous. It's a whole lot like 'Star Wars' with more interesting machines than Buck Rogers ever imagined.

''Thanks a lot for thinking of me and praying for me. With all that energy directed toward my recovery, how can we miss?''

Mr. Speaker, there wasn't much that Ann Richards and I did agree on, but we both agreed on our love for Texas, and we both agreed we only wanted the best for our State. Texas is proud to have had a Governor like Ann Richards. Although oftentimes we were on opposite sides of the issue, she will be missed in my home State of Texas.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 5½ minutes. The gentleman from Connecticut has 15 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent to transfer 10 minutes over to my colleague, if there is need to use that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut.

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

Mr. Speaker, all of us come in contact with individuals who have a way to connect one way or another. Sometimes it is from near, and sometimes it is from afar. I shall never forget the speech that Governor Richards made at the Democratic convention in 1988. You know, speeches are things that you hear a lot of when you are involved in public activity and public office, and you don't always look for anything special when you see another one coming. I mean, sometimes, it is another speech.

But the amount of wit and charm that Ann Richards had and her ability to convey it in such a way that she could make a humorous point that was not always so humorous, but you still got the humor out of it, and whoever it was directed to and at didn't necessarily view it as being offensive, she had the ability to do that.

We have heard speaker after speaker talk about the fact that she appointed this large number of individuals to boards and commissions and made regents out of people and gave them positions that people just didn't sort of expect, because it had not been done before.

Then she took on a real tough question that some people feel caused her to lose an election, but she probably knew the risk that she was taking, because it had to do with the right of individuals to keep and bear arms, dealing with semiautomatic weapons that the normal average person wouldn't necessarily carry.

I mean, you wouldn't walk around, even if you wanted to go hunting, with a semiautomatic weapon to shoot rabbits or deer or whatever it is that you would shoot, although I have never believed in shooting that many things any way, unless they were shooting back. Therefore, I was never much of a hunter, because the animals didn't have anything to shoot back with. That was about the only way that I would see myself shooting at them.

But she knew the great political risk that she was taking, and not withstanding that risk, held to her guns, held to her position, did not waver, did not back up. That is what real leaders are made of. They don't take positions just to get elected or just to be in office. But they take them based upon principles upon which they believe, ideas and ideology that govern their lives.

That was the kind of woman that Ann Richards was, and that is why I think she was able to mean so much to so many people, not only in Texas; but she was a great advancement for the women's movement, for enticing more women to run for public office, and, of course, to be elected to public office, and to reach another level of equity, another level of having arrived at a point in history where a woman, a little girl growing up, can believe that she has the possibility of moving not only to Governor of the State of Texas, but to Speaker of the House of the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as she might consume to our distinguished Speaker, NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you very much, Congressman DAVIS, and thank you for bringing this opportunity to the fore for us to sing the praises of the great Governor of Texas, Ann Richards. I am proud to join you today, Mr. DAVIS, in honor of Ann Richards, a true pioneer and one of Texas' great daughters.

Ann Richards expanded the realm of what is possible for women. As she loved to say: ''A woman's place is in the dome.'' She is certainly smiling down on us today. As more women than ever rise to elective office, we owe a great debt to Ann Richards for helping to blaze the trail.

So important was she to the women in Congress who serve here now, as part of my swearing-in festivities, I had a tea honoring Ann Richards in which we reviewed a film of her life in which her beautiful granddaughter, Lily, made a presentation about her grandmother, from which we all drew strength and inspiration about this woman, a true, true pioneer. Ann Richards will be remembered for her devastating wit and gigantic heart, which led her to make real and lasting improvements for all Americans.

From health care, to education, to opening the doors of government to all, Ann Richards was one of our Nation's most fierce champions for expanding opportunity. Just as Ann was an advocate for all of America's children, she was particularly proud of her own. Ann's daughter Cecile Richards was an essential member of my team when I became leader and has since become President of Planned Parenthood of America. I know Ann was equally proud of her three children, Daniel, Clark and Ellen, and her eight grandchildren, I mentioned Lily. She was proud of all of them.

I hope it is a comfort to her entire family that so many people here in the Congress, indeed in the country, remember Ann with great enthusiasm and are grateful for her leadership. She has been gone a number of months now, but it is a loss that we sorely feel. It is a memory that we greatly cherish of a great woman, a leader in our country, and a person.

As I say to all of us in Congress or in elective office, all of us owe Ann Richards a great debt of gratitude. She is the gold standard for statesmanship, man or woman. Again, we are especially proud of the leadership she provided as a woman leader in our country.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the distinguished Speaker for her remarks.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, all Members on this side of the aisle have a tremendous appreciation for this great lady, and we are happy to honor her and are grateful the House is, in fact, honoring her.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in proud support, and as an original cosponsor of H. Res. 42. This resolution is offered by the Texas Democratic Delegation in the House, chaired by Congressman ORTIZ,

and recognizes the extraordinary contributions of Ann Richards to public life in Texas and the United States. It is both fitting and proper that the People's House pay this tribute to a pioneering and path breaking woman who devoted her life to serving the people.

Mr. Speaker, this happy moment stands in stark contrast to that sorrowful morning of September 14, 2006, when I informed the House from this podium of my sad duty to report that an American original and the First Lady of Texas politics, the great Ann Richards, had lost her long and valiant battle with throat cancer.

Mr. Speaker, Dorothy Ann Willis Richards began her career in politics in the early 1970s after having raised four children. A Democrat, she served as County Commissioner in Travis County, Texas from 1977 to 1982. Richards was elected to the first of two terms as Texas State Treasurer in 1982. We who knew and loved her will remember her always as a forcefully articulate and an amusingly folksy speaker. She first gained national prominence with her keynote address at the 1988 Democratic National Convention. In 1990 she was elected governor of Texas, the first woman chief executive of Texas in more than fifty years.

Dorothy Ann Willis was born in Lakeview, Texas. She grew up in Waco, Texas, and graduated from Waco High School in 1950, participating in Girls State. She received a bachelor's degree from Baylor University while on a debate scholarship. She married her high school sweetheart, David Richards, and moved to Austin, Texas, where she earned a teaching certificate from the University of Texas at Austin.

After graduation, she taught social studies and history at Fulmore Junior High School in Austin, Texas from 1955 to 1956. She had also two daughters and two sons in the following years, and she campaigned for Texas liberals and progressives such as Henry B. Gonzalez, Ralph Yarborough, and Sarah Weddington. One of her daughters, Cecile Richards became president of Planned Parenthood in 2006. Throughout her life Ann Richards was a forceful champion for economic and social justice for all Americans, especially women and the disadvantaged.

In 1976, Richards ran against and defeated a three-term incumbent on the Travis County, Texas Commissioner Court, holding the position for six years. She then was elected State Treasurer in 1982, becoming the first woman elected to statewide office in more than fifty years. In winning the Democratic nomination for treasurer, Richards ended the career of a Texas politician with the same name as a president (but no relation), Warren G. Harding. In 1986, she was re-elected treasurer without opposition.

Ann Richards delivered the keynote address to the 1988 Democratic National Convention, a move which put her in the national spotlight with the line "Poor George [H.W. Bush], he can't help it . . . He was born with a silver foot in his mouth." The speech set the tone for her political future; she described herself as a real Texan (in supposed contrast to George H.W. Bush), established herself as a feminist, and reached out to African-Americans and Hispanics. In 1989, with co-author Peter Knobler, she wrote her autobiography, Straight from the Heart.

In 1990, she sought and won the Democratic gubernatorial nomination besting such venerable vote getters as Texas Attorney General James "Jim" Mattox and former governor Mark White. In the general election she defeated multi-millionaire rancher Clayton Williams after a brutal campaign and was inaugurated the 45th governor of Texas in January 1991.

The Texas economy had been in a slump since the mid–1980s, compounded by a downturn in the U.S. economy. Governor Richards responded with a program of economic revitalization, yielding growth in 1991 of 2% when the U.S. economy as a whole shrank. She also streamlined Texas's government and regulatory institutions for business and the public. Her efforts helped to revitalize and position Texas's corporate infrastructure for the explosive economic growth it experienced later in the decade. Her audits on the state bureaucracy saved Texas taxpayers more than $6 billion.

Governor Richards reformed the Texas prison system, establishing a substance abuse program for inmates, reducing the number of violent offenders released, and increasing prison space to deal with a growing prison population (from less than 60,000 in 1992 to more than 80,000 in 1994). She backed proposals to reduce the sale of semi-automatic firearms and "cop-killer" bullets in the state.

The Texas Lottery was also instituted during her governorship—advocated as a means of supplementing school finances; Ann Richards purchased the first lotto ticket on May 29, 1992. However, most of the income from the lottery went into the state's general fund rather than specifically to education, until 1997, when all lottery net revenue was redirected to the state's Foundation School Fund, which supports public education. School finance remained one of the key issues of her governorship and of those succeeding hers; the famous Robin Hood plan was launched in the 1992–1993 biennium which attempted to make school funding more equitable across school districts. Richards also sought to decentralize control over education policy to districts and individual campuses; she instituted "site-based management" to this end.

In March 2006, Governor Richards announced that she had been diagnosed with esophageal cancer and will be seeking treatment at M.D. Anderson Cancer Center in Houston, Texas. The disease has a five-year survival rate of 25 percent. Despite the statistics, Governor Richards vowed to beat her illness and battled valiantly until the very last day, when she finished her journey on earth and ascended to the heavens.

None of us who knew and loved Ann Richards will ever forget her or the way she brightened the lives of all the people she served. She was one in a million and she will be deeply missed. She will never be replaced. She was an American original. She was my friend.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 42, recognizing Ann. Richards extraordinary contributions to Texas and American public life.

Ann Richards and I worked together when I served in Texas State Senate in 1991 and 1992 before I was elected to the House of Representatives in 1993. At that time, she was serving as the Governor of Texas. During our tenure in the state house we worked together to support stronger environmental laws for our district and Texas.

Governor Richards was a teacher who started out in politics as a volunteer on the campaigns of Sarah Weddington, Henry B. Gonzalez, and Ralph Yarborough. She began her own political career in 1976 when she was elected to serve as a County Commissioner in Travis County.

Six years later in 1982, she was elected Texas State Treasurer and served two terms. Ann made history by becoming the first woman elected to statewide office in Texas in fifty years.

In 1990, Ann ran for governor and promised to increase the role of minorities and women in state government as part of her plan for a "New Texas." When Governor Richards was elected she made it a priority as governor to appoint more women and minorities to state boards and commissions and followed through on her promise.

During her tenure, Governor Richards had many accomplishments including revitalizing the Texas economy, reforming the prison system, and instituting the state lottery. Once she left public office, Ann continued to be an inspiration to us all when she bravely battled osteoporosis and esophageal cancer.

Ann wasn't only the governor of one of the greatest states in America, but she was one of America's greatest governors in terms of her personality, sense of humor, and trailblazing accomplishments. Governor Richards was the First Lady of Texas politics and her extraordinary accomplishments make her not only a Texas hero, but also an American hero.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 42 offered by my colleague and neighbor Congressman SOLOMON ORTIZ. Governor Ann Richards was a woman of incomparable spirit, wit, intelligence, and heart. She was a trailblazer who opened the world of public service and politics to women and minorities in her beloved home state of Texas, as well as throughout the country.

I remember her most for her commitment to my constituents in South Texas. In 1993, Governor Richards signed the bill to create South Texas Community College, now South Texas College.

Without Governor Richards' direct insight and involvement in granting us a three year waiver in not requiring a taxing district, the creation of the school simply would not have been possible. Today, the college, with 17,000 students, is responsible for contributing to our local economy through workforce and job training programs, has directly contributed to the drop in the region's unemployment rate, and extends education opportunities for so many students. She also helped to streamline the state's government and helped create programs and opportunities for Texas' economy to flourish at a time when the country's languished.

It is incumbent upon all of US to continue the legacy started by Ann Richards decades ago. We need to lend voice to the disadvantaged and disenfranchised; give americans a leg-up, not a hand-out; and, create opportunities for all to participate in their government. It is a legacy she was proud of, and one I will not forget. She will be missed by so many, and especially by me.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation honoring such a great lady.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, Ann Richards was a true Texas treasure. We shall miss her

dearly, but her spirit will live on to inspire generations to come. She made a positive difference for Texas and for our nation. In my book she represented the very best of political leadership.

In an era when the good ol' boy system denied opportunities to women and racial minorities, she broke down barriers to ensure that public service would be open to all. In an era when self-important politicians too often took themselves too seriously, she used good humor to keep our feet on the ground, even as we were rolling in laughter.

As Governor of the state she loved, her accomplishments were many, whether in improving education or health care or job opportunities. Yet, like the best of political leaders, her greatest legacy will be having inspired others to be their best, to reach for their dreams, and to make life better for our neighbors.

I have no doubt that after all of us in this House are gone and forgotten, the legacy of Ann Richards will be carrying on through the countless lives of those who were inspired to public service by the touch of this great American.

On a personal note, it was an honor for me to know Ann Richards, especially since she graduated from Baylor University and her parents lived in my hometown of Waco, Texas. It was back in Waco, often outside the limelight of the press, that I admired Ann Richards' deep love and respect for average working families. She understood that they are the backbone of our nation.

Those of us honored to call Ann Richards our friend, and those of us whose lives were touched by her commitment to equality and public service know that there will never be anyone quite like her. That is why we miss her so.

Somehow, I just have to believe that Governor Richards wanted to witness from a heavenly seat the swearing in of Speaker PELOSI as the first woman Speaker of the U.S. House. Or, perhaps the Good Lord just wanted Ann Richards to be by His side when that history was made.

Either way, I have no doubt that heaven is a little funnier place with Ann Richards there and that our nation is a better place because of her time here on earth.

To the Richards family, I want to express a heart-felt "thank you" for sharing your special loved one with all of us for so many years. Our memories of her will inspire us to be better, to do more for years to come.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 42. Anne Richards's devotion to the state of Texas deserves our highest honor and commendation. Her work to promote the rights of women in politics, devotion to equality and her never-failing drive to better the lives of her constituents made her an iconic figure in Texas politics.

Governor Richards began her political career in the 1970's fighting for equality. As an advocate for female politicians, she managed Sarah Weddington's successful bid to become a member of the Texas State House of Representatives. She then joined State Representative Weddington as a legislative assistant in 1974, during this time she also participated in Wilhelmina Delco's campaign to become the first African-American to represent Austin in the state legislature. Not content to rest there, she provided training sessions across the state for female candidates and managers. She would continue this fight for equality for the next 20 years.

In 1982 she was elected to the post of state treasurer becoming the first woman elected to state-wide office in more than 50 years. She devoted herself to the modernization of the state treasury and to earning the greatest possible interest for the state of Texas. According to one estimate, the treasury earned 1.8 billion dollars under her leadership, representing a huge improvement over her predecessor. During her tenure she displayed the incredible wit that made her such a powerful public speaker and one of the most popular figures in Texas politics.

After two terms as state treasurer she was elected Governor of the state of Texas in 1990. What she accomplished in her four years as Governor was nothing short of amazing. Among the achievements for which we are honoring her here today, she revitalized the Texan economy, achieving growth during a period of national economic decline. She revamped the Texas prison system to improve rehabilitation for inmates and to better protect the citizens of Texas by establishing a substance abuse program for inmates, working to expand capacity and reduce prison overpopulation, and reducing the number of violent offenders released. The Texas Lottery was also instituted during Governor Richards' time in office as a means to supplement school financing

Education and school financing were focal points of her Governorship. She worked tirelessly to make school funding more equitable across districts and championed "sitebased management" programs to decentralize school administration.

Of her nearly 3,000 government appointments, 46 percent were female, 15 percent were black, 20 percent were Hispanic and 2 percent were Asian American. I rise today to honor her commitment to diversity, her battle for equality, and her lifetime of service to the state of Texas and the United States of America.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. SHAYS for his accommodation and would urge passage of H. Res. 42.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 42.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PELL GRANT EQUITY ACT OF 2007

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 990) to provide all low-income students with the same opportunity to receive a Pell Grant by eliminating the tuition sensitivity provision in the Pell Grant program, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 990

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pell Grant Equity Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. TUITION SENSITIVITY.

Section 401(b)(3) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a(b)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) This paragraph shall not apply to the determination of a student's basic grant for the 2007–2008 academic year.".

SEC. 3. GUARANTEE AGENCY COLLECTION RETENTION.

Clause (ii) of section 428(c)(6)(A) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1078(c)(6)(A)(ii)) is amended to read as follows:

"(ii) an amount equal to 24 percent of such payments for use in accordance with section 422B, except that—

"(I) beginning October 1, 2003 and ending September 30, 2007, this subparagraph shall be applied by substituting '23 percent' for '24 percent'; and

"(II) beginning October 1, 2007 and ending September 30, 2008, this subparagraph shall be applied by substituting '22 percent' for '24 percent'.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

□ 1600

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 990, the Pell Grant Equity Act of 2007.

This is a bill that is designed to adjust an inequity in the current law that works against the interest of many college students in those States that have low tuition.

At a time when we have seen tuition and fees of public colleges and universities increase significantly, there is a notable exception to that trend, and that is that California community colleges recently decreased their tuition and fees from $26 a credit to $20 a credit. For a student taking 13 credits for two semesters, they save $520 in tuition for the year. This is almost unheard of in a day of skyrocketing college costs. Unfortunately, a provision in the Higher Education Act penalizes students attending low-cost institutions, such as California's community colleges.

The provision known as "tuition sensitivity" reduces the Pell Grant for the neediest of students attending higher education institutions with the lowest tuition. The result is that thousands of low-income students receive a lesser Pell Grant.

The Pell Grant Equity Act eliminates this discriminating provision in the law, ensuring that students receive the full amount of the Pell Grants they are entitled to receive. This is a very important bill for these students and for their families.

This is legislation that my colleague, Mr. MCKEON, the senior Republican on the committee, worked very hard last year to get into the Higher Education Act. It was passed on the floor of the Congress. He worked very hard to bring this matter to the attention of all of the Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, but as you know, that legislation was not passed in the end, and that is why we are here today because this has an immediate impact on those students who find themselves in this situation. And I want to thank him for all of the effort that he made to adjust this inequity in the law over the last couple of years as we have tried to deal with this within the Higher Education Act.

This bill is a 1-year fix, and we do so because we anticipate that this would cover the upcoming academic year. And we would hope to be able to make the permanent changes when we reauthorize the Higher Education Act in this Congress.

According to the Congressional Research Service, our bill will help approximately 96,000 students receive an average of $100 more in a Pell Grant aid. Sometimes that doesn't sound like a lot of money, but in grant aid to these students and these families, this is an important amount of money because it is not just the tuition that is going down, it is other costs continue to go up.

This increase will help make a real difference for these students in meeting not just their tuition costs, but the costs of their books, their supplies, transportation, room and board, and expenses that quickly add up.

We know this is an issue because we have received letters and heard stories from the community colleges, from the students and from their families. It is a situation where you can find two siblings, one at Cal State school and another at a nearby community college. Both students take similar courses, enrolled full-time, live at home, commute to colleges, both have filed Federal financial aid forms and have an expected family contribution of zero. So both qualify for the maximum Pell Grant. Due to the current rules, the sibling attending the community college will receive $402 less, even though the educational costs overall are the same for those two individuals.

That is why we need to pass this legislation today. It has strong bipartisan support. And it will keep the Pell Grant as a strong part of our Federal student aid program targeted to those in the most need.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 990, the Pell Grant Equity Act.

I thank my friend and colleague, Chairman MILLER, for his work on this legislation. I also thank Ranking Member KELLER of the Higher Education Subcommittee and Chairman HINOJOSA for working with us on this measure.

The Pell Grant Equity Act will repeal a Federal rule known as ''tuition sensitivity.'' This arcane rule reduces the annual maximum Pell Grant for students attending institutions with very low tuition charges.

In a time when we are trying to keep the cost of education down, we penalize students that choose to go to a school that is charging less tuition. It seems like we have it really mixed up, and I am glad this bill is coming out to help us change that. Simply put, Mr. Speaker, a student should not be forced to sacrifice grant aid because of their choice of one institution over another.

As Congress and the President work to continue improving student aid programs, it is illogical that certain students who may otherwise be eligible for a maximum Pell Grant won't get it simply because of where they go to school. Moreover, repealing this rule takes away an incentive for some low-cost institutions to raise their tuition in order for their students to become eligible for the maximum Pell award.

The tuition sensitivity rule is estimated to impact between 90,000 and 100,000 students each year, with these students losing hundreds of dollars in grant aid annually, the students that need it the most.

With many California community colleges reducing their cost of attendance this semester, the tuition sensitivity rule is expected to have an even more substantial impact for students in that State if not corrected.

So I am especially pleased, just as I am sure Chairman MILLER is, that this measure will benefit many of those seeking postsecondary education in our home State.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that as much as I support this bill, I wish it could have been the law of the land much sooner. This measure was included in the College Access and Opportunity Act, which the House passed last year to reauthorize the Higher Education Act. Similarly, had House Republicans, or anyone else for that matter, been able to offer this as an amendment to H.R. 5 earlier this year, I would have done so.

As is often the case in Washington, it is better late than never. I am pleased to support this measure which helps students and is fully paid for in accordance with the budget rules.

Again, I thank my colleagues. And I hope we can find more opportunities for bipartisan cooperation on college access down the road.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. KELLER, such time as he may consume.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the ranking member on the Higher Education Committee and a strong supporter of the Pell Grant program to urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Pell Grant Equity Act of 2007.

The rationale for this legislation is pretty simple: It is unfair that 100,000 college students are penalized for attending community colleges with low tuition rates. These students will now be able to use the additional $108 in Pell funding, on average, to pay for legitimate education expenses beyond tuition, such as books and mandatory lab fees in their science classes.

At a time when college tuition is skyrocketing across the Nation, we should praise and not punish those community colleges who are doing their part to keep tuition low and reward those students who are going to those colleges who otherwise wouldn't have a chance at the American Dream of a college education.

I want to praise Chairman MILLER and Chairman HINOJOSA as well as Ranking Member MCKEON for their leadership and moving this legislation along. I think it is a great piece of bipartisan legislation that deserves all of our support, and I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''yes'' on this bill.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank Chairman MILLER for bringing this legislation, for his kind words, and the opportunity to work together, something that will benefit students who are in great need of this extra help.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the first few hours of this session, this Congress took a bipartisan vote to cut interest rates for the neediest students who are borrowing money. Those same group of students, many of them are still eligible for the Pell Grant. This action we take today, again on a bipartisan basis, I think will be very helpful to these students and to their families as, again, they try to put together the resources necessary so that they can begin their advanced education in the higher education system in this case. Hopefully in community colleges, they will continue to try to figure out, along with the State legislatures, how to lower the cost of that college. And this would provide an additional incentive, since they know now that those students will not be punished in a sense because they are going to a lower cost college at that time.

I would like to thank the staff of both committees for all of the work they did on this, for the senior Republican, Mr. KELLER, on the subcommittee, and Mr. MCKEON on the full committee, and to Mr. HINOJOSA, the chairman of the subcommittee, for all of their work. We look forward to a quick passage here and hopefully a speedy passage in the Senate.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, part of our job in Congress is to ensure that every American has the right to a higher education. Unfortunately, a provision in the Higher Education Act makes it difficult for people of low incomes who attend schools with low tuitions to receive the assistance they need.

I rise in strong support of the Pell Grant Equity Act, which provides low-income students

the opportunity to go to college by eliminating the ''tuition sensitivity provision.'' This provision prohibits maximum Pell grant awards to students attending low-tuition institutions of higher education even if their income is low enough to otherwise qualify for the maximum award.

As implemented by the U.S. Department of Education, ''tuition sensitivity'' is intended to reduce the Pell grant for low-income students who attend very low tuition schools as a cost-saving measure. Unfortunately, the students most negatively impacted by this policy are the poorest students who still cannot afford the lower tuition.

As I have been saying throughout my district this past week, education is an investment not an expenditure. We must invest in our students now or be forced to pay more later. We can start this investment by passing the Pell Grant Equity Act, allowing approximately 96,000 of our poorest students to receive the financial assistance they need in the upcoming academic year.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 990—The Pell Grant Equity Act of 2007. This legislation is a simple measure to reduce the real and perceived barriers to a higher education for many low-income families across the United States.

Community colleges and other low-cost institutions offer life-changing educational opportunities for motivated students. Pell grant recipients are by definition motivated.

The Pell grant program works as a contract between the Federal Government and the individual. The Government says, ''we will provide you with the means to get a higher education if you desire to invest in yourself.''

Removing the tuition sensitivity provision of the Higher Education Act will help students cover the full cost of attending college, which is significantly higher than tuition alone.

For over 30 years, Congress has consistently increased funding available to the Pell grant program and increased the maximum grant that each student can receive. Why? Because the program works. Pell grant recipients regularly go on to succeed in jobs with career potential and upward mobility.

Increased access to higher education is an important goal for the Congress because having an educated workforce is essential to our country's future. As former Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan once said to me, ''if our people are educated there isn't a problem we can't solve. If they aren't, there isn't one that we can.'' Eliminating tuition sensitivity from the Pell grant program is a positive step towards making college education available to everyone who wants one, and there isn't a higher goal than that.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 990, which will provide all low-income students with the same opportunity to receive a Pell grant by eliminating the ''tuition sensitivity'' provision in the Pell grant program. The Federal Pell grant is need-based aid that serves as the foundation of a student's financial aid package. In fiscal year 2006, more than 5 million undergraduate students received the Pell grant scholarship, with 74 percent of these recipients having a combined family income below $30,000.

Mr. Speaker, under current law Pell grants are awarded to students based on the difference between the appropriated maximum Pell grant award and the student's expected family contribution, which is a measure of the student's and their family's ability to pay for education expenses.

The ''tuition sensitivity'' provision of the Pell grant comes into effect when the appropriated award is above $2,7000.00. The provision then reduces the Pell grant scholarship, received by the poorest students attending institutions with the lowest tuition. As a result of this provision, two students with the same low-income background and family expenses could be awarded different amounts for the Pell grant although they are both entitled to receive the maximum amount.

Although both students share the same economic hardships, the student attending the college with the lower tuition would receive a smaller Pell grant, thus requiring their expected personal and family expenses to the institution to rise. However, if these same two students attended universities with matching tuition expenses, the award amounts would be equal.

Just because a student attends a school with low tuition, that does not mean that he or she can expend more from their personal and family income. A needy student should receive the same amount regardless of their institution's tuition.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 990, which would provide all low-income students with the same opportunity to receive a Pell grant by eliminating the tuition sensitivity provision in the Pell grant. Every student in our Nation who plans to further their education, whether at our Nation's most expensive or least expensive schools, deserves that opportunity. Our Federal Government has made the provisions to financially assist students, especially those from low-income families, in their quest to attend college and we must ensure that every student has this opportunity.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support for H.R. 990, the Pell Grant Equity Act.

This important piece of legislation would amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide all low-income students with the same opportunity to receive a Pell grant by eliminating the tuition sensitivity provision in the Pell grant program.

Current law prohibits maximum Pell grant awards to students attending low-tuition higher education institutions even if their income is low enough to otherwise qualify for the maximum award.

As the husband of a retired high-school teacher, I have always been a strong advocate for education.

Unfortunately, the high costs of a college education prohibit many low-income students from receiving a higher degree.

Pell grants provide low-income students with their best opportunity to attend college, and we must support financial aid programs like this in order to help as many students as possible succeed and receive a college degree.

Higher education is the best way to ensure our children and grandchildren have a promising future regardless of socio-economic status.

I thank my colleagues for supporting this bill.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join Chairman MILLER and Ranking Members MCKEON and KELLER in cosponsoring the Pell Grant Equity Act. I would like to thank them for their leadership in bringing this bill forward without delay.

Currently low-income students who attend low-cost institutions have their Pell Grants reduced because of the provision called ''tuition sensitivity'' in current law. It is contrary to common sense and our shared goals of providing access to higher education for low-income students to systematically reduce the grant aid for the neediest students who often attend low-cost institutions because they are more affordable.

According to the Congressional Research Service, our action today will benefit 96,000 low-income students and increase their Pell grant by an average of $108. When you are a low-income student, every penny counts and this increase will make a real difference.

The colleges in my congressional district serve some of the lowest income students and families in the Nation. They work very hard to keep tuition low and limit increases to a minimum. This legislation will ensure that their efforts to contain costs are not undone by aid policy that reduces the Pell Grant because the institution charges low tuition.

The Pell Grant Equity Act will immediately lift tuition sensitivity for the upcoming academic year. As we move towards the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, we will make this repeal permanent and put all low-income students on an equal footing in the Pell grant program.

I look forward to continuing this spirit of bipartisanship as we consider the rest of the Higher Education Act and thank my colleagues for treating this issue with the sense of urgency it deserves.

I strongly encourage all my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 990, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''To provide all low-income students with the same opportunity to receive a Pell Grant by suspending the tuition sensitivity provision in the Pell Grant program.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TROJAN FOOTBALL TEAM FOR ITS VICTORY IN THE 2007 ROSE BOWL

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 126) commending the University of Southern California Trojan football team for its victory in the 2007 Rose Bowl.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 126

Whereas the University of Southern California (USC) Trojan football team achieved many historic accomplishments during the 2006 season;

Whereas the USC Trojan football team achieved its fifth consecutive Associated Press (AP) Top 4 finish;

Whereas USC was invited to make an unprecedented fifth consecutive Bowl Championship Series bowl appearance;

Whereas USC won an unprecedented fifth consecutive Pacific-10 Conference championship;

Whereas USC achieved its fifth consecutive season of at least 11 victories, an achievement equaled by only 3 other Division I schools in the history of National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) football;

Whereas USC accomplished these feats while playing the second most difficult schedule in the Nation;

Whereas USC boasts a 33-game winning streak for all home games, as well as a 23-game winning streak for Pac-10 home games;

Whereas USC has maintained a top 10 ranking in the Associated Press College Football Poll for the past 56 editions;

Whereas USC has won 56 of its last 60 games;

Whereas during the 2006 season, USC featured 5 All-American first team players (wide receivers Dwayne Jarrett and Steve Smith, center Ryan Kalil, offensive tackle Sam Baker, and defensive tackle Sedrick Ellis);

Whereas USC head football coach Pete Carroll has the best winning percentage of any current NCAA Division I football coach with at least 5 years of experience;

Whereas the annual Rose Bowl is the oldest of all college bowl games, and its history and prestige have earned it the title ''The Granddaddy of Them All'';

Whereas USC has played in the Rose Bowl on 31 occasions and won 22 times, both records exceeding any other collegiate football program;

Whereas during the 2007 Rose Bowl game, USC featured a second half offensive explosion behind a game record-tying 4 touchdown passes from quarterback John David Booty;

Whereas during the 2007 Rose Bowl game, wide receiver Dwayne Jarrett caught 2 touchdown passes, was named Offensive Most Valuable Player for the game, and became USC's career receptions leader with 11 catches for 205 yards;

Whereas during the 2007 Rose Bowl game, linebacker Brian Cushing made 7 tackles, 4 tackles for losses, 2.5 sacks, and forced a fumble, and he was named the Defensive Most Valuable Player for the game; and

Whereas, under the leadership of USC's 10th president, Steven B. Sample, USC has established itself as a world-class research university, known for its leadership in the fields of communication, media, the sciences, and the arts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the University of Southern California Trojan football team and USC President Steven B. Sample for USC's victory in the 2007 Rose Bowl; and

(2) recognizes the achievements of the players, coaches, students, alumni, and staff who were instrumental in helping the University of Southern California win the Rose Bowl.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each Member would have 5 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. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I want to congratulate the University of Southern California for their victory in the 2007 Rose Bowl.

On New Year's Day, college football fans, student athletes and the Nation were treated to an exceptional college bowl game. And no matter what team you support, it is always a thrill to watch the Rose Bowl.

The University of Southern California made history by appearing in its fifth consecutive Bowl Championship Series game and defeated the Michigan Wolverines by a score of 32–18.

I would like to extend my congratulations to the coaching staff, administration, and most of all to the student athletes and fans for winning the Rose Bowl.

I also want to extend my congratulations to the Michigan Wolverines and their student athletes for a great season. Winning the Rose Bowl has brought national acclaim to a university that already has a rich history as the oldest private research university in the West. USC also lays claim as the birthplace of important Internet technologies and has the only marching band in the United States of America that has earned a platinum record.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I congratulate the University of Southern California for their success in winning the Rose Bowl, and also for their great educational tradition. I urge passage of this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 126. This resolution recognizes the University of Southern California football team for yet another great season, winning the PAC–10 conference as well as their dominating 32–18 victory over the University of Michigan in the granddaddy of them all, the Rose Bowl.

USC has put together one of the best coaching staffs in the country, and this game was proof. Early in the second half, Michigan had made it clear to USC that they could not establish the run. Now, former USC offensive coordinator Lane Kiffin said, ''We're not running the ball for another play.'' And for the next 30 plays USC took to the air, rushing the ball only twice.

The ability of Coach Carroll and his coaching staff to change the game plan mid-game and make personnel adjustments is what separates USC from the rest of the country every year, and led them to their Rose Bowl victory.

Today, when you hear about USC winning the Rose Bowl and finishing the season as the fourth best team in the country, it doesn't sound like too much of an accomplishment, that is until you look at this team and see that they lost two Heisman trophy winners, six key pieces in their offense in the first three rounds of the NFL draft, and lost 11 players overall to the NFL before the season began.

I extend my congratulations to Head Coach Pete Carroll, his coaching staff, and every one of the dedicated players, the fans, and to the University of Southern California.

I am happy to join in honoring this exceptional team and also of its accomplishments and wish all involved continued success.

I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as she might consume to the gentlelady from California, Representative DIANE WATSON.

□ 1615

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today to commend the University of Southern California, located in my district, Trojan football team for its victory in the 2007 Rose Bowl. The Trojans' Rose Bowl victory puts an exclamation mark on a successful 2006–2007 season as well as years of unparalleled Trojan football excellence. Let me cite just a few examples of the football team's long list of accomplishments:

The USC Trojan football team achieved its fifth consecutive AP top 4 finish. Its appearance in the 2007 Rose Bowl marked an unprecedented fifth consecutive Bowl Championship Series bid. The team won an unprecedented fifth consecutive PAC-10 Conference championship. It maintained a top 10 ranking in the AP College Football Poll for the past 56 editions. And the football team won 56 of its last 60 games.

It is noteworthy that the USC Trojan football team accomplished these feats while playing the second most difficult schedule in the Nation.

The victory of the USC Trojan football team also exemplifies the excellence of the University of Southern California as not only an athletic powerhouse but also an academic institution of higher learning. USC has established itself as a leader in the fields of communications, media, the sciences, as well as the arts. It is home to one of the best, if not the best, schools of film in the United States. It also boasts a world-renowned school of music.

USC is the oldest private research university in the West and is a critical part of the 33rd Congressional District of California. It is home to 33,000 students, 3,100 faculty, and 7,900 employees. It is the largest private employer in the City of Los Angeles. Its physicians serve more than 1 million patients a year. Its Educational Opportunity Programs Center has provided academic enrichment and support services to thousands of neighborhood residents.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I commend both the University of Southern California's football team for its victory in the 2007 Rose Bowl; its coach, Pete Carroll; its athletic director, Mike Garrett; as well as the coaches, students, alumni, and staff who were instrumental in USC's Rose Bowl victory.

And I just need to add this: I want to also commend the University of Southern California and its president, Steven B. Sample, for taking in 130 students from New Orleans when their university had flooded. And they not only allowed them to come there and admitted them, but they gave them room and board at a time of great need.

So USC and its president have played a major role in the continuous success of the University of Southern California; the City of Los Angeles; and the people of the Golden State, California.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that Ms. WATSON talked about all the other accomplishments of SC while I just talked about the football team. The football team was great, but it is nice to see that they are doing all of these other wonderful things, and I commend them for it. I urge our colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the ranking member. It does sound like Ms. WATSON is quite proud of the University of Southern California. As a matter of fact, I want to take this opportunity also to thank her and the University of Southern California for hosting one of our State of the African American Male conferences that I had the opportunity to attend with her.

It is indeed a great institution, not only in terms of its athletic prowess but also in terms of its scholarship and academic tradition. I urge support for this resolution.

Mrs. BONO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 126, as authored by my fellow Californian, Mrs. WATSON.

As an alumnus of the University of Southern California, I've had the pleasure of watching our football teams compete against some of the best teams in the country over the years. The recent record of success is undeniable, which is why I'm happy to offer my support of my alma matter and this Resolution.

This year's Rose Bowl included USC playing against a University of Michigan football team that was nationally ranked at number three in the country. The Wolverines, though laden with their own star-power, were simply unable to match the combined efforts of the Trojans on New Year's Day in January.

The players on offense for USC displayed one reason why the Trojans were ranked so highly at the end of the season, even while playing what was one of the most difficult schedules of any collegiate team in the country. Our offense was led by the tandem of John Booty and Dwayne Jarrett, who helped the Trojans to a second-half burst that was exciting for any USC supporter, young or old.

But they were not the only reason for an impressive 32–18 victory; the Trojans defense held the University of Michigan offense to just 14 yards of total rushing, which is no simple feat given the running backs for the Wolverines.

The Trojans' win in January was part of a recent string of impressive marks, from winning a fifth consecutive Pac-10 Conference Championship to the team winning 56 of its last 60 games. Winning the 2007 Rose Bowl was an excellent way to end the team's season and should remain a motivating factor when this fall rolls around.

I'm hopeful all of our Members, and yes, even those who attended the University of Michigan, can offer their support of today's resolution that commends USC on its victory. And here's to hoping we can support a similar such Resolution next year.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 126.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING THE MOUNT UNION COLLEGE PURPLE RAIDERS FOR WINNING THE 2006 NCAA DIVISION III FOOTBALL NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 103) congratulating the Mount Union College Purple Raiders for winning the 2006 NCAA Division III Football National Championship.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 103

Whereas on December 16, 2006, the Mount Union College Purple Raiders of Alliance, Ohio, won the 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division III Football National Championship by defeating the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater Warhawks by a score of 35–16 in the Amos Alonzo Stagg Bowl;

Whereas while there are currently 231 schools playing NCAA Division III college football, during the last 14 years the Purple Raiders have won an unprecedented 9 NCAA Division III Football National Championships;

Whereas Mount Union College currently has the second longest winning streak in all of college football with 23 consecutive victories;

Whereas the Purple Raiders have won 62 consecutive games on the road;

Whereas the Purple Raiders hold college football's two longest winning streaks—55 consecutive games won from 2000 to 2003 and 54 consecutive wins from 1996 to 1999;

Whereas in winning the 2006 National Championship, Mount Union College Football Head Coach Larry Kehres completed his 21st season as head coach of the Purple Raiders;

Whereas Coach Kehres has compiled a phenomenal 246–20–3 record at Mount Union College and the best career winning percentage (.920) for a head coach—at any division level—in the history of college football;

Whereas Coach Kehres has led the Purple Raiders to all 9 of their National Championships, 17 Ohio Athletic Conference titles, and 15 undefeated regular seasons;

Whereas Coach Kehres was named the American Football Coaches Association Division III Coach of the Year for a record eighth time in 2006;

Whereas the Purple Raiders finished the 2006 season ranked first nationally in Division III football in total offense, first in scoring, first in passing efficiency, second in rushing, second in total team defense, second in scoring defense, second in rush defense, and eighth in pass efficiency defense; and

Whereas Mount Union College graduates approximately 98 percent of the student-athletes who remain in the football program for a full four years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the Mount Union College Purple Raiders for winning the 2006 NCAA Division III Football National Championship; and

(2) recognizes all the players, coaches, and support staff who were instrumental in this achievement.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each Member would 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. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate another college for their accomplishments. Mount Union College, located in Alliance, Ohio, is not only known as one of the top liberal arts colleges in the Midwest but also more recently for winning the NCAA Division III Football National Championship.

On December 16 of last year, the Mount Union College Purple Raiders captured their ninth NCAA Division III Football National Championship by defeating the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater Warhawks.

We know that such accomplishments are achieved through a group effort. I applaud the Purple Raiders coaching staff; the administration; student athletes; and, of course, the fans for a championship season.

I also want to extend my congratulations to the Wisconsin-Whitewater Warhawks for a well-played game and a successful season.

The Purple Raiders, whose purple parrot mascot is well known in northeastern Ohio, have achieved some notable athletic accomplishments, including nine national championships in the past 14 years, along with two of the longest winning streaks in college football.

Mr. Speaker, once again I commend and congratulate Mount Union College

for their dedication and success, not only for their athletic prowess but also for their academic achievement and academic reputation.

I urge support for this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 103. This resolution congratulates the Mount Union College Purple Raiders for winning the 2006 NCAA Division III Football National Championship.

The Purple Raiders captured the title by defeating the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater Warhawks 35–16 in the Amos Alonzo Stagg Bowl on December 16 in front of 6,051 faithful fans.

Since 1990, and under the tutelage of Head Coach Larry Kehres, the Raiders have made 16 playoff appearances while posting college football's most wins and best winning percentage. Coach Kehres completed his 21st year at the helm of the Purple Raiders football fortunes in 2006 and has built one of the most successful programs in all of college football. His teams have won 17 Ohio Athletic Conference Championships while posting 15 undefeated regular seasons and have won nine Division III National Championships in the last 14 years. Along the way, Coach Kehres has compiled a phenomenal 246–20–3 record and the best career winning percentage for a head coach, at any division level, in the history of college football. For his efforts, Kehres has been named the AFCA Division III National Coach of the Year eight times.

I extend my congratulations to Head Coach Larry Kehres, all of the hard-working players, the fans, and to Mount Union College. I am happy to join my good friend and colleague Representative REGULA in honoring this exceptional team and all of its accomplishments and wish all involved continued success.

I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield at this time such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 103, congratulating the Mount Union College Purple Raiders on their 2006 Division III Football National Championship.

As you know, Ohio is quite a football State; and while most people think of teams like Ohio State when they think of Ohio football, the team with the most amazing winning record is actually Mount Union College and its Purple Raiders. In December they beat the Wisconsin-Whitewater Warhawks in the Amos Alonzo Stagg Bowl.

The Purple Raiders from Mount Union College in Alliance have been a perpetually dominant team under the reign of Head Coach Larry Kehres and staff, winning an astounding nine NCAA Division III Football Championships. The players who have come and gone through the Mount Union football program should also be honored for their superior work ethic on the football field and in the classroom. As an alumnus of Mount Union College, I take special pride that the students that remain in the football program all 4 years have an incredible 98 percent graduation rate. That is astounding, I think, everything considered in what we hear and so on. Such phenomenal scholastic and athletic achievement should not go unnoticed. These graduation rates are impressive for any higher education institution and are especially remarkable for college athletes.

The most recent NCAA victory comes as no surprise to those who have followed the Purple Raiders over the past two decades. They have had the two longest winning streaks in all of college football, with 54 consecutive victories from 1996 to 1999 and 55 victories from 2000 to 2003. The Purple Raiders also currently hold the second longest winning streak in all of college football, with 23 consecutive victories. With winning streaks like these, it is no shock that Larry Kehres has the best career winning percentage in any division level of college football ever, with a remarkable record of 246 wins, 20 losses, and 3 ties. That is a remarkable record.

Along with such incredible regular season records, the Purple Raiders have also won nine NCAA Division III championships, 17 Ohio Athletic Conference titles to go along with 15 perfect seasons. These statistics have all been achieved under the excellent coaching of Larry Kehres. His record has earned him the American Football Coaches Association Division III Coach of the Year a record eight times. Coach Kehres can certainly take great pride in the dexterity and proficiency he has instilled in the young athletes that have walked the halls of Mount Union College.

This year's players have yet again risen to the occasion and proved to be the best of Division III. The Purple Raiders finished first nationally in Division III football in total offense and second in total defense, which can only give a slight indication as to the work ethic of this team. The national title they achieved in 2006 was well earned by these athletes, coaches, and staff.

I would like to congratulate Mount Union College President Richard Giese; Coach Larry Kehres; his coaches; the faculty and staff; as well as the terrific and enthusiastic fans, and we have them, but especially all of the players for yet another undefeated year and national championship.

□ 1630

Mr. Speaker, 2006 was a great season, and I am sure it will not be the last for these Purple Raiders. As the great coach Vince Lombardi once said, ''Being a champion means you are willing to go longer, work harder, and give more than anyone else.'' The current Purple Raiders team and those of prior seasons, along with Coach Kehres, have proven the wisdom of this statement time and time again.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be here to sing the praises of the Purple Raiders. When I heard Mr. REGULA talk about all of their accomplishments and then the 98 percent graduation rate, that really is impressive. I would like to meet Coach Kehres one day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Mr. REGULA for having such an outstanding institution in his district to represent. When you consider all of the football games that they have won, as well as the graduation rate and the kind of academics that they display, he has to indeed be proud. I am proud for him.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 103.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 990, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF ARTERIAL ROAD IN ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1129) to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of an arterial road in St. Louis County, Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1129

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

SECTION 1. PROJECT DEFINED.

In this Act, the term ''project'' means only the portion of St. Louis County, Missouri,

arterial road 1151 that is deed-restricted property, which specifically applies to approximately 0.3 acres and 540 lineal feet and is identified as the ''FEMA'' route in the document entitled ''Lemay Connector Road for Long-Term Recovery, Recreational Enhancements, & Community, & Economic Development'', dated June 1, 2006, on file with the St. Louis County department of highways and traffic.

SEC. 2. APPLICABLITY OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAW.

The St. Louis County arterial road 1151, known as the ''Lemay Connector Road'' in St. Louis City and County, Missouri, may be constructed, operated, and maintained over the deed-restricted property described in section 1, notwithstanding section 404(b)(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c) or Public Law 103–211 and any easement or other similar restriction pursuant to those Federal laws on the development of property that requires the property be maintained for open space, recreation, or wetland management.

SEC. 3. NO DETRIMENTAL EFFECT ON FLOOD PLAIN.

For the project, St. Louis County, Missouri, shall ensure that the project is constructed, operated, and maintained in such a manner that would not cause any future additional flood damage that would not have occurred without the project. Prior to constructing the project, St. Louis County or its assignee must identify and agree to restrict a nearby parcel of land of equal or greater size to the deed restricted land used for the project so that such parcel is maintained for open space, recreation, or wetland management.

SEC. 4. LIABILITY FOR FLOOD DAMAGE.

The Federal Government shall not be liable for future flood damage that is caused by the project. St. Louis County, Missouri, or its assignee shall be liable for any future flood damage that is caused by the project.

SEC. 5. NO FUTURE DISASTER ASSISTANCE.

The deed-restricted property described in section 1 is not eligible for any future disaster assistance from any other Federal source.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 1129.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us would authorize St. Louis County, Missouri, to build a road over three-tenths of an acre of deed-restricted property. The road that they would build will lead to a development project along the Mississippi River adjacent to St. Louis.

In the aftermath of the 1993 Mississippi River flood, which many of us can vividly remember, and I recall so much part of that tragedy our then majority leader, Mr. Gephardt, passing sandbags down along the riverfront to halt the onslaught of the river, it was a very compelling moment in flood history in America. St. Louis was particularly hard hit.

FEMA, under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, acquired property, took it out of development and protected the floodplain from development for uses that would be inconsistent with the need to protect the area against flood.

FEMA requires that properties purchased under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program be maintained in perpetuity for uses consistent with open space, recreation or wetlands management. The law generally does not allow new structures to be built on such property, but exceptions are permitted under existing law, including projects preapproved in writing by the director of FEMA. FEMA has promulgated regulations to spell out those restrictions.

The property which is the subject of this legislation, was not purchased with hazard mitigation funds, but with Community Development Block Grant funds. But those funds were subjected to the same FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program easement restrictions for open space.

All parties tried in the current situation to find an exception in the historic application of FEMA law and regulation, but the project didn't fit any of the historic examples or exceptions. So the State and the county both are seeking a waiver of the easement so that both entities can proceed with construction of a road that will create access to a complex development project of housing, retail, commercial space and open and recreational space.

Now, this project itself is not within nor will it be built anywhere on restricted property, property restricted by FEMA under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program funds. And to be sure that there are no escape clauses or escape hatches, if you will, the bill includes requirements to ensure that the road authorized to be developed will not increase the danger of flooding and that the road will not subject the Federal Government to any additional exposure or liability.

The bill requires the county in which the road will be constructed, and that is St. Louis County, Missouri, we have one also in Minnesota, to ensure that the construction, operation and maintenance of the road will not cause any future additional flood damage that would not have occurred without the project. It is very important to spell those conditions out.

The bill also requires the county or its assignee to mitigate the project by adding to the flood protection area a nearby parcel of land of equal or greater size to the deed-restricted land used for the road.

Further, the bill provides that the Federal Government shall not be liable for future flood damage that may be caused by the project and that the county will be liable for such damage.

The bill also provides that the deed restricted property on which the road will be built, and only the road, will not be eligible for any future disaster assistance from any other Federal source.

I think with those very precise, very carefully crafted constraints, we can and should approve this legislation to allow the other development to go forward, a development that is not within the hazard area.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, H.R. 1129, introduced by Representative RUSS CARNAHAN of Missouri, provides for the construction, operation and maintenance of an arterial road in St. Louis County, Missouri, over deed-restricted property and requires that county to restrict a nearby parcel of land for open space, recreation or wetland management. The bill allows construction of a surface road across property purchased with Federal funds.

Following the 1993 Midwest floods, this property was purchased for the purpose of clearing the floodplain of homes to prevent future flood losses. The bill requires St. Louis County to ensure that this project will not cause future flood damage. If there is flood damage caused by this project, the bill assigns liability to St. Louis County. This property will remain permanently ineligible for Federal disaster assistance. The Federal interest in reducing Federal disaster costs remains protected.

This project is not setting precedent. In the past, exceptions have been made to allow for road and public works development on deed restricted properties.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my great appreciation to the gentleman from Wisconsin and to the staff on the Republican side for their splendid cooperation throughout the crafting of this legislation. It took a great deal of time and effort to get to this point and it was a bipartisan initiative. We very much appreciate their consideration.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of our committee, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN), the author of the legislation, and within whose district this project and development will occur. I also want to express my appreciation and perhaps admiration for his persistence in following through on this very difficult, complex initiative. The gentleman has certainly worked hard on behalf of his constituency.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Chairman OBERSTAR, thank you and Ranking Member MICA and the gentleman from Wisconsin here today for working with me

to move this important legislation along. Also, special thanks to your staff and committee staff on both sides that have been helpful in moving this legislation. On behalf of myself and the citizens the Third District in Missouri, I want to thank them all.

This bill, H.R. 1129, means a great deal to the congressional district I represent in Lemay, St. Louis County, Missouri. It will allow the construction, maintenance and operation of a road to a community in South St. Louis County hard hit by the great flood of 1993. This Lemay Connector Road, as it is called, is vital to the long-term recovery of that community. It will bring badly needed jobs and tax revenues to the area, support the cleanup of brownfields sites, and create new parks and recreational opportunities.

The transformation taking place in this area is the type communities dream about, turning environmentally contaminated idle property into hundreds of millions of dollars in economic development, thousands of new jobs, and wonderful recreational opportunities alongside a national treasure, the Mississippi River.

In 1993, Lemay, Missouri, just south of St. Louis, was hard hit by the flood of 1993. In the aftermath, Community Development Block Grant funds were used to acquire certain parcels of land which carried with them FEMA deed restrictions. St. Louis County has since acquired the land, but deed restrictions still apply.

Years ago, this area was home to businesses providing thousands of jobs for this community. Unfortunately, byproducts heavily polluted the area, and since the closure of businesses, four specific sites, including the former National Lead Site, which closed in 1978, the Carondolet Coke site, which closed in 1992, the Stupp Brothers site, which closed in 1998, and the National Imaging and Mapping Agency site, closed in 1994, have since been designated as brownfields. Thankfully, clean up and redevelopment of the land will come to fruition as the Lemay connector road is built.

Since 1993, the Federal Government has invested more than $33 million in South St. Louis City and County region for the purpose of revitalizing these communities. In addition, the State and local community have come together to plan the redevelopment of this area. Plans include new businesses, which will generate thousands of new jobs, a bandshell, ice skating rink, bowling alley, multi-screen movie complex, a new county park with soccer and baseball fields. The proposed Lemay connector road will provide access to all this, the four abandoned brownfield sites, and complete the link to the Great Rivers Greenway regional ring of trails.

In 2003, the Missouri Department of Transportation conducted a federally funded survey with regard to the area and decided it was one of the top priorities for the region.

□ 1645

The planned road is authorized by this legislation and has been identified by means of an environmental assessment as the environmentally preferred route.

The road is considered safe by the Missouri Department of Transportation, has been endorsed by its officials, and also the local police and fire departments, because it will enable city and county to reduce first responder times. Most importantly, the planned road has the unwavering support of community leaders.

In addition to the public access benefits already stated, the road will include dedicated bicycle paths and sidewalks, and provide improved access to schools, community institutions and parks, and I want to name a few in the area: Hancock Place School District, Notre Dame High School, Metropolitan Sewer District, St. Louis Enterprise Center in South County, Lemay Child and Family Center, Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery, and a park and planned military history complex. In addition, park areas include the Black Forest Park, Lemay Park, and the Great Rivers regional system of interconnected parks and trails.

The bill costs the Federal Government nothing. The cost of the road will be incurred by the county in cooperation with local developers. This legislation has broad bipartisan support in Missouri and here in the Congress among our congressional delegation, including my Missouri colleague on the Transportation Committee, Mr. GRAVES. The legislation specifically authorizes the Lemay connective road to be built over deed-restricted parcels of land.

In an attempt to avoid the same disastrous consequences of the flood of 1993, the bill requires the county to take appropriate flood mitigation efforts upon constructing the road. It is the intent of Congress that prior to constructing the road, adjacent or nearby land of approximately equal size and value of the easement necessary to build the road, about 0.3 acres, will be designated for open space, recreational use, or wetlands management.

Finally, consistent with existing law, the Federal Government will not be liable for any flooding caused by the construction, maintenance and operation of the road.

My colleagues, this is a good bill that will have remarkably positive impacts on the Lemay community in Missouri. I urge your support and passage of H.R. 1129.

I want to conclude by giving special thanks to our St. Louis County executive, Charlie Dooley, and his staff in St. Louis County, and all those working with the county for their impressive work on this project.

I can't wait to travel on the new Lemay connector road, to take a tour of the newly opened businesses, community center, and take a bike ride along the Great Rivers Greenway.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I certainly look forward to doing a bike ride along that area, if it is a long enough road, and look forward to the project moving forward with the construction of this road and the development and the investment and the job creation that the gentleman has cited.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1129.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ST. JOSEPH MEMORIAL HALL CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 494) to provide for the conditional conveyance of any interest retained by the United States in St. Joseph Memorial Hall in St. Joseph, Michigan, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 494

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

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF RETAINED INTEREST IN ST. JOSEPH MEMORIAL HALL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the terms and conditions of subsection (c), the Administrator of General Services shall convey to the city of St. Joseph, Michigan, by quitclaim deed, any interest retained by the United States in St. Joseph Memorial Hall.

(b) ST. JOSEPH MEMORIAL HALL DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''St. Joseph Memorial Hall'' means the property subject to a conveyance from the Secretary of Commerce to the city of St. Joseph, Michigan, by quitclaim deed dated May 9, 1936, recorded in Liber 310, at page 404, in the Register of Deeds for Berrien County, Michigan.

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under subsection (a) shall be subject to the following terms and conditions:

(1) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a), the city of St. Joseph, Michigan, shall pay $10,000 to the United States.

(2) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Administrator may require such additional terms and conditions for the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Administrator considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 494.

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

There was no objection.

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

This bill authorizes conditional conveyance of any interest retained by the United States in St. Joseph Memorial Hall in St. Joseph, Michigan, to the city of St. Joseph, Michigan. In the 109th Congress, an identical bill was introduced, moved through committee, and passed the House as H.R. 4700. Unfortunately, no action was taken on that bill by the other body.

The bill would complete a land transfer between the Federal Government and the city of St. Joseph, Michigan, that is very long standing. It goes back to 1935. The city in that year received a nonhistoric building and property with a restriction limiting use of the property to a public park. In 1954, the public use restriction was lifted on the parcel just north of the building through Public Act 348.

H.R. 494, the bill presently before us and its predecessor in the last Congress, conveys to the city of St. Joseph any interest in St. Joseph Hall that is retained by the United States. This legislation has the effect of removing the restriction requiring use of the property for a park.

City officials have asked for this transfer in order to permit the city to complete a redevelopment plan for the downtown that would utilize this parcel of land and the building. The city is further prepared to pay $10,000 to the General Services Administration for the transfer.

This legislation has been advocated by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) who has been very persevering in pursuit of this legislation. I have come to know the gentleman from Michigan very well personally through our work on Great Lakes issues and on the U.S.-Canada Interparliamentary Group in which we have both participated. He is very earnest about this project, and has been a very effective advocate for it. I am hopeful that with our action again in this body that we will be able to persuade the other body to move forthwith on the legislation and get it enacted.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, introduced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) on January 16, 2007, conveys the final interest retained by the United States in St. Joseph Memorial Hall in St. Joseph, Michigan.

St. Joseph, Michigan, is in the process of redeveloping an area of town that will link downtown with the beautiful lakefront district. Removing the deed restriction will allow St. Joseph to create a recreational, educational, and cultural district that benefits the entire community.

This redevelopment will make the city a more attractive place to work, live and play while improving the local economy.

H.R. 494 will allow St. Joseph Memorial Hall to be incorporated into these redevelopment plans. Under the current restriction, redevelopment of the area may be impeded by a deed restriction placed on the property by the Federal Government more than 70 years ago. The deed restriction on Memorial Hall has remained despite the fact that similar deed restrictions in the city have been lifted. If not lifted, limitations on this tiny parcel of land located in the center of the redevelopment will significantly jeopardize the city's plan.

The bill before us is a commonsense solution that will allow the city of St. Joseph to proceed with redevelopment. In the 109th Congress, the House recognized this as a sensible, simple solution and passed the same language in H.R. 4700. I support this measure, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 494, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF AMERICAN HEART MONTH

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 52) supporting the goals and ideals of American Heart Month.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 52

Whereas heart disease affects adult men and women of every age and race in the United States;

Whereas heart disease continues to be the leading cause of death in the United States;

Whereas an estimated 79 million adult Americans, nearly one in every 3, have 1 or more types of heart disease, including high blood pressure, coronary heart disease, congestive heart failure, stroke, and congenital heart defects;

Whereas extensive clinical and statistical studies have identified major and contributing factors that increase the risk of heart disease;

Whereas these studies have identified the following as major risk factors that cannot be changed: age (the risk of developing heart disease gradually increases as people age; advanced age significantly increases the risk); gender (men have greater risk of developing heart disease than women); and heredity (children of parents with heart disease are more likely to develop it themselves; African Americans have more severe high blood pressure than Caucasians and therefore are at higher risk; the risk is also higher among Latina Americans, some Asian Americans, and Native Americans and other indigenous populations);

Whereas these studies have identified the following as major risk factors that Americans can modify, treat or control by changing their lifestyle or seeking appropriate medical treatment: high blood pressure, high blood cholesterol, smoking tobacco products and exposure to tobacco smoke, physical inactivity, obesity, and diabetes mellitus;

Whereas these studies have identified the following as contributing risk factors that Americans can also take action to modify, treat or control by changing their lifestyle or seeking appropriate medical treatment: individual response to stress, excessive consumption of alcoholic beverages, use of certain illegal drugs, and hormone replacement therapy;

Whereas more than 72 million adult Americans have high blood pressure;

Whereas more than 36.6 million Americans have cholesterol levels of 240 mg/dL or higher, the level at which it becomes a major risk factor;

Whereas an estimated 46 million Americans put themselves at risk for heart disease every day by smoking cigarettes;

Whereas data released by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shows that more than 60 percent of American adults do not get enough physical activity, and more than 25 percent are not physically active at all;

Whereas 66 percent of adult Americans are overweight or obese;

Whereas 20 million adult Americans have diabetes and 65 percent of those so afflicted will die of some form of heart disease;

Whereas the American Heart Association projects that in 2007 1.2 million Americans will have a first or recurrent heart attack and 452,000 of these people will die as a result;

Whereas in 2007 approximately 700,000 Americans will suffer a new or recurrent stroke and 150,000 of these people will die as a result;

Whereas advances in medical research have significantly improved our capacity to fight heart disease by providing greater knowledge about its causes, innovative diagnostic tools to detect the disease, and new and improved treatments that help people survive and recover from this disease;

Whereas the Congress by Joint Resolution approved on December 30, 1963, (77 Stat. 843; 36 U.S.C. 101) has requested that the President issue an annual proclamation designating February as ''American Heart Month''; and

Whereas every year since 1964 the President has issued a proclamation designating the month February as ''American Heart Month'': Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) supports the goals and ideals of American Heart Month;

(2) invites the chief executive officers of the States, territories, and possessions of the United States to issue proclamations designating American Heart Month and recognizing the goals and ideals of American Heart Month;

(3) commends the efforts of States, territories and possessions of the United States, localities, non-profit organizations, businesses, and other entities, and the people of the United States who support the goals and ideals of American Heart Month;

(4) recognizes and reaffirms our Nation's commitment to fighting heart disease by promoting awareness about its causes, risks, and prevention and by promoting new education programs, supporting research, and expanding access to medical treatment;

(5) recognizes all Americans battling heart disease, expresses gratitude to their family members and friends who are a source of love

and encouragement to them as they combat this disease, and salutes the health care professionals and medical researchers who provide assistance to those so afflicted and continue to work to find cures and improve treatments; and

(6) encourages each and every American to take to heart the four simple healthy life, healthy heart goals identified by the HealthierUS Initiative of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services: exercise regularly and maintain a healthy weight; develop good eating habits; avoid tobacco products, drugs and excessive alcohol; and have regular medical checkups to take advantage of screenings that can detect heart-disease related problems early.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 52 supporting the goals and ideals of American Heart Month. February is American Heart Month, and each year since 1963 Congress has charged the President to claim February American Heart Month.

The goal of American Heart Month is to raise funds, conduct research, and promote education about heart disease and stroke.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, heart disease is the leading cause of death in the United States and the major cause of disability. The most common heart disease in the U.S. is coronary heart disease, which often first appears as a heart attack. Almost 1.2 million people in the U.S. will have a heart attack and about 700,000 people die of heart disease annually.

Each of us should continue to take steps to prevent and control factors that put us at greater risk. Prevention measures certainly help to reduce the risks for heart disease and its effects. Additionally, knowing the signs and symptoms of heart attack are crucial to the most positive outcomes after having a heart attack. Recognizing and responding quickly to symptoms and receiving appropriate care can limit heart damage. People who have survived a heart attack can also work to reduce their risk of another heart attack or a stroke in the future. Research has shown a healthy diet and life style are the best weapons you have to fight heart disease.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for her work on this issue. I certainly urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 52.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 52, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of American Heart Month. I commend Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD for her efforts in bringing this resolution to the floor.

Beginning in 1964, the President has issued a proclamation every year designating the month of February as American Heart Month. It is important to recognize the need for greater heart health. Heart disease is the leading cause of death in America. This year alone, over 1.2 million Americans are expected to experience a heart attack. American Heart Month renews the need to recognize and respond to symptoms of heart damage.

Great work is being done by the American Heart Association to reach out into communities and help provide instructional programs on heart disease. It is important to have policies in place that ensure access to screening, referral, and counseling services for stroke and heart disease risk factors.

I believe Congress should continue to support the goals of American Heart Month. This resolution is important in that it continues to encourage Americans to take a healthy approach to living and protecting their hearts.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me on this important issue.

On December 30, 1963, Congress requested that the President issue an annual proclamation designating February as American Heart Month. House Concurrent Resolution 52, supporting the goals and ideals of American Heart Month, reaffirms the Federal Government's commitment to fighting heart disease, recognizes Americans struggling with this illness, and encourages Americans to take preventive measures to protect themselves from heart disease.

□ 1700

I want to recognize the sponsor of this resolution, Representative JUANITA MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and thank her for her leadership on this and other critical health issues.

Over 79 million, or one in three, American adults have cardiovascular disease, including high blood pressure, coronary heart disease, heart failure, stroke and congenital cardiovascular defects.

The lifetime risk for cardiovascular disease for an individual aged 40 is two in three of men, and over one in two for women.

Cardiovascular disease was the underlying cause of death for well over a third of all the 2.4 million deaths in the United States in 2004. Cardiovascular disease accounts for more deaths than any other single cause of death in the United States. Nearly 2,400 Americans die of cardiovascular disease each day, an average of one death each 36 seconds.

The estimated direct and indirect costs of cardiovascular disease in 2007 are $431.8 billion. Heart disease is a significant factor in driving up medical costs in the United States. About two-thirds of unexpected cardiac deaths occur without prior recognition of cardiac disease.

This is an important point to underscore, and it highlights the need for American Heart Month. Public education can help raise awareness, encourage preventive measures, discourage unhealthy behaviors and persuade more Americans to get regular medical exams. By doing so, we will be able to reduce the incidences of heart disease.

We can lower those numbers that I have just mentioned, but we can also improve and extend the lives of real people, our family members, friends and neighbors. That is what American Heart Month is all about.

We know the risk factors that lead to heart disease: high blood pressure, high blood cholesterol, tobacco use, physical inactivity, unhealthy diet, obesity and diabetes.

Cigarette smoking results in a two- to threefold increased risk of dying from coronary heart disease.

We also know the way to manage risk and prevent heart disease: regular exercise and maintaining a healthy weight; healthy eating habits; avoidance of tobacco, drugs and excessive alcohol; getting regular checkups to be screened for signs of heart disease risk.

American Heart Month is particularly important in getting the word out to those who are disproportionately affected by heart disease and who too often fail to receive the treatment they need. Women and minorities may have atypical symptoms when suffering a heart attack or angina, and if they are sent home undiagnosed, they are about twice as likely to die from these symptoms as those who are admitted.

Heart disease is the number one killer of women in this country, claiming over 349,000 American women each year. Raising awareness and improving treatment and screening can save many lives.

Forty-two percent of women who have heart attacks die within 1 year, compared with 24 percent of men. This may be because, on average, women are older than men when they have a heart attack. It also may be because heart disease is not typically diagnosed as or treated as aggressively as that in men.

Cardiovascular disease, including heart disease, hypertension, and stroke, is the number one killer of women in the United States. Experts estimate that one in two will die of heart disease or stroke, compared with one in 25 of women who will die of breast cancer.

Existing heart disease is undiagnosed in half of women who have a first heart attack.

Management of chest pains differ by sex and race. Men are more likely than women to receive definitive diagnoses of angina as opposed to vague chest pain. Women and blacks typically receive fewer cardiovascular medications than men and whites.

Lack of studies on women limits usefulness of research on coronary heart disease. Although CHD causes more than 250,000 deaths in women each year, much of the research on CHD in the last 20 years has either excluded women or included very few women. As a result, many of the tests and therapies used to treat women for CHD are based on studies conducted predominantly in men and may not be as effective in women.

Again, I want to thank Representative MILLENDER-MCDONALD for her leadership, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 52.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 52.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. PALLONE. 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.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NEED FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH INTO HYDROCEPHALUS

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 74) expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the need for additional research into the chronic neurological condition hydrocephalus, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 74

Whereas hydrocephalus is a serious neurological condition, characterized by the abnormal buildup of cerebrospinal fluids in the ventricles of the brain;

Whereas there is no known cure for hydrocephalus;

Whereas hydrocephalus affects an estimated one million Americans;

Whereas 1 or 2 in every 1000 babies are born with hydrocephalus;

Whereas over 375,000 older Americans have hydrocephalus, which often goes undetected or is misdiagnosed as dementia, Alzheimer's disease, or Parkinson's disease;

Whereas with appropriate diagnosis and treatment, people with hydrocephalus are able to live full and productive lives;

Whereas the standard treatment for hydrocephalus was developed in 1952, and carries multiple risks including shunt failure, infection, and overdrainage;

Whereas there are fewer than 10 centers in the United States specializing in the treatment of adults with normal pressure hydrocephalus;

Whereas each year, the people of the United States spend in excess of $1 billion to treat hydrocephalus;

Whereas a September 2005 conference sponsored by 7 institutes of the National Institutes of Health—''Hydrocephalus: Myths, New Facts, Clear Directions''—resulted in efforts to initiate new, collaborative research and treatment efforts; and

Whereas the Hydrocephalus Association is one of the Nation's oldest and largest patient and research advocacy and support networks for individuals suffering from hydrocephalus: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) the Congress commends the Director of the National Institutes of Health for working with leading scientists and researchers to organize the first-ever National Institutes of Health conference on hydrocephalus; and

(2) it is the sense of the Congress that—

(A) the Director of the National Institutes of Health should continue the current collaboration with respect to hydrocephalus among the National Eye Institute; the National Human Genome Research Institute; the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering; the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke; the National Institute on Aging; and the Office of Rare Diseases;

(B) further research into the epidemiology, pathophysiology, disease burden, and improved treatment of hydrocephalus should be conducted or supported; and

(C) public awareness and professional education regarding hydrocephalus should increase through partnerships between the Federal Government and patient advocacy organizations, such as the Hydrocephalus Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill that we are considering.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 74, expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the need for additional research into the chronic neurological condition hydrocephalus.

Hydrocephalus simply means water on the brain. The term ''hydrocephalus'' defines a condition characterized by an excessive accumulation of fluid in the brain. This buildup of fluid inside the skull causes the brain to swell, infections of the nervous system, lesions or tumors of the brain or spinal cord, and decreased mental function among other symptoms.

The causes of hydrocephalus are not all well understood. It may result from genetic inheritance or developmental disorders. Other possible causes include complications of premature birth, diseases or infections caught before birth, and injury before, during or after childbirth.

Hydrocephalus is believed to affect approximately one in every 500 children. At present, most of these cases are diagnosed prenatally, at the time of delivery, or in early childhood. Advances in diagnostic imaging technology allow more accurate diagnoses in individuals with atypical presentations, including adults with conditions such as normal pressure hydrocephalus.

The National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, a part of the National Institutes of Health, is the leading support of research on hydrocephalus within the Federal Government. NINDS works collaboratively with other institutes at NIH to further research on the influence of hydrocephalus on development and on the more general issue of the effect of early brain injury. The knowledge gained from this research will foster hope for new methods to treat and prevent developmental brain disorders such as hydrocephalus.

I would like to thank Congressman MIKE THOMPSON of California for his work to bring this resolution before us today, and I would urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 74.

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

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I stand here today in support of this resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 74, addressing the need for additional research into the chronic neurological condition hydrocephalus.

This disease, for which there is no cure, affects an estimated 1 million Americans. Often the symptoms of hydrocephalus are confused with those of dementia, Alzheimer's disease or Parkinson's disease. When the disease is properly identified, people with hydrocephalus are able to live full and productive lives.

The National Institutes of Health has responded to the needs of the hydrocephalus community by working with scientists and researchers to organize a conference in September of 2005 called ''Hydrocephalus: Myths, New Facts, Clear Directions.''

Demonstrating the need for collaborative research at the National Institutes of Health, seven institutes were able to work together and initiate new research and treatment efforts for hydrocephalus.

I thank Representative MIKE THOMPSON for his work in bringing awareness to this issue.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), the sponsor of the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am here today to ask all of my colleagues to support this resolution. Hydrocephalus is an abnormal buildup of fluid in the brain, and it affects nearly 1 million Americans. Without treatment, hydrocephalus is fatal, but when treated, most people with this condition can lead full and productive lives.

I became aware of this condition through a constituent and a friend of mine, Cynthia Solomon, who has a family member who suffers from this condition. Cynthia struggled to find information about hydrocephalus and wanted to connect with other affected families. So she cofounded the first patient advocacy organization for this condition, the Hydrocephalus Association.

As anyone who has been affected by this condition can tell you, the symptoms are many and they vary from person to person. Excess fluid in the brain can cause head enlargement, blurred vision, seizures, learning disabilities and impaired physical development. In older adults, symptoms can mimic dementia, Alzheimer's disease and Parkinson's disease, often leading to a misdiagnosis and a delay in receiving critical and proper treatment.

Doctors do not yet understand the specific causes of hydrocephalus. However, the current treatment was developed back in 1952 and involves surgically inserting a shunt into the brain. This carries serious risk of shunt failure, infection and obstructions. Overdrainage is also a threat. This can trigger a vertical collapse, causing blood vessels to tear and possibly resulting in a subdural hematoma.

Improvement in this treatment is long overdue, and with additional research, we can make it happen.

The National Institutes of Health recognizes this need and recently organized their first ever conference on hydrocephalus. This has resulted in efforts to initiate new collaborative research projects and an expansion of their focus on the development of new treatments.

This resolution commends the NIH for their action and encourages them to continue their collaborative efforts. It also calls for additional research into this serious condition.

However, we cannot depend solely on Federal efforts to expand awareness about hydrocephalus. I commend the Hydrocephalus Association and other groups for their commitment to patient advocacy and public education. Partnerships between these groups, health care providers and the government will bring us closer to our common goal: improved treatment of this condition.

I would like to say a special thanks to Dory Kranz, who is the current director of the Hydrocephalus Association, for her help in putting this resolution together and her ongoing work in this regard.

I ask my colleagues for their support of this resolution so we can further research into this very serious and important condition and we can bring about improved treatment to those individuals who are affected by this very, very serious and debilitating condition.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 74 which has been introduced by my colleague from California, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, and co-sponsored by Democratic and Republican Members alike.

H. Con. Res. 74 encourages additional support for research into the prevention and treatment of the neurological condition hydrocephalus. It is a chronic medical condition that, like other conditions affecting a relatively small number of people, receives inadequate attention and resources, which delays research that could achieve great breakthroughs. Passage of H. Con. Res. 74 will demonstrate the support of the Congress for aggressive research to find improved methods for detecting and treating hydrocephalus not only among children, but within the increasingly large number to adults who are affected by late onset of the condition.

I am especially proud that the Hydrocephalus Association is headquartered in my congressional district in San Francisco, and that the couple whose pioneering efforts have encouraged and supported so many people with hydrocephalus and their families are San Franciscans—Emily and Russell Fudge, as is the Association's Executive Director, Dory Kranz.

Under their leadership, together with the board composed of leading physicians and researchers, parents and people with hydrocephalus, the Hydrocephalus Association has raised public awareness of this condition and the enormous impact it has on over one million Americans. Because of the medical advances and the advocacy efforts promoted by the Association, most of these children and adults are able to lead full and productive lives and make enormous contributions to our society.

These successes have inadvertently complicated the efforts to advance research, diagnosis and treatment. The typical surgical treatment—the insertion of a shunt to carry away excessive cerebral fluid from the brain—was developed over 50 years ago. Because shunting has alleviated many of the more grave aspects of pre-shunt hydrocephalus, many believe it represents a cure. But it does not. Shunt surgery and the frequent repairs, which are well known to those with hydrocephalus and their families, are not only serious operations, but cost a billion dollars a year, much of which might well be averted with development of advanced treatment strategies.

Promoting additional research through increased federal support is the goal of this resolution. Those advances will benefit not only those with hydrocephalus, but will help to reduce excessive costs in our health care system, and allow hundreds of thousands of people with hydrocephalus to live even fuller lives freed from the anxieties and costs associated with shunt failure and related complications.

Seven of the institutes of the National Institutes of Health—including the Office of Rare Diseases—sponsored a major national conference in September 2005 on "Hydrocephalus: Myths, New Facts, Clear Directions" which has encouraged aggressive action in the areas of research and treatment. Now it is time for the Congress to join the campaign to expand our understanding of the causes and modernize the treatment of hydrocephalus. I call upon my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 74 to encourage our nation's leading medical institutions and researchers to expand their focus on achieving breakthrough research in the diagnosis and treatment of hydrocephalus.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 74. This resolution will encourage research into Hydrocephalus, a chronic and often devastating neurological condition.

Hydrocephalus affects an estimated one million Americans—which classifies it as a rare disease. And, unfortunately, like so many other rare diseases, insufficient resources have been directed toward it. Individuals with this disease are forced to undergo "shunting," a highly invasive surgical procedure that carries with it serious safety risks. This procedure also takes a heavy toll on our entire healthcare system, costing an average of $35,000 per procedure.

We can avoid paying this price. With more research and focus on this disease, better treatment—and perhaps even a cure—is within our reach. Patients can be spared the trauma of brain surgery and American citizens can avoid paying more than a billion dollars each year for this treatment.

The NIH has already taken some positive steps toward this goal. By initiating a collaborative effort among 7 NIH institutes and sponsoring a major national conference, the NIH has begun the work that must be done. Now we need to send a strong statement that we want this work to continue.

Cures for rare diseases like Hydrocephalus will never be found unless we increase our effort and follow the scientific promise. We can start with this vote today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H. Con. Res. 74 sponsored by Congressman MIKE THOMPSON. Passage of this bill will express federal support for Hydrocephalus research.

Hydrocephalus, a chronic neurological condition that causes cerebrospinal fluid to build up in the brain cavity instead of being reabsorbed into the body, is a disease that affects over one million Americans. This disease can cause head enlargement and blurred vision, learning disabilities and impaired physical development and is fatal if untreated.

Like many other diseases that affect a relatively small portion of our population, Hydrocephalus research lacks proper funding. It is deplorable that the current standard treatment, which requires the insertion of a shunt into the brain to drain out the fluid, was designed in 1952. Shunts are extremely prone to infections and frequently require repair through major surgery.

Modem medicine can do better. I am certain that with federal support for additional research we can develop a better treatment, if not a cure, for those suffering from Hydrocephalus and help them live healthier, fuller lives.

I applaud my colleague, Mr. THOMPSON, for his efforts in this area and I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 74.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Con. Res 47, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 755, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 884, by the yeas and nays.

The vote on H. Con. Res 52 will be taken tomorrow.

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

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF A NATIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 47.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 47, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
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)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
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
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
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)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
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)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
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
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
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 (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
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
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Clay
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
Emanuel
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hunter
Kingston
Lewis (CA)
Meeks (NY)
Moran (KS)
Ross
Rothman
Rush
Smith (TX)
Space
Stark
Wexler

□ 1903

Mr. REICHERT and Mr. FLAKE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING TRANSPARENCY IN FINANCIAL REPORTING ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 755.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 755, 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 412, nays 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—412

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
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)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
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)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
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)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
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
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
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
Spratt
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
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Carney
Clay
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hunter
Kingston
Lewis (CA)
Meeks (NY)
Moran (KS)
Ross
Rothman
Rush
Space
Stark
Wexler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1910

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PASSING OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE GENE SNYDER

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty as the dean of the Kentucky delegation to inform the Members of the passing of our former colleague from Kentucky's Fourth District, Gene Snyder, who served some 20 years in this body until he retired in 1986. He passed away on February 16 of this year in Florida. His funeral and interment in Louisville took place last Saturday.

For those who would desire, there will be a Special Order taken out by his successor in that district, GEOFF DAVIS, tonight around 8:45. If you would like to participate in the Special Order, time will be available.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

There was no objection.

PROMOTING ANTITERRORISM COOPERATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 884.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 884, 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 396, nays 16, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—396

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
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)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
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
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
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
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—16

Abercrombie
Barrett (SC)
Blackburn
Cannon
Conaway
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Flake
Foxx
Goode
Manzullo
Paul
Petri
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Tiahrt

NOT VOTING—21

Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Clay
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
Gilchrest
Hastings (WA)
Hunter
Kingston
Lewis (CA)
Meeks (NY)
Moran (KS)
Ross
Rothman
Rush
Simpson
Space
Stark
Wexler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1919

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. WAMP changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea''.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 556, NATIONAL SECURITY FOREIGN INVESTMENT REFORM AND STRENGTHENED TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2007

Mr. ARCURI, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–25) on the resolution (H. Res. 195) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 556) to ensure national security while promoting foreign investment and the creation and maintenance of jobs, to reform the process by which such investments are examined for any effect they may have on national security, to establish the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HONORING JOHN J. McNULTY, JR.

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

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute a very special constituent of mine on the occasion of his 85th birthday, which is today. He has been an outstanding son, husband, father, grandfather and great grandfather, and he has also been an outstanding public servant, having first been elected to public office in the year 1949 and having been elected to office in seven different decades. He served as a town supervisor and mayor, a sheriff, a member of the New York State Commission of Corrections.

Mr. Speaker, I want to salute and pay tribute to him today on the occasion of his 85th birthday, the Honorable John J. McNulty, Jr., and, yes, Mr. Speaker, he is my dad.

CONGRESSIONAL INACTION JEOPARDIZES JEFFERSON COUNTY'S AWARD WINNING JUVENILE PROGRAM

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the failure of Congress to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act amounts to a breach of faith to more than 600 forested counties and 4,400 school districts across America, including Jefferson County in Oregon, where more than 50 percent of the land is in Federal ownership, which means the county's Community Work Service program for primarily juvenile offenders will be eliminated.

Under the program, juvenile community service work crews remove trash from public lands, rehabilitate hiking trails, revegetate denuded areas, and repair resource damage due to vandalism. In 2004 alone, these young people removed more than 150 tons of garbage and more than 2 miles of old barbed wire fence from BLM lands.

In fact, the Bureau of Land Management awarded this program the National Volunteer Award for making a difference on the public lands in 2005. It has been very successful in addressing recidivism and introducing a new generation to America's forests.

Former Madras Mayor Rick Allen said: ''Loss of these funds will cripple community services.''

My colleagues, Congress must keep the Federal Government's promise to timbered communities. Pass H.R. 17. Time is running out.

HONORING DR. JAMES L. COLEMAN, JR.

(Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is understood that overall America's health care facilities face a decline in the quality of their staff. But South Carolina is graciously blessed with Dr. James L. Coleman, Jr., whose mission it is to improve the ways we provide the best and accessible primary and preventive health care to folks in our State who lack the means for quality medical care.

Currently serving as chief executive officer of the Margaret J. Weston Medical Center, Dr. Coleman is known for providing a message of diversity in health care. He and his staff at the medical center understand that in order to have healthy citizens, it is essential to provide affordable health care services.

With degrees from Winthrop, Central Arkansas and a doctorate of education from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Dr. Coleman is a teacher and local crusader for the improvement of lives by the improvement of health services.

During February's Black History Month, I would like to recognize Dr. Coleman. His efforts to provide better health care to underprivileged South Carolina citizens has not gone unnoticed.

BIG READ, AN EXCERPT FROM ''THE GRAPES OF WRATH''

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, today my community celebrates the birthday of

John Steinbeck, one of our famous native sons, born in Salinas and raised in and around Monterey Bay. At home in my district this month, the National Steinbeck Center will get the whole community to read one book together, ''The Grapes of Wrath,'' one of the best, well-known tomes by Steinbeck.

The book is being read across the country as part of NEA's Big Read program, designed to bring reading for pleasure back into our lives. Since I am a citizen of Monterey County myself, I would like to offer my own participation in this celebration by reading the following passage from ''The Grapes of Wrath'':

''The people came out of their houses and smelled the hot stinging air and covered their noses from it . . . Men stood by their fences and looked at the ruined corn, drying fast now, only a little green showing through the film of dust. The men were silent and they did not move often. And the women came out of the houses to stand beside their men—to feel whether this time the men would break. The women studied the men's faces secretly, for the corn could go, as long as something else remained . . . The children sent exploring senses out to see whether men and women would break . . . After a while, the faces of the watching men lost their bemused perplexity and became hard and angry and resistant. Then the women knew that they were safe and that there was no break. Then they asked, What'll we do? And the men replied, I don't know. But all was all right. The women knew it was all right and the watching children knew it was all right . . . The men sat still—thinking—figuring.''

This is Steinbeck at his best.

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.

U.S. MUST FOCUS EFFORTS IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to discuss more recent developments regarding the U.S. involvement in Afghanistan and Pakistan. The Taliban and al Qaeda seem to be growing in strength, and the evidence shows that they are in the planning stages for a spring offensive.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on the floor many times about the forgotten war in Afghanistan. It was promising to see the Bush administration finally wake up and bring the issue to the forefront this weekend with Vice President DICK CHENEY making a trip to Afghanistan and Pakistan. I was relieved to hear that Vice President CHENEY was not hurt after a deadly suicide bombing took place near the U.S. military base he was visiting in Afghanistan.

A few hours after the attack, a Taliban official took credit for the tragic bombing and claimed that it was an attack on the Vice President, and this incident only underscores the recent resurgence the Taliban and al Qaeda have seen in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

The details of Vice President CHENEY's trip to Afghanistan and Pakistan were kept extremely classified. This is in contrast with last year, when President Bush and Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice both visited Pakistan with far less secrecy. The increased level of confidentiality for Vice President CHENEY's trip illustrates the growing strength of al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan and shows that the administration is obviously aware of the increased dangers that al Qaeda poses in the region.

During his trip to Pakistan, the Vice President apparently delivered a stiff message, as he said, to Pakistani President Musharraf. The administration will not provide details of the encounter between the two leaders, but reports claim that the Vice President warned President Musharraf that American aid to Pakistan could be in jeopardy.

The Vice President is obviously referencing provisions in H.R. 1, a bill crafted by Democrats in Congress, that implements the recommendations of the bipartisan 9/11 Commission. These provisions will end U.S. military assistance and armed sales licensing to Pakistan unless the Pakistani President certifies that the Islamabad Government makes all possible efforts to end Taliban activities in Pakistan.

Now, President Musharraf responded to these comments from Vice President CHENEY by claiming that ''Pakistan does not accept dictation from any side or any source.''

□ 1930

It is unacceptable though, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, for the Pakistani President to completely disregard the numerous accounts that show al Qaeda training camps flourishing in the western region of his country.

The Pakistani President seems to forget that the U.S. has sent over $10 billion in aid to Pakistan over the last 5 years alone. It is my opinion that unless President Musharraf takes necessary steps to eradicate al Qaeda training camps in Pakistan, this aid should be put to an end.

It is encouraging to see the Bush administration increase the focus on Afghanistan and Pakistan, but more needs to be done to ensure the Taliban doesn't reach the level of power it achieved prior to the U.S. invasion in 2001. Taliban commanders are already claiming that they have 10,000 fighters and thousands of suicide bombers at their disposal.

The U.S. and NATO must also work to support local elders in towns such as Musa Qala, where a failed peace deal between town leaders and NATO troops has allowed the Taliban regime to regain control of the town. It is clear that the Taliban has regrouped and that peace deals, such as the one in Musa Qala, are dangerous and cannot be relied upon without proper support from U.S. and NATO troops.

Furthermore, our country must focus the humanitarian assistance we are sending to Afghanistan on rural development efforts that give Afghan farmers an alternative to the illicit opium trade.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush wrongly continues the war in Iraq at the expense of the largely forgotten war in Afghanistan. I urge my colleagues to keep the attention on where the real war on terror is happening, and that is in Afghanistan.

CONGRESSIONAL CONSTITUTION CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce and renew our hope to be a regular occurrence on the House floor for the 110th Congress. The members of the Congressional Constitution Caucus will use this opportunity to emphasize for our colleagues and for the Nation as well the necessity of ensuring that our government is operating according to the intent of the our Founding Fathers. As the 10th amendment affirms, the authority over most domestic issues belong to the States and local governments and the people themselves.

But before I begin, let me express my sincere gratitude to my friend Utah who has led this important education effort in the past and this year as well. He has faithfully championed the notion of a limited, effective and efficient Federal Government, and continues to fight for the authority granted to his home State and the other 49 states as well when each was admitted into this most cherished Nation.

I look forward to working with other like-minded Members of this Congress who share the sentiment that our Federal Government has seized control of programs that State governments have traditionally been much more effective in administering. I invite my colleagues to consider joining this important effort regularly as well.

This Congressional Caucus, I strongly believe that this body must begin to focus on the principles delineated in the 10th amendment. Our Founders were precise when they established our system of government. They intended to set up a republic of sovereign, self-governing States with a small central

government operating under clearly defined, limited powers.

Dividing sovereignty between the Federal Government and those of the States prevents an unhealthy concentration of powers at any one level of government. As James Madison in the Federalist Number 51 said, this arrangement is a double security in protecting the rights of the people.

Throughout the last few generations in particular, the intent of the 10th amendment, that of a limited and efficient central government, has been fading away. There are those I know who support a bigger, more centralized government. They believe a central government run bureaucracy can make the best decisions for the American people.

They believe in the public good of higher taxes. But on that I strongly disagree. As a member of the House Committee on the Budget, I am very much aware of where such faulty reasoning leads our Nation. It leads to our current situation, a bloated Federal Government consumed by a deficit upwards of $400 billion, which, in turn, delivers sub par public services.

Now then, to be fair, much of the spending that recently caused this deficit to increase is temporary relief on the gulf coast region and the global war on terror. It may not show up on the bottom line. And while this eases the short-term picture, the bigger problem is still one that must be addressed. And if we do not curb this foolish Federal spending habit now, our children will have to pay the price.

Congress, you see, on almost a daily basis allows, our government to grow, pushing it is further into deficit. And we are swiftly drifting away from the limits set by our Founding Fathers.

Each time a Member slides his card to cast a vote, he needs to ask himself this one question: Does the bill that I am voting for violate the Constitution? Does it take away rights promised to our constituents and put them in the hands of a bureaucracy in Washington instead?

I remind this body that the Constitution does not only protect the rights of the people though. It also protects the rights of the states. In Federalist number 45, James Madison wrote, ''The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined. Those which will remain in the states governments are numerous and indefinite.''

I have long served in this House long enough to know that it makes our lives easier at home when we come to D.C. and support increased funding for every conceivable type of program. Yet James Madison and his colleagues were less concerned about their ability to write glittering press releases than they were in developing an efficient system of government, one that would operate at the lowest cost to the people paying it, the people at home.

That is what this caucus is all about and what these weekly information sessions are about as well. We must turn a critical eye on the Federal Government. This is how we will lower the deficit, grow the economy and assure that America remains that beacon on a hill.

Aside from being informational, this Caucus also seeks to make specific legislative gains in the name of governmental efficiency and Constitutional adherence. So we will support legislation that seeks to return power and authority back where it belongs, to the States, local governments and to the people.

And so tonight, I specifically ask all Members to consider supporting the Reaffirmation of American Independence resolution that will soon be reintroduced by Congressmen FEENEY and GOODLATTE. This is a resolution I know our Founding Fathers would be original cosponsors of, were they able. Article VI of the U.S. Constitution states, ''This Constitution and the laws of the U.S. shall be made in pursuance thereof; shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws or any state or the country notwithstanding.''

This legislation goes in the direction to ensure that all such laws abide with our Constitution and not by foreign governments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MESSAGE TO THE PRESIDENT: END THE OCCUPATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last week British Prime Minister Tony Blair announced that more than 1,600 British soldiers would be sent home from Iraq. By recalling troops from Iraq, the British government has sent a very clear message that increasing the number of troops is not the right strategy. In fact, the British government has come to the same conclusion that many Americans have reached almost 4 years ago. We should be ending the military occupation of Iraq, not expanding it. We should be supporting the men and women who have served bravely in Iraq by sending them home, not sending them back for their fourth or their fifth tour of duty after only a very few months of spending time with their families.

The British government's decision to scale back its military commitment in Iraq should have been another important wake up call to President Bush. However, the President has continued his course to go it alone, regardless of the staggering costs to our Nation.

President Bush has drained America's reservoir of goodwill by ignoring the facts on the ground, the advice of his generals, and the will of the American public. By stubbornly pursuing the same misguided policies over and over again, he has left it to Congress to stop him.

Two weeks ago, the House took an important first step by overwhelmingly passing a bipartisan resolution condemning the President's decision to send more than 20,000 additional American soldiers to the front lines. I commend the Democratic leadership, and I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for having the courage to stand up to the President and to oppose his escalation. This vote, however, is only the first step.

Now that the House has stood up to disagree with the President, we must use this consensus to take on the urgent job of bringing our troops safely home.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and a co founder of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I have introduced a comprehensive and detailed plan to end the occupation while ensuring that we achieve security and stability in Iraq. My bill, H.R. 508, the Bring the Troops Home and Iraq Sovereignty Restoration Act, now has 47 cosponsors.

H.R. 508 will provide for a fully funded withdrawal of U.S. troops and contractors from Iraq within a 6-month period. During the time of that 6-month passage, our troops will return home to receive the full health care benefits they deserve because we owe them, we owe them no less for their sacrifices. And while they are coming home, we will be putting those laws into place, ensuring they get their benefits.

Also during that 6-month withdrawal period, our government will accelerate the training and equipping of Iraqi security forces, and if requested by the Iraqi government, we will work with the international community to provide a stabilization force to enhance Iraq's security.

Additionally, my bill would prohibit the establishment of permanent U.S. bases in Iraq, and we would return control of Iraq's oil resources to the Iraqi people. The only way to restore stability to Iraq is to return the country to the Iraqis, and we must work with our allies to achieve this. But when the Bush administration, in spite of all the advice to the contrary, decides to escalate the occupation, and the British government takes the sensible path of withdrawal, they both can't be right.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to wait for the President to realize his mistake. Too many brave men and brave women have died and suffered to continue this occupation. We must stand up, we must demand, we must bring our troops home. That is how we can protect our troops.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, 110TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, In accordance with clause 2(a)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I am reporting that the Committee on Financial Services adopted the following rules for the 110th Congress on January 31, 2007, and as amended on February 13, 2007, in open session, a quorum being present, and submit those rules for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,

U.S. House of Representatives,

110th Congress,

First Session

RULE 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Financial Services (hereinafter in these rules referred to as the ''Committee'') and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are privileged motions in the Committee and shall be considered without debate. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day).

(b) Each subcommittee is a part of the Committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(c) The provisions of clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House are incorporated by reference as the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable.

RULE 2—MEETINGS

Calling of Meetings

(a)(1) The Committee shall regularly meet on the first Tuesday of each month when the House is in session.

(2) A regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chairman of the Committee (hereinafter in these rules referred to as the ''Chair''), there is no need for the meeting.

(3) Additional regular meetings and hearings of the Committee may be called by the Chair, in accordance with clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the rules of the House.

(4) Special meetings shall be called and convened by the Chair as provided in clause 2(c)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

Notice for Meetings

(b)(1) The Chair shall notify each member of the Committee of the agenda of each regular meeting of the Committee at least two calendar days before the time of the meeting.

(2) The Chair shall provide to each member of the Committee, at least two calendar days before the time of each regular meeting for each measure or matter on the agenda a copy of—

(A) the measure or materials relating to the matter in question; and

(B) an explanation of the measure or matter to be considered, which, in the case of an explanation of a bill, resolution, or similar measure, shall include a summary of the major provisions of the legislation, an explanation of the relationship of the measure to present law, and a summary of the need for the legislation.

(3) The agenda and materials required under this subsection shall be provided to each member of the Committee at least three calendar days before the time of the meeting where the measure or matter to be considered was not approved for full Committee consideration by a subcommittee of jurisdiction.

(4) The provisions of this subsection may be waived by a two-thirds vote of the Committee, or by the Chair with the concurrence of the ranking minority member.

RULE 3—MEETING AND HEARING PROCEDURES

In General

(a)(1) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair or, in the Chair's absence, by the member designated by the Chair as the Vice Chair of the Committee, or by the ranking majority member of the Committee present as Acting Chair.

(2) Meetings and hearings of the committee shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(3) Any meeting or hearing of the Committee that is open to the public shall be open to coverage by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography in accordance with the provisions of clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House (which are incorporated by reference as part of these rules). Operation and use of any Committee operated broadcast system shall be fair and nonpartisan and in accordance with clause 4(b) of rule XI and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House.

(4) Opening statements by members at the beginning of any hearing or meeting of the Committee shall be limited to 5 minutes each for the Chair or ranking minority member, or their respective designee, and 3 minutes each for all other members.

(5) No person, other than a Member of Congress, Committee staff, or an employee of a Member when that Member has an amendment under consideration, may stand in or be seated at the rostrum area of the Committee rooms unless the Chair determines otherwise.

Quorum

(b)(1) For the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(2) A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the purposes of reporting any measure or matter, of authorizing a subpoena, of closing a meeting or hearing pursuant to clause 2(g) of rule XI of the rules of the House (except as provided in clause 2(g)(2)(A) and (B)) or of releasing executive session material pursuant to clause 2(k)(7) of rule XI of the rules of the House.

(3) For the purpose of taking any action other than those specified in paragraph (2) one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

Voting

(c)(1) No vote may be conducted on any measure or matter pending before the Committee unless the requisite number of members of the Committee is actually present for such purpose.

(2) A record vote of the Committee shall be provided on any question before the Committee upon the request of one-fifth of the members present.

(3) No vote by any member of the Committee on any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(4) In accordance with clause 2(e)(1)(B) of rule XI, a record of the vote of each member of the Committee on each record vote on any measure or matter before the Committee shall be available for public inspection at the offices of the Committee, and, with respect to any record vote on any motion to report or on any amendment, shall be included in the report of the Committee showing the total number of votes cast for and against and the names of those members voting for and against.

(5) POSTPONED RECORD VOTES.—(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the Chairman may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time, but no later than the next meeting day.

(B) In exercising postponement authority under subparagraph (A), the Chairman shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote;

(C) When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

Hearing Procedures

(d)(1)(A) The Chair shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any committee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing, unless the Chair, 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 Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(B) Not less than three days before the commencement of a hearing announced under this paragraph, the Chair shall provide to the members of the Committee a concise summary of the subject of the hearing, or, in the case of a hearing on a measure or matter, a copy of the measure or materials relating to the matter in question and a concise explanation of the measure or matter to be considered.

(2) To the greatest extent practicable—

(A) each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file with the Committee two business days in advance of the appearance sufficient copies (including a copy in electronic form), as determined by the Chair, of a written statement of proposed testimony and shall limit the oral presentation to the Committee to brief summary thereof; and

(B) each witness appearing in a non-governmental 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 subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years.

(3) The requirements of paragraph (2)(A) may be modified or waived by the Chair when the Chair determines it to be in the best interest of the Committee.

(4) The five-minute rule shall be observed in the interrogation of witnesses before the Committee until each member of the Committee has had an opportunity to question the witnesses. No member shall be recognized for a second period of 5 minutes to interrogate witnesses until each member of the Committee present has been recognized once for that purpose.

(5) Whenever any hearing is conducted by the Committee on any measure or matter, the minority party members of the Committee shall be entitled, upon the request of

a majority of them before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

Subpoenas and Oaths

(e)(1) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House, a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or a subcommittee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present, or pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) The Chair, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, may authorize and issue subpoenas under such clause during any period for which the House has adjourned for a period in excess of 3 days when, in the opinion of the Chair, authorization and issuance of the subpoena is necessary to obtain the material or testimony set forth in the subpoena. The Chair shall report to the members of the Committee on the authorization and issuance of a subpoena during the recess period as soon as practicable, but in no event later than one week after service of such subpoena.

(3) Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chair or by any member designated by the Committee, and may be served by any person designated by the Chair or such member.

(4) The Chair, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses before the Committee.

Special Procedures

(f)(1)(A) COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS AND COINS.—It shall not be in order for the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, Trade, and Technology to hold a hearing on any commemorative medal or commemorative coin legislation unless the legislation is cosponsored by at least two-thirds of the members of the House.

(B) It shall not be in order for the subcommittee to approve a bill or measure authorizing commemorative coins for consideration by the full Committee which does not conform with the mintage restrictions established by section 5112 of title 31, United States Code.

(C) In considering legislation authorizing Congressional gold medals, the subcommittee shall apply the following standards—

(i) the recipient shall be a natural person;

(ii) the recipient shall have performed an achievement that has an impact on American history and culture that is likely to be recognized as a major achievement in the recipient's field long after the achievement;

(iii) the recipient shall not have received a medal previously for the same or substantially the same achievement;

(iv) the recipient shall be living or, if deceased, shall have been deceased for not less than 5 years and not more than 25 years;

(v) the achievements were performed in the recipient's field of endeavor, and represent either a lifetime of continuous superior achievements or a single achievement so significant that the recipient is recognized and acclaimed by others in the same field, as evidenced by the recipient having received the highest honors in the field.

(2) TESTIMONY OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS.—

(A) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(4), when the Chair announces a hearing of the Committee for the purpose of receiving—

(i) testimony from the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board pursuant to section 2B of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 221 et seq.), or

(ii) testimony from the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board or a member of the President's cabinet at the invitation of the Chair, the Chair may, in consultation with the ranking minority member, limit the number and duration of opening statements to be delivered at such hearing. The limitation shall be included in the announcement made pursuant to subsection (d)(1)(A), and shall provide that the opening statements of all members of the Committee shall be made a part of the hearing record.

(B) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(4), at any hearing of the Committee for the purpose of receiving testimony (other than testimony described in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A)), the Chair may, in consultation with the ranking minority member, limit the duration of opening statements to ten minutes, to be divided between the Chair and Chair of the pertinent subcommittee, or the Chair's designee, and ten minutes, to be controlled by the ranking minority member, or his designee. Following such time, the duration for opening statements may be extended by either the Chair or ranking minority member for an additional ten minutes each, to be divided at the discretion of the Chair or ranking minority member. The Chair shall provide that the opening statements for all members of the Committee shall be made a part of the hearing record.

(C) At any hearing of a subcommittee, the Chair of the subcommittee may, in consultation with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, limit the duration of opening statements to ten minutes, to be divided between the majority and minority. Following such time, the duration for opening statements may be extended by either the Chair of the subcommittee or ranking minority member of the subcommittee for an additional ten minutes each, to be divided at the discretion of the Chair of the subcommittee or ranking minority member of the subcommittee. The Chair of the subcommittee shall ensure that opening statements for all members be made part of the hearing record.

(D) If the Chair and ranking minority member acting jointly determine that extraordinary circumstances exist necessitating allowing members to make opening statements, subparagraphs (B) or (C), as the case may be, shall not apply to such hearing.

Rule 4—Procedures for Reporting Measures or Matters

(a) No measure or matter shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

(b) The Chair of the Committee shall report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the Committee and take necessary steps to bring a matter to a vote.

(c) The report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been flied with the clerk of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the Committee, for the reporting of that measure pursuant to the provisions of clause 2(b)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

(d) All reports printed by the Committee pursuant to a legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the Committee shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report: ''This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Financial Services and may not necessarily reflect the views of its Members.''

(e) The Chair is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chair considers it appropriate.

Rule 5—Subcommittees

Establishment and Responsibilities of Subcommittees

(a)(1) There shall be 5 subcommittees of the Committee as follows:

(A) SUBCOMMITTEE ON CAPITAL MARKETS, INSURANCE, AND GOVERNMENT SPONSORED ENTERPRISES.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises includes—

(i) securities, exchanges, and finance;

(ii) capital markets activities, including business capital formation and venture capital;

(iii) activities involving futures, forwards, options, and other types of derivative instruments;

(iv) the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(v) secondary market organizations for home mortgages, including the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, and the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation;

(vi) the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight;

(vii) the Federal Home Loan Banks;

(viii) the Federal Housing Finance Board;

(ix) terrorism risk insurance; and

(x) insurance generally.

(B) SUBCOMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL MONETARY POLICY, TRADE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, Trade, and Technology includes—

(i) financial aid to all sectors and elements within the economy;

(ii) economic growth and stabilization;

(iii) defense production matters as contained in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended;

(iv) domestic monetary policy, and agencies which directly or indirectly affect domestic monetary policy, including the effect of such policy and other financial actions on interest rates, the allocation of credit, and the structure and functioning of domestic financial institutions;

(v) coins, coinage, currency, and medals, including commemorative coins and medals, proof and mint sets and other special coins, the Coinage Act of 1965, gold and silver, including the coinage thereof (but not the par value of gold), gold medals, counterfeiting, currency denominations and design. the distribution of coins, and the operations of the Bureau of the Mint and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing;

(vi) development of new or alternative forms of currency;

(vii) multilateral development lending institutions, including activities of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies as related thereto, and monetary and financial developments as they relate to the activities and objectives of such institutions;

(viii) international trade, including but not limited to the activities of the Export-Import Bank;

(ix) the International Monetary Fund, its permanent and temporary agencies, and all matters related thereto; and

(x) international investment policies, both as they relate to United States investments for trade purposes by citizens of the United States and investments made by all foreign entities in the United States.

(C) SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CONSUMER CREDIT.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit includes—

(i) all agencies, including the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of

Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve System, the Office of Thrift Supervision, and the National Credit Union Administration, which directly or indirectly exercise supervisory or regulatory authority in connection with, or provide deposit insurance for, financial institutions, and the establishment of interest rate ceilings on deposits;

(ii) the chartering, branching, merger, acquisition, consolidation, or conversion of financial institutions;

(iii) consumer credit, including the provision of consumer credit by insurance companies, and further including those matters in the Consumer Credit Protection Act dealing with truth in lending, extortionate credit transactions, restrictions on garnishments, fair credit reporting and the use of credit information by credit bureaus and credit providers, equal credit opportunity, debt collection practices, and electronic funds transfers;

(iv) creditor remedies and debtor defenses, Federal aspects of the Uniform Consumer Credit Code, credit and debit cards, and the preemption of State usury laws;

(v) consumer access to financial services, including the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act and the Community Reinvestment Act;

(vi) the terms and rules of disclosure of financial services, including the advertisement, promotion and pricing of financial services, and availability of government check cashing services;

(vii) deposit insurance; and

(viii) consumer access to savings accounts and checking accounts in financial institutions, including lifeline banking and other consumer accounts.

(D) SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND COMMUNITY OPPORTUNITY.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity includes—

(i) housing (except programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs), including mortgage and loan insurance pursuant to the National Housing Act; rural housing; housing and homeless assistance programs; all activities of the Government National Mortgage Association; private mortgage insurance; housing construction and design and safety standards; housing-related energy conservation; housing research and demonstration programs; financial and technical assistance for nonprofit housing sponsors; housing counseling and technical assistance; regulation of the housing industry (including landlord/tenant relations); and real estate lending including regulation of settlement procedures;

(ii) community development and community and neighborhood planning, training and research; national urban growth policies; urban/rural research and technologies; and regulation of interstate land sales;

(iii) government sponsored insurance programs, including those offering protection against crime, fire, flood (and related land use controls), earthquake and other natural hazards, but not including terrorism risk insurance; and

(iv) the qualifications for and designation of Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities (other than matters relating to tax benefits).

(E) SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations includes—

(i) the oversight of all agencies, departments, programs, and matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee, including the development of recommendations with regard to the necessity or desirability of enacting, changing, or repealing any legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee, and for conducting investigations within such jurisdiction; and

(ii) research and analysis regarding matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee, including the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

(2) In addition, each such subcommittee shall have specific responsibility for such other measures or matters as the Chair refers to it.

(3) Each subcommittee of 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 matter of which is within its general responsibility.

Referral of Measures and Matters to Subcommittees

(b)(1) The Chair shall regularly refer to one or more subcommittees such measures and matters as the Chair deems appropriate given its jurisdiction and responsibilities. In making such a referral, the Chair may designate a subcommittee of primary jurisdiction and subcommittees of additional or sequential jurisdiction.

(2) All other measures or matters shall be subject to consideration by the full Committee.

(3) In referring any measure or matter to a subcommittee, the Chair may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the Committee.

(4) The Committee by motion may discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred to a subcommittee of the Committee.

Composition of Subcommittees

(c)(1) Members shall be elected to each subcommittee and to the positions of chair and ranking minority member thereof, in accordance with the rules of the respective party caucuses. The Chair of the Committee shall designate a member of the majority party on each subcommittee as its vice chair.

(2) The Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee shall be ex officio members with voting privileges of each subcommittee of which they are not assigned as members and may be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum in such subcommittees.

(3) The subcommittees shall be comprised as follows:

(A) The Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises shall be comprised of 49 members, 26 elected by the majority caucus and 23 elected by the minority caucus.

(B) The Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, Trade, and Technology shall be comprised of 26 members, 14 elected by the majority caucus and 12 elected by the minority caucus.

(C) The Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit shall be comprised of 47 members, 25 elected by the majority caucus and 22 elected by the minority caucus.

(D) The Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity shall be comprised of 26 members, 14 elected by the majority caucus and 12 elected by the minority caucus.

(E) The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations shall be comprised of 20 members, 11 elected by the majority caucus and 9 elected by the minority caucus.

Subcommittee Meetings and Hearings

(d)(1) 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, consistent with subsection (a).

(2) No subcommittee of the Committee may meet or hold a hearing at the same time as a meeting or hearing of the Committee.

(3) The chair of each subcommittee shall set hearing and meeting dates only with the approval of the Chair with a view toward assuring the availability of meeting rooms and avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

Effect of a Vacancy

(e) Any vacancy in the membership of a subcommittee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the subcommittee as long as the required quorum is present.

Records

(f) Each subcommittee of the Committee shall provide the full Committee with copies of such records of votes taken in the subcommittee and such other records with respect to the subcommittee as the Chair deems necessary for the Committee to comply with all rules and regulations of the House.

RULE 6—STAFF

In General

(a) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the professional and other staff of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed by the Chair, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chair.

(2) All professional and other staff provided to the minority party members of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the ranking minority member of the Committee, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of such member.

(3) It is intended that the skills and experience of all members of the Committee staff be available to all members of the Committee.

Subcommittee Staff

(b) From funds made available for the appointment of staff, the Chair of the Committee shall, pursuant to clause 6(d) of rule X of the Rules of the House, ensure that sufficient staff is made available so that each subcommittee can carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee and that the minority party is treated fairly in the appointment of such staff.

Compensation of Staff

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Chair shall fix the compensation of all professional and other staff of the Committee.

(2) The ranking minority member shall fix the compensation of all professional and other staff provided to the minority party members of the Committee.

RULE 7—BUDGET AND TRAVEL

Budget

(a)(1) The Chair, in consultation with other members of the Committee, shall prepare for each Congress a budget providing amounts for staff, necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee and its subcommittees.

(2) From the amount provided to the Committee in the primary expense resolution adopted by the House of Representatives, the Chair, after consultation with the ranking minority member, shall designate an amount to be under the direction of the ranking minority member for the compensation of the minority staff, travel expenses of minority members and staff, and minority office expenses. All expenses of minority members and staff shall be paid for out of the amount so set aside.

Travel

(b)(1) The Chair may authorize travel for any member and any staff member of the Committee in connection with activities or

subject matters under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is granted, there shall be submitted to the Chair in writing the following:

(A) The purpose of the travel.

(B) The dates during which the travel is to occur.

(C) The names of the States or countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each.

(D) The names of members and staff of the Committee for whom the authorization is sought.

(2) Members and staff of the Committee shall make a written report to the Chair on any travel they have conducted under this subsection, including a description of their itinerary, expenses, and activities, and of pertinent information gained as a result of such travel.

(3) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, and regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration.

RULE 8—COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATION

Records

(a) (1) There shall be a transcript made of each regular meeting and hearing of the Committee, and the transcript may be printed if the Chair decides it is appropriate or if a majority of the members of the Committee requests such printing. Any such transcripts shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require that all such transcripts be subject to correction and publication.

(2) The Committee shall keep a record of all actions of the Committee and of its subcommittees. The record shall contain all information required by clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House and shall be available for public inspection at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee.

(3) All Committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Chair, shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto as provided in clause 2(e)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(4) 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 Chair 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 written request of any member of the Committee.

Committee Publications on the Internet

(b) To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

REAFFIRMATION OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, when I was young, growing up, I would often ask my mother if I could go to my friend's house to play, and she would say no. And instinctively I would then say, well, Billy's mom lets him go. And my mom would then say, I know, but I am not Billy's mom and I don't care what Billy's mom lets Billy do.

Well, that was an important lesson that I learned. Unfortunately, some of our courts have failed to learn that specific lesson, and that is why I feel honored to be able to stand here and talk about the Reaffirmation of American Independence Resolution, which my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, briefly introduced in his remarks.

This bill states that ''judicial determinations regarding the meaning of laws of the United States should not be based in whole or in part on judgments, laws or pronunciations of foreign institutions unless those foreign judgments, laws and pronouncements inform an understanding of the original meaning of the Constitution of the United States.''

Now, why would we do this? This only sounds logical. We are doing it simply because one Supreme Court majority admitted that they referred to laws of other countries and to international authorities as instructive for its interpretation of our 8th amendment.

Another case, the Court once again took into account the European Court of Human Rights in establishing the belief systems that they came up with.

Now, you may ask, once again, so what? What does that mean?

Justice Scalia made a good answer on what that means. ''It lends itself,'' as he said, ''to manipulation.'' In fact, it invites manipulation. If I am a judge who wants, in some way, to overturn a decision, I need some reason for it. I have to sound in some way like an attorney. I need to cite something. You can't cite something that is American because what I am trying to do is overturn two centuries of American precedent. So you find some intelligent man living in Zimbabwe or Poland or somewhere else in the world and cite his examples, and it looks very lawyerly. But it is, of itself, a manipulation.

Precedent is extremely important in our system of justice. Having a standard that does not change is important for the judge so that he realizes the standard he used in case A and case B will always be the same. It is even more important for citizens, for individuals, so that they know whether they go before judge one or judge two it will once again be the same standard that will be used in that situation. When we break those precedents, when we allow foreign precedents to take over, what we are simply doing is opening up the process for arbitrary and capricious decisions to be made. We are not in the process of, as someone once said of evolving our standards of decency as a mark of the progress of the maturing society. Because as Justice Scalia again said, sometimes society does not mature; it simply rots.

And the purpose of the Bill of Rights was to prevent change, not to encourage it, so that you leave people guessing as to what is appropriate, what is politically correct and what is indeed legal.

Satchel Paige used to talk to young pitchers when they were trying to learn how to pitch and being too cute at the plate by hitting the corners and were walking people. And he simply said, ''throw strikes. Home plate don't move.''

□ 1945

If we allow the court system to base their decisions on foreign opinions as opposed to American precedent, then home plate moves and home plate moves in a way that hurts citizens of the United States.

Now, there are some lawyers, maybe Supreme Court Justices, and others who would say that my comparison of my mom's reasoning to foreign law used in an American court would be inaccurate or oversimplistic. Perhaps so because, after all, they say, didn't our Founding Fathers look to foreign law when they were forming the Constitution? Indeed, if you read the Federalist Papers, you will see lots of references to the Swiss system and the German system. It is full of it. But the issue at hand is, once the Constitution is established, then our job is to try to understand what it meant when it was adopted, not search for some hook to find an alternate opinion for personal reasons or personal pique. Now, that is the key.

We shouldn't care what Billy's mom or foreign courts let Billy do because our court is not Billy's mom.

MOURNING AND HONORING DETECTIVE KEITH DRESSEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened to stand before our House today to announce the tragic death of Detective Keith Dressel of the Toledo Police Department and offer deepest condolences on behalf of our entire community to his wife, Danielle, and their children.

Detective Dressel, who was only 35 years old, was fatally shot on the morning of Wednesday, February 21, while on routine patrol in North Toledo, the first Toledo police officer to lose his life in service to our community since 1970.

In reality, though, there is nothing routine or common about Detective Dressel's extraordinary service or that of the men and women with whom he served. Every day Detective Dressel sacrificed his safety so that he might protect all of ours.

As a member of the vice squad, Detective Dressel engaged in dangerous work that frequently placed him in high-risk environments. He did this not for glory or praise, but to serve and protect residents from all walks of life.

Charlotte Bronte's poem ''Life'' teaches us:

''What though Death at times steps in
And calls our Best away?
What though sorrow seems to win,
O'er hope, a heavy sway?
Yet hope again elastic springs, unconquered,
though she fell;
Still buoyant are her golden wings,
Still strong to bear us well.
Manfully, fearlessly,
The day of trial bear,
For gloriously, victoriously
Can courage quell despair!''

On the fateful day when lives were changed forever, the painful call went out: ''Attention all units. Detective Keith Dressel has answered his final call.''

The Toledo Blade newspaper reports today: ''The final radio call to the slain Toledo police vice detective, a taped broadcast played at the conclusion of his funeral Mass yesterday, broke somber faces into tears.''

The impact of this terrible tragedy has touched every corner of our community and beyond. We have all been moved by Keith Dressel's sacrifice, commitment, and courage, as well as that of his family.

On behalf of the citizens of Toledo, Ohio, and all of the lives Detective Dressel has touched, I offer our deepest sympathy to Detective Dressel's loved ones, colleagues, and friends. May their faith sustain them through the difficult journey ahead as they remember the words of Psalm 46, versus 1 and 2: ''God is our refuge and our strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore, we will not fear, though the Earth be removed and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea.'' May their strength as a family and their memories of their husband, father, brother, nephew, uncle, grandson, son, and friend sustain them as they mourn his loss and celebrate his selfless legacy of patriotism, purpose, and service to his fellow citizens. His children should be comforted by the knowledge that life is not measured in years but in deeds.

Detective Keith Dressel lived as a man for others, despite the danger and sacrifice to his own. May he rest in peace in God's house as an archangel watching over and guiding our earthly pursuits.

The Blade describes this hero's funeral: "Two lines of officers—at least two people deep—wove through the parking lot. Three to four other lines of officers stood at the front doors of the church, including Toledo police Chief Mike Navarre and Toledo fire Chief Mike Bell.

"After a private ceremony for the family, Detective Dressel's flag-draped casket was escorted from the funeral home to a white hearse with a small American flag on the driver's side door. White-gloved Toledo police honor guard members stood on both sides of the hearse. Three rows of Cleveland Police Pipes and Drums members in full garb played and led the slow procession to the church. Officers lining the way saluted as the hearse passed.

"At the church, pallbearers in dark suits slowly pulled the casket from the hearse. The casket was blessed with Holy Water before being wheeled into the sanctuary. Inside, the U.S. flag covering the casket was removed and replaced with a white pall. . . More than 2,000 people filled Our Lady of Mount Carmel Catholic Church in Temperance for a funeral Mass for the 35-year-old husband and father of two. Detective Dressel's wife, Danielle, 32, held the couple's 4-year-old son, Noah, as the family was escorted inside the church.

The Mass ended with Detective Dressel's last call, bagpipes, a prayer, and a hymn.

Law enforcement officers streamed out of the church and formed more than a dozen rows in front of the front doors. Music from bagpipes and drums filled the background. The officers saluted as the casket was placed inside the hearse.

The procession from the church to St. Anthony's Cemetery involved more than 1,500 police cars and other vehicles from dozens of states. Dozens of firefighters from the Toledo Fire Department and other area communities stood single file along the west side of Jackman Road leading to two fire aerial trucks forming an arch at Jackman and Temperance Road. The firefighters saluted the passing hearse and procession. The extended aerial ladders held an American flag, which blew south to north in the wind. The Toledo police mounted patrol unit joined the solemn procession, including for a time a riderless horse with boots backward in the stirrups, and led it to the cemetery.

Along the way, residents stood at the ends of their driveways and schoolchildren stood with their hands over their hearts. Across the road from the cemetery, citizen mourners and officers stood silently in the cold, sometimes biting breeze, for the hearse and the clip-clop of the horses. Mrs. Dressel acknowledged those standing along the side of the road

The start of the graveside ceremony was delayed to allow mourners—many of them law enforcement officers—to park and walk more than a mile to the small, fenced cemetery for a final tribute to the fallen hero. A shorter service included The Lord's Prayer, which many officers said aloud. The American flag on Detective Dressel's casket was folded into a triangle and given to his widow.

Seven officers fired a three-volley shotgun salute as officers snapped their own salute.

"Taps" echoed through the air. "Amazing Grace" was played on the bagpipes as snowflakes slowly fell from the sky.

As the Dressel family shared a last, private moment near the detective's casket, red-cheeked officers sniffled as they filed out of the cemetery.

Detective Dressel was hired by the Toledo Police Department in 1993. Held in high esteem by his colleagues, this fallen hero will be remembered as a devoted public servant who was committed to his work and to his family. Despite his challenging work, Detective Dressel never compromised his integrity or sacrificed his sense of humor. Evidence of his legacy is clear in the heartfelt eulogies:

Officiating at the Mass, his priest, Father Nusbaum said, "Before Keith's laughter will fade away from this Earth, we'll hear it in a blink of an eye. That wonderful laugh."

His police chief Michael Navarre said, "We honor a true hero, a young man who dedicated his life to this community . . . "I salute you [Keith]. We all salute you and a life well lived."

It is reported that "Ken Dressel, Detective Dressel's uncle, said one of the happiest days of his nephew's life was when he was accepted into the police academy. Only second to his family, the slain detective was most proud of his badge. 'As much of a cop as he was—doing some of the most dangerous work in Toledo—we would often see him sitting on the floor playing with the children at family gatherings.' "

The impact of this terrible tragedy has touched every comer of our community and beyond. We have all been moved by Keith Dressel's sacrifice, commitment, and courage as well as that of his family's.

We recall in excerpt the lines of Longfellow's poem, What the heart of the young man said to the psalmist.

Life is real! Life is earnest!
And the grave is not its goal;
Dust thou art, to dust returnest,
Was not spoken of the soul.

Not enjoyment, and not sorrow,
Is our destined end or way;
But to act, that each to-morrow
Find us farther than to-day.

Art is long, and Time is fleeting,
And our hearts, though stout and brave,
Still, like muffled drums, are beating
Funeral marches to the grave.

In the world's broad field of battle,
In the bivouac of Life,
Be not like dumb, driven cattle!
Be a hero in the strife!

Trust no Future, howe'er pleasant!
Let the dead Past bury its dead!
Act,—act in the living Present!
Heart within, and God o'erhead!

Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time;

Footprints, that perhaps another,
Sailing o'er life's solemn main,
A forlorn and shipwrecked brother,
Seeing, shall take heart again.

Let us, then, be up and doing,
With a heart for any fate;
Still achieving, still pursuing,
Learn to labor and to wait.

On behalf of the citizens of Toledo, Ohio, and of all the lives Detective Dressel has touched, I offer my deepest condolences to Detective Dressel's loved ones, colleagues and friends. Without a doubt, our community is better because he served. Detective Dressel will not be forgotten. May their faith sustain them through the difficult journey ahead as they remember the words of Psalm 46, verses 1–2: "God is our refuge and our strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore, we will not fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea." May their strength as a family and their memories of their husband, father, brother, nephew, uncle, grandson, son and friend sustain them as they mourn his loss and celebrate his legacy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM EQUITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, later this week, in our Committee on Energy and Commerce's Subcommittee on Health, we will be having a hearing called ''Covering the Uninsured Through the Eyes of a Child, Part Two.'' Now, having sat through part one of this hearing, a hearing dealing with the reauthorization of CHIP funding this year, I really think the title of the hearing should be ''Covering the Uninsured Through the Guise of a Child'' because if some deception is implied in that title, indeed, I believe some deception is taking place within the SCHIP program.

Now, most of my colleagues in this body, having heard from medical professionals and hospital groups this past month up here on the Hill, are aware of the need for reauthorizing the Children's Health Insurance Program this year. It is a good program. It has provided needed health insurance to millions of needy children across our country. And both the House and the Senate are discussing funding options. And we are concerned about the rising cost of health care in general but in particular, specifically, the rising cost for the SCHIP program.

Fourteen States are going to expect budgetary shortfalls in their SCHIP program. For some of those States, they are their own worst enemy. They are the reason for their own problem. They are using children's funding to cover adults.

In fiscal year 2005, the adult enrollment in the SCHIP program exceeded the number of children enrolled in the program in four States: in Arizona we had over 113,000 adults in the program and just over 88,000 children; in the State of Michigan, over 101,000 adults and under 90,000 children; in Minnesota 35,000 adults and just over 5,000 children; in Wisconsin 108,000 adults, just over 57,000 children.

Now, why does this matter? Well, if you look at what it costs to cover a child versus what it costs to cover an adult, for every dollar you spend on the adult, you only need to spend about 60 cents on the child. They are generally healthier. A dollar spent on children's health insurance goes a lot farther because children tend to be a healthier population, and if you provide them a modicum of preventative care, they are going to be healthier still. And after all, if we can attenuate a disease in its early stages in childhood, we will avoid the larger expenditures of allowing that disease to go on unchecked over years.

I can think of a number of diseases that would fall into this category. Childhood obesity immediately comes to mind, an area where we need to devote significant time, energy, and resources. But if we are spending the money elsewhere, we are not going to be able to spend it on the children.

And the real deception, in my mind, is that this is a method of expanding a single-payer government-run health care system through the SCHIP program. And, again, that subverts the entire concept of why this program was created in the first place almost 10 years ago.

I would ask my colleagues to remember a dollar spent on a nonpregnant adult is a dollar that is not spent on a needy child. Indeed, States should prioritize spending on needy children and live within their annual allocations instead of looking to other States from which to take their moneys when their programs run a shortfall.

To ensure that States are not using children-specific funding for nonpregnant adults, I have introduced H.R. 1013, the SCHIP Equity Act. There are four principles to the bill:

It prohibits future HHS approval of any State waiver submitted by a State for SCHIP coverage of nonpregnant adults.

The bill terminates portions of State waivers that HHS has approved that extend coverage to nonpregnant adults.

States must eliminate coverage of nonpregnant adults by January 1, 2008.

And if the coverage of a nonpregnant adult was part of a multipurpose waiver, those components not dealing with the coverage of the nonpregnant adult will remain in effect for the duration of the waiver.

SCHIP has been a success story for so many States, for so many children. I am asking you to consider supporting my bill, H.R. 1013.

I want to remind all Members of Congress that ''C'' in CHIP stands for ''children.'' Let's keep it that way.

AMERICAN HEART MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, let me first offer my warmest thanks to my dear friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois, who led the debate on the floor today in my absence on my bill that is recognizing this month as American Heart Month. I was told that she did a great job, and I am very grateful to her for that. Traveling from California to Washington sometimes is quite a task, and we appreciate our friends for standing in for us.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly in support of this resolution, as heart disease is an issue of great importance to our Nation's health, especially women who many have felt for years that breast cancer was the number one killer for women.

For over 40 years, the Federal Government has recognized February as American Heart Month, and during this time we have made great strides in fighting heart disease in this country. New medical innovations have improved the treatment of heart disease, and public education campaigns have made Americans more aware of the importance of prevention.

Nonetheless, heart disease is still the number one killer of Americans, both men and women. One in three Americans has some form of heart disease, whether it be high blood pressure, coronary heart disease, heart failure, stroke, or congenital cardiovascular defects. And while men are more likely to suffer from heart disease in their lives, women are not far behind.

While women may have a lower incidence of heart disease than men, women with heart disease are less likely to receive the proper preventative, diagnostic, and treatment interventions. This could be due to the fact that medical professionals consider heart disease to be primarily an affliction of men and are therefore slower to recognize it in women.

Additionally, women suffering from a heart attack or angina are more likely to have atypical symptoms. In fact, women with atypical heart attack symptoms who are sent home undiagnosed from the hospital are about twice as likely to die from a heart attack as individuals who are admitted.

Another problem with managing heart disease in women is that most of the research on coronary heart disease has been exclusively or primarily done on men. As a result, test and treatments developed from these studies may be less effective in women. This is why there is an urge to test more women and do more research on coronary heart disease with women.

Mr. Speaker, American Heart Month is a time to remember how far we have come, as well as how far we need to go. Heart disease is not just a man's disease, and one of the next big frontiers in battling heart disease involves improving its management in women. Additionally, men and women alike need to remember that preventing heart disease early is preferable to treating it later. A healthy diet, regular exercise, and avoidance of smoking all reduce a person's risk for heart disease. By enhancing both treatment and prevention of heart disease, we will go a much further way, a long way, to improving the health and the hearts of all Americans.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation when it comes to the floor tomorrow for a vote.

□ 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF THE HONORABLE GENE SNYDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). Under a previous order of

the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CHANDLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to honor the memory of one of our former colleagues who passed away on February 16th of this year. He was a former Member from my home State of Kentucky, and, among other things, had the unusual distinction of representing two different congressional districts in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Former Congressman Gene Snyder was a man of steadfast conviction. He could always be counted on to fight for his constituents, and you always knew where he stood on the issues. Congressman Snyder had a way with people and a memorable sense of humor. He loved to tell stories and he used those stories to foster close relationships with Republicans and Democrats alike.

We often talk about a different time in Congress, when Members discussed policy over dinner with their families, when Washington was more cordial, and when there was a sense of kinship among fellow legislators. Gene Snyder was one of those Members committed to fostering that kinship, which is far too rare in these halls today.

Most Kentuckians will remember Gene Snyder by the freeway that bears his name. And while one road certainly doesn't sum up a man, in many ways, it is appropriate. While Gene Snyder was never afraid to vote against what he thought was a wasteful appropriations bill, few Members have fought harder to provide the seeds of economic growth for their home region.

Before Gene Snyder got to Congress, his district faced numerous age-old problems; transportation deficits, traffic issues and flooding from the Ohio River to name a few. I can remember hearing stories about people floating through the streets of Louisville in boats during the historic flood of 1937.

These problems, and many more, were tackled by Gene Snyder. He helped complete the Jefferson County floodwall. He showed great leadership in the construction of a new terminal at Standiford Field in Louisville. And he helped secure funding for the Clay Wade Bailey Bridge in Northern Kentucky, better connecting Covington and Cincinnati and helping to drive economic growth in that region.

There were countless other projects that Congressman Snyder developed, and all the bridges he built, the highways he paved and the buildings he raised have helped provide jobs to thousands of our fellow Kentuckians.

These jobs, and the opportunities that resulted from his efforts, will be Gene Snyder's lasting contribution to the constituents who he took such pride in serving. It is my honor this evening to celebrate Gene Snyder's life and his legacy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF THE HONORABLE GENE SNYDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, like my colleague from Kentucky, I rise to honor former Congressman Gene Snyder. Because we find ourselves both as a Congress and a country working to dig ourselves out of a divisive partisan trench, which in recent years has been characterized by petty attacks and contentiousness, my constituents may be surprised to know that I counted Gene Snyder as a friend.

Gene, who was always more interested in the public than publicity, told me a story about a persistent reporter who badgered him about a meeting he wanted to cover. Gene didn't want the reporter at the meeting and refused to disclose the location. So when Gene spotted the reporter in his rearview mirror tailing him to the meeting, Gene said to heck with it. He told his aide to head for the mountains, and led the reporter on a 100-mile wild goose chase through Virginia.

Now, as a former member of the news media, I won't applaud that tactic, but I admire the competitive spirit it exemplified. In any event, that was the last time that reporter tried to get the best of Gene.

Although Gene and I enjoyed each other's company, you would be hard-pressed to find more than a handful of issues upon which the honorable Gene Snyder and I agreed in the political arena. But political issues are only one part of this job, the other being serving one's constituents.

As far apart as we sat on the ideological spectrum, Gene Snyder's model of constituent service is one I aspire to closely emulate. In his three decades of service, Congressman Snyder set the example of how to serve a district. He set the bar, and he set it high.

When Gene held my seat, we in Louisville knew that we had a representative with an open door and an open ear for all of us. If it concerned our community, no matter, big or small, was unworthy of his attention. He welcomed us warmly, shared a laugh, and left us with a feeling that something would soon be done to address anything from a clerical glitch to the need for a new highway. Inevitably, and remarkably, for an age when distrust of a power-hungry government dominated, the issue would be handled effectively and expediently.

As I now work to institute my own open door policy, I am consistently cognizant that I follow the example set by a predecessor and a friend, Gene Snyder. I look to him has a fervent believer that democracy stems not from politicians, but from the citizens we represent, and I endeavor to capture that spirit as he did.

Gene Snyder was my representative, he was my friend, and he will be greatly missed. I hope my colleagues will join me in honoring his life and service to his constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE BUDGET, DEBT AND THE BLUE DOG'S IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we are gathered here this evening to talk about the budget, to talk about the debt and to talk about the Blue Dogs' Iraqi accountability legislation. This is a very, very important time for us, and we hope that this hour will be illuminating and be very informative for everyone.

We are accustomed having my good friend, MIKE ROSS, in this position. MIKE ROSS is from Arkansas, and, as we know, there was a tornado that went through there. MIKE ROSS and a group of us just came back yesterday from Europe. MIKE ROSS had to jump on a plane and go down to Arkansas to see about his constituents, and we want to make sure that we send our prayers down to the folks in Arkansas.

Of course, MIKE knows that we stand ready to help in every way we can to make sure that they get the services that they need. So we are here to carry on.

We have a great lineup and array of Blue Dogs here tonight to carry on and to talk about the budget, we want to talk about the debt, we want to talk about our Iraq resolution that we have before us, and the whole issue of accountability.

Mr. Speaker, as we get started, I want to call your attention to our chart. As you know, one of the hallmarks of the Blue Dogs is fiscal responsibility and accountability. Let's look at the national debt and what it is today.

If we look at it correctly, it is now $8.773 trillion. The share for each individual in this Nation is $29,000, and it continues to go up. We want to talk about that tonight. The Blue Dogs have a plan. We want to talk about our 12-point plan to bring down this debt. It is one of the most horrendous areas that we have to deliberate on.

We want to get started with some of our Blue Dogs that are here. First, I

want to recognize our distinguished co-chair from the great State of Tennessee, Representative COOPER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Georgia. Mr. SCOTT does an outstanding job, not only representing his constituents, but also helping our Nation get on the right track.

As the gentleman has mentioned, every single Blue Dog has that sign outside his or her office. It is a troubling sign, because it shows that in our 230-plus year history, our Nation has borrowed $8.7 trillion. That is a lot of money. Sadly, $3 trillion-plus have come in the last several years. So we are on an accelerating borrowing pace. That means the interest bills, the interest we are putting on our kids and grandkids, is mounting very rapidly.

Since that number is so hard for anyone to understand, it is important that you drill down and see what your individual share is. Every listener tonight, everyone in this Chamber and back home, their individual share, man, woman or child, even an infant in this country is born with a $29,000 debt before they are even able to breathe their first breath of air.

But as troubling as that number is, I am worried that doesn't tell the whole story, because there is a Treasury document here that is called The Financial Report of the United States Government, put out by the U.S. Treasury. It says that using modern business-like accounting, unlike the accounting that the Federal Government traditionally uses, it says that according to modern accounting, our real debt burden isn't $8.7 trillion, as massive as that is, this document from the U.S. Treasury Department says the real debt burden is $50 trillion. That is our fiscal exposure.

It goes on to say that our individual share of that massive debt is not $29,000. I wish it were that small. This document says that your individual share, even the moment you are born in this country, is $170,000. $170,000. That is a terrific burden.

I hope that this accounting isn't right, but I am worried that this is the right accounting. Most Americans know already that today the U.S. stock market fell over 400 points. As a percent, that is not great. It is 3.3 percent. But it is still a worrisome fall. The Chinese stock market fell even more today. It fell at least 9 percent, or at least the Shanghai market.

We live in an interconnected global economy. That means to me we need Blue Dog commonsense now more than ever, because the Blue Dogs are for a strong economy, we are for a growing economy, we are for sensibly living within our means and applying commonsensical economic principles to our budget and economic matters.

So I want to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia for leading this Special Order and leading our Nation to a path of better prosperity for our kids and grandkids.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you much. Would the gentleman share with us that document, where it came from, who wrote it and what it means?

Mr. COOPER. This is called The Financial Report of the United States Government. It is an official U.S. Government document. You can get it on the Web if you go to the U.S. Treasury Web site. It has an introductory letter by the Secretary of Treasury, who is now Henry Paulson, a former Goldman Sachs investment banker.

This document interests me, if is not that long, it describes all the Federal document, but it is the only government document that uses modern, business-like accounting.

Every business back home in our districts, every business with revenues over $5 million, is required by law to use this accounting. That is what businessmen and women and Rotary Clubs, Lions Clubs, Optimist Clubs all over America understand. And they are pretty shocked when they learn that the Federal Government doesn't abide by those accounting rules. We cook the books.

We pretend that we can just use what is called cash accounting, which is very simplistic. Only the smallest businesses in America are even allowed to use that. But here the Federal Government with a budget of $3 trillion a year uses cash accounting.

This is the President's budget. This is what it looks like. You can also get this on the Web. But it won't tell you anywhere in this document they are using simplistic cash accounting. They want you to believe that you are getting the true story.

But even if you read this document, you will see that according to the President's numbers and, of course, they put it on the very last page here, it is on page 372, that the debt in the next 5 years, even though the President has promised us that he is going to balance the budget, this says the debt is going up $3 trillion more.

So it won't be $8.7 trillion when Bush leaves office, when his successor is elected, it will be closer to $11 trillion or $12 trillion. That is fundamentally irresponsible and it means that the burden on our kids and grandkids is going to be even more massive than we can imagine.

So whether you use the President's budget or his own Secretary of Treasury's budget, we need to be focusing on these matters.

□ 2015

The Blue Dogs are the leading group in Congress to focus on this. No constituent passes our doors without seeing that sign and reminding them that the Federal Government is borrowing way too much money and putting way too much of an obligation on our kids and our grandkids.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. The gentleman mentioned what happened today in the stock market. It is very interesting to note that this whole change happened and started early in the morning in China. When you look at how much money we are borrowing from foreign governments, needless to say China with $360 billion in debt, the interconnectedness of this, and our liability to these other countries, make us so dependent on them. In some cases when they sneeze, we are getting a cold, which is what happened today.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is exactly right. I believe the Chinese currently hold almost $1 trillion in U.S. Treasury bonds. They are our fastest growing lender. They have aggressively purchased U.S. Treasury bonds, and that means increasingly we are paying interest to the Chinese. Our economies are interconnected. I worry that it is a national security issue. It is not just an economic issue anymore because when you get that beholden to another country, if they have any instability or problem or any reluctance to loan us more money, then we have a much bigger problem in this country.

I hope that won't come to pass. I hope that we can get our Nation on a sounder footing. I wish the President had offered us a sounder budget when he gave us one just a few weeks ago in his State of the Union message. We need to work hard on this in the next several weeks to improve it and make sure our Nation is on a stronger course in the future.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. You brought some very significant wisdom, that our debt burden is $50 trillion, and a very important piece of information from the Treasury Department which gave great expanse to what our burden is: $8.73 trillion in national debt, and our share for each individual in this country is $29,000.

I would like to call on a distinguished Blue Dog, one of our hard-working Blue Dogs, and one of my fellow travelers. We just returned from an extraordinary trip abroad with NATO, had some very interesting meetings there, BEN CHANDLER, a Representative from the great State of Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here with Mr. SCOTT tonight, to be a member of the Blue Dog Coalition, and to hear the wonderful presentation by Mr. COOPER of Tennessee who does a tremendous job in this Congress, and who is one of the real consciences of the people here in Washington. Even though some of the news he has to relate to us is not the best of news, the people of this country need to hear the truth, and that is what Mr. COOPER so eloquently gives us on a regular basis.

I very much enjoyed the opportunity to travel this past week with my fellow members of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, and there are several Blue Dogs who are represented on that very important task force that we have to try to foster cooperation in a very important alliance we have. The alliance that United States has with NATO and

the other 25 countries in NATO is extremely important to our national security. I don't think people realize how important it is.

It was a pleasure to have an opportunity to travel with Mr. SCOTT, a newly appointed member to that commission, and Ms. BEAN from Illinois who is also here with us tonight. I know she will have a few words to say in a little while. She was with us on that trip.

You know, when we go abroad like that and we talk with our allies, we talk about a lot of things. On this particular occasion, of course, the subject continually came up of Iraq and Afghanistan. NATO is helping us in Afghanistan. We of course in Iraq don't have as many allies as we do in Afghanistan. Some of the countries in NATO have a different view about Iraq than they do about Afghanistan, but we are proud to have their help in Afghanistan. It is very, very important to us because that is an engagement there I think that most of the American people are united, that we have to have success, certainly in Afghanistan.

But whatever anybody thinks about that war or about the war in Iraq, one thing I believe we can all agree upon is that the taxpayer money that is being used for those efforts needs to be used accountably. It needs to be accounted for. That certainly has not been the case.

We in the Blue Dog Coalition came out with a plan not too long ago, a resolution that would require essentially accountability for the use of that money, would make an effort to try to stop the war profiteering that we believe is going on, certainly in Iraq. I hope we can set up a commission in this government, very much like the Truman Commission of World War II, which would look at the expenditure, would actually hold this administration accountable for the expenditures in Iraq.

Now, the importance of that I think is pretty obvious for everybody. Every dollar that we misspend or waste in Iraq is a dollar that cannot be used efficiently to protect our troops, it cannot be used efficiently to get the job done over there, and it is also money taken away from needed programs and services right here in this country.

I don't need to mention all of those programs one by one. We all know what they are, from education, health care, right on down the line. We need those dollars, and those dollars need to be spent appropriately.

But we can even go so far, if you can believe this, to apply some of that wasted money on the national debt. That is what the Blue Dogs talk about all of the time, the national debt in this country.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield, you bring up a very good point. The waste that has happened in Iraq with our military is just astounding. It is very important that the American people realize this is the trust of our legislation. We are going to support the troops. We are going to have a military and we are going to spend more on our military. We are going to enlarge our military. Under our Democratic leadership, we are going to make our military stronger.

In order to do that, there are two important points, as the gentleman pointed out, in our legislation that will address and act as a catch to stop some of this waste, and that is under our legislation, we will require that the Inspector General in the Defense Department report to Congress quarterly on exactly how the money that Congress is allocating is being spent. And the Inspector General in Iraq for the Reconstruction of Iraq will also report to Congress on how that money is being spent.

So our financial accountability act for Iraq accountability is very important, and I want to just take a minute to point those things out that address how we are going to respond to the concerns of waste and fraud that you have just spoken about.

Mr. CHANDLER. Thank you, Mr. SCOTT. What those points bring to mind is it is the least we can do. As representatives of the people of the United States of America, I believe it is our job to spend their money efficiently. It is right at the top of the list of the important responsibilities that we have and that is what we are trying to do as Blue Dogs.

Now I don't know about you, but I grew up going to church.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Oh, yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. I suspect you did, too.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. You are absolutely right, my friend.

Mr. CHANDLER. And during some of those church services, I would hear time and time again about the notion of stewardship. Is that a word that is familiar to you?

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. It is a word that is very familiar to me.

Mr. CHANDLER. And that is what we are talking about here. We are talking plain and simple about stewardship, are we going to be good stewards of our country. All we have got is our country and the money, the hard work that our citizens do and the money that they contribute to our national government. The least we can do is make sure that the Federal Government spends it properly.

I am concerned about this debt: $8.7 trillion. And what really is amazing is what Mr. COOPER told us a little earlier tonight, that not only is the debt $8.7 trillion, this is the debt that the government insiders are familiar with. The public I don't think is really aware of how dramatically large this debt is. But what Mr. COOPER told us was that this doesn't even warm it up. The real debt is more in the neighborhood of $50 trillion.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. And it comes directly from this administration's Treasury Department. That is why I wanted Mr. COOPER to make sure he pointed out the authorship. This is not our report to Mr. COOPER. This was put together by the Treasury Department.

Mr. CHANDLER. The $50 trillion figure comes directly from this administration. What is unfortunate is that this administration has been a large part of the reason that the debt is that high. It is terribly unfortunate. One figure that I saw not too long ago, and you talked about it a little earlier, about our interrelatedness to China, well, we have that connection with many countries all over the world in one way or another, but the number that troubles me is the fact that the Bush administration has borrowed more money from foreign governments in the 6 years that this administration has been in office than all 42 previous administrations combined.

Now, Mr. SCOTT, I don't know about you, but that is one of the more astonishing figures that I have been privy to since I have been in the United States Congress. I am shocked about that.

What I hope we can accomplish as we go forward, and certainly in the effort that we are making tonight, is bring to light a little bit to the American people what kind of financial situation we have in this country and that we have got to get our act together. It is high time that we behave accountably to the American people, that we hold this administration accountable for how they have spent the money. That is what the Blue Dogs want to do. That is why I am proud to be a Blue Dog and proud to be here tonight.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. CHANDLER, I want to make sure that the American people got what you just said. Now, just to make sure that they get it, what you said was that in the last 6 years under this administration this country has borrowed more money from foreign governments than all of the previous administrations going all of the way back to 1789, counting all of the wars, counting the Depression, World War I and World War II, all of the way up to now. From 1789 to 2001, we didn't borrow as much money as we have borrowed in the last 6 years. That is very important.

And the other staggering point about that is just the interest that we are paying on this loan is the fastest growing segment of our budget, and just the interest that we are paying to these countries is more than we are collectively spending on our veterans, on homeland security, and on education. That is a remarkable state of financial irresponsibility; and the Blue Dogs are providing the leadership, have been for many years, and finally we got a first step into this process during the first 100 days under the leadership of Speaker NANCY PELOSI in passing the PAYGO legislation.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am just going to say one more thing and then allow some of my other fine colleagues to have a word on this subject.

When I get ready to tell some of my constituents the nature of this spending problem and particularly the point about this administration borrowing more in 6 years than our country has borrowed in the entirety of its history previous to these 6 years, I advise them to please sit down before they hear this information because they are not going to believe it. It is that extraordinary. I can't believe it. I still can't really get my arms around the fact that we are doing that.

□ 2030

I think one of the most important points is, when you borrow to that extent and when you get yourself in debt to that extent, it makes you less secure. We are looking for security in this country. That is what the American people want. When you are deeply in debt, I would submit to you that you are, in fact, less secure, and that is what we are getting in this country.

I thank you for the time.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you, and the gentleman brought up some very interesting points. We are going to talk a little bit more about that, but I know the Americans may be asking, well, what are the Blue Dogs going to do? What is their plan?

We have a 12-point plan for budget reform. I want to briefly hit the points right quick. One, require a balanced budget; two, do not let Congress buy on credit; three, put a lid on spending; four, require agencies to put their fiscal house in order; five, make Congress tell taxpayers how much they are spending; six, set aside a rainy day fund; seven, do not hide votes to raise the debt limit; eight, justify spending for all projects; nine, ensure that Congress reads the bills that it is voting on; ten, require honest cost estimates for every bill that Congress votes on; eleven, make sure new bills fit the budget; and twelve, make Congress do a better job of keeping tabs on government programs.

Now, I want to yield to my distinguished friend from Tennessee who is just one of the hardest working Members up here and a leader in the Blue Dogs, Congressman LINCOLN DAVIS from Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I can assure my good friend from Georgia that I will not bore the folks for 35 minutes in this House Chamber, nor will I bore you that much, but it is certainly an honor to be with you here in this House Chamber, this historic Chamber.

I asked one of the freshmen Members as we traveled from the Chamber after voting recently through the tunnel going to the Cannon Building, and I said, well, your first 6 weeks, how does it feel? He said, LINCOLN, I want to be honest with you. He said, I never knew how it felt to work in a museum, but I do now.

Working here in this Capitol, where those statues of the tremendous leaders of the past, inside the House Chamber where many decisions have been made, where on December 8 we declared war on Japan in 1941 and then two or 3 days later, after being declared war on by the Axis Nations, Germany and Italy, and that declaration occurred here, declaration of war, really the last declaration of war that has been held inside this House Chamber and declaration of war that only Congress, quite frankly, can declare.

So, being here at this time of history and being on the floor with you and other members of the Blue Dogs certainly is an honor, not a privilege, but an honor that the folks back in my district have given me, and I believe that they expect us to come here and be bipartisan in our efforts, that we are not here to be demagoguing the other side or critical, but you have to try to work in a harmonious way to find solutions to whatever difficulties we have in this Nation.

I had a Member ask me when I first came here, LINCOLN, what did you want to change when you came up here? And I thought real hard, and it really did not take a lot of thought. My answer was I did not want to change America. No country in the world has reached the level of helping its citizens the way that this government of the United States of America has. I do not want to change it, but there are problems. We need to fix those, and we can do it by working together.

So, for me, my challenge to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and colleagues here on this side of the aisle, let us start being a little more civil with each other.

I left from this House Chamber after the debate we had on whether or not to agree with the President's plan for a surge in Iraq is something we wanted to do in this Chamber, and it got to the point where the questions of someone's patriotism became a part of that debate and dialogue. Of course, some may obviously follow suit with that, but we had a debate about whether or not we supported the troops. The resolution said we do. We had a debate about whether we agreed with the strategy, apparently the new strategy of this President to engage an additional numbers of troops in Iraq.

Now I want to talk a moment about that budget we looked at and at the deficit. I remember I was elected in 1980 to the State House in Tennessee. As I was travelling from my home of Byrdstown in Pall Mall to Nashville to the State capital, it came across the radio that we had just increased the national debt ceiling to a trillion dollars. That frightened me. A trillion dollars in the early 1980s. I remember that as we talked about increasing that debt ceiling by $20 billion or $15 billion how difficult it was in this House Chamber. Now we increase it by hundreds of billions of dollars without even really having an up-or-down vote on that particular debt ceiling increase.

I thought how ironic it was that in 1980 how difficult it was for a debt ceiling to be increased, and now it just seems to be as if a snap of the finger and all of the sudden, we reach that level.

Then I watched for the next 8 years, the next 12 years, as that debt not gradually, but very rapidly rose in the 3 and 4 trillions of dollars. I am thinking in a 12-year period of time, how is that possible. If we look back basically almost 200 years, we reached a trillion, and suddenly we had doubled and quadrupled what we had in that period of time.

Since 2001, even with the surpluses that were applied to reduce the debt that this country owed, for a period of almost 4 years, out 4 years of surplus budgets where we had more than we spent, we took in more than we spent, and started paying down the debt, I am surprised that almost $3 trillion in the last 5 years has been added to that figure down there.

I often hear people talk about the first thing a baby does—my chief of staff just recently had a newborn son in early December, and they nicknamed him Willis, a pretty little thing, handsome little fellow. He came to one of my open meetings with him. On Saturday, we had 24 throughout the district. I represent 24 counties. The first thing little Willis did when he came to this earth, he started crying. I know now why he was crying. He realizes that this country, that these leaders in this Chamber, that this Nation has handed him a $29,000-plus debt, that he does not even have a job yet to pay off, and if we continue to go as we are going, before he gets his first job, he will owe more money than five times the first house cost me that I bought for our family in the late 1960s.

I want to talk now about Iraq for a moment. I hear people in this Chamber talk about cut and run being the policy of Democrats and staying the course being the policy of the White House. Both of those are wrong. I do not think standing the course is going to get it done, and cut and run is something, quite frankly, that I go back in history, and I cannot find that example, except some folks might say Vietnam.

But I saw Vice President CHENEY in Japan early last week thanking our troops, and it dawned upon me that, let me say now we have troops in Japan after World War II. We have troops in Germany after World War II. I went back and looked at the tens of thousands of troops we have in Korea and South Korea after the Korean War; I go to Kosovo and in Bosnia and in Serbia and in the Balkans, and I realize that we have forces there from the late 1990s, although there were those in this Chamber on the other side of the aisle that called that Nation building and wanted to know when then-President Clinton was going to give us a time certain, even I think the presidential candidate at that time as well who later became the President in 2001, even he was talking about Nation building and a time certain that our troops should be pulled out.

As we debate this issue, it is ironic to me that anyone would accuse someone else of asking for some of the same considerations that they asked for a certainty of. But we are still in Bosnia and Kosovo and, quite frankly, this President that is here now and this Congress saw fit to stay there, that we should keep the peace with our friends of NATO.

But I look at other parts of the world. We are in Turkey. Our ally in NATO, the Turks, we still have bases there. But then I got to thinking, well, now, we had a war in the Middle East, a U.N.-sanctioned, totally supported, my understanding is we probably had three or four times the number of troops that went in 1991 to remove Saddam Hussein from his aggressive actions in Kuwait, and we forced him back into his country. Then we had north and south no-fly zones, had him pretty much contained. But we still have troops in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. We still have troops in Kuwait. We still have troops in places like United Arab Emirates. Are we going to have troops in Iraq when this is over? This is never going to be over.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. You make a very good point, and I think it is tantamount and the American people have seen through and are seeing through the rhetoric of the Bush administration. They are not buying cut and run. The American people went to the polls in November and they did not go to the polls to cut and run. They went to the polls to change direction, a new direction.

There is no question about the fact that we have a vital interest in the Middle East. We know that for the foreseeable future, clearly 45 percent of all of the known oil reserves would be under that region and certainly under Iran alone. All of the geologists have pointed out that 25 percent is under that region. There is a great responsibility for us all there. Nobody is talking about cut and run.

We are talking about what is happening here is a civil war, and these Iraqis have got to fight that out for themselves, just as surely as it would not have been right for Germany or France to come and plop a hundred or 200,000 troops in the middle of our civil war. That had to be settled by us. They have got to settle their civil war. We have got to contain the situation, and that is how this new direction needs to evolve.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. I thank my friend from Georgia.

I think, what my hope is, all of us become a little bit more civil in this debate that we are having and realize that this is about America. We want security and we want peace. We want the Iraqis to win. What we have done is destroyed an Army in Iraq and I agree with that, we have destroyed an Army in Iraq that was able to defend, or at least to resist the Iranian Army with three times the population they have for a period of over 10 years. We now have to be the Army for the Iraqis.

It is our responsibility to defend Iraq. In essence, I think we have to put our troops along the Syrian and Iranian border to be sure that no one interferes with Iraq and let the Iraqis settle their own differences. Twelve million Iraqis voted in December of 2005. They established their government; it is there. Departments elected. It is time we let them govern themselves, but we must protect them.

You have been very kind to allow me to be here participating in this Blue Dog conversation.

Before I leave, one thing I want to say, one of the reasons we have been in the Middle East since shortly after World War II, quite frankly, we were there to keep Germany from getting all the oil that could have helped them delay the war much longer in World War II, maybe even have won some territories. Europe may have looked totally different if Hitler and his Nazis had been able to get control of the oil fields in the Middle East. We have been there and have been invited by governments in the Middle East for some time. Folks may or may not have agreed with us, but the leaders who were there invited us to help them. Quite frankly, there was fear in the Cold War that that might go to the Communist Nations of Russia and perhaps even China. So we have been there for a reason.

We now are there we say to protect ourselves from terrorists. My opinion is that we have to stay there to protect the Iraqis from other aggressor Nations and let them solve their problems and then we can bring our troops home. We will be there for a long time. The American public understands that.

Thank you for allowing me to speak.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Well, thank you. The gentleman from Tennessee brings a lot of depth to his thinking, and we appreciate his contribution tonight.

Now I want to recognize and yield time to my distinguished friend from the great State of Ohio, the sixth district. He serves on the House Committee on Financial Services and the House Committee on Science and Technology, my good friend, Congressman CHARLIE WILSON. I yield to the gentleman.

□ 2045

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am here this evening to support the Blue Dog Coalition, and ask for a realistic and responsible budget as we move forward.

I believe that for so long, we have been out of touch, and I believe that the debt that has been created by this administration has been overwhelming. And I know that more people in America need to understand what really has happened and how there has been wasteful spending, not accountability, difficulties that have just been swept away and we need to stop and look at it.

So I am pleased as a new Member of Congress from Ohio to be a member of the Blue Dog Coalition. I believe that, as we take a closer look at what is going on with this budget that has been submitted to us, that we realize that there are not only numbers that don't add up, but there are assumptions that are made that really would go against any principle of gap accounting and any type of realistic obligations that we have to the American people to explain to them.

The numbers show that while real fiscal responsibility is so sorely needed, this is not what we have in this budget. And it becomes important that we have people like the Blue Dogs who have, and I have my new sign outside my new door in the Cannon Building at 226, of which I am very proud to be a member of the Blue Dog Coalition to show that every man, woman, and child in this country is in debt $29,000 as of today. And that number may be realistically much lower than what it actually is.

The numbers also show that we need accountability. In 2004 alone, the Federal Government spent $25 billion that cannot be accounted for. I have heard other rumors and other stories of money that just disappeared.

This is not fair. It is not fair to the people, the taxpayers whose money it belongs to. It is not fair for the programs that we could be doing for our seniors, for the education of our children, the health care that we could provide, and to help those in middle America, the working families to help with opportunities for them.

We were able in this new Congress, to move forward. And just yesterday, Congressman SCOTT, I did a TV interview in Youngstown, Ohio. And the person interviewing me asked why did we prohibit the other side from being able to amend and change in our first 100 hours. And I said, quite frankly, that I thought we needed to do that in order to be able to get the issues taken care of that we did. And it was with this kind of responsibility that we moved forward, and that I believe now we can work together and accomplish what needs to be accomplished, but certainly looking at the realism of what is going on with our national debt.

We need to work together, not a Democrat or a Republican, but rather an American initiative, to make sure that every dollar we spend, every decision we make is for the betterment of our country.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield for a point. I think it is very important, you pointed out that in 2004, if I heard you correctly, $24 billion of Federal Government spending went absolutely unaccounted for. But the other point of that is that this Congress, or the Republican-controlled Congress during that time, did not hold the executive branch accountable for the omission. So not only was the money unaccounted for, there was no means of putting forward accountability by the executive branch.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I thank you for that observation.

I truly believe this is what the American people said in this November's election. They said: We need accountability. We need people to be responsible. And that is why the election turned the way it did. And I believe now that it is important for us to pursue every opportunity to make sure that we have fiscal responsibility, to make sure that we are doing the right things for the people, and keeping an eye on our national debt.

Just last week, I received a graph in my office, and the amount of debt that we are paying to foreign countries is huge in comparison to what we are spending on education or health care for our seniors. That is the thing that is most difficult to understand about this, is how we can let the really important things go and spend all this money on interest. I know as a businessman, I could not run my business that way. As a person, I couldn't run my personal finances that way. And so there is no reason to think that we should run our government that way.

Moving forward, I just think that we need to be sure that this Congress is responsible. And one of the primary ways of doing that, that the Blue Dogs are advocating, is PAYGO, and that is as we pay as we go, just like you and I do in our budgets at home. If we are going to buy a new car, we need to make a sacrifice of something else. If we are going to go on a vacation, there needs to be something traded for that. PAYGO, quite frankly, Mr. SCOTT, says that what we really have to do is to make sure, if we are going to pay forward, that we eliminate something that we are doing now, and then we pay as we go.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. I certainly thank the gentleman for his observations. They have been very illuminating to us especially on the budget. We have a number of other Blue Dogs here we want to bring into this.

I want to now recognize my good friend from Illinois and one of my fellow travelers. We just returned together from NATO, and she has some refreshing observations, I am sure, from that trip of how it relates. She is a good friend and one of the hard-working Blue Dogs who is making a great contribution to this Congress, and that is Ms. Melissa Bean of Illinois. I yield the young lady as much time as she may need.

Ms. BEAN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding. It is always an honor to join you here on the floor as it was an honor to join you during the NATO parliamentary assembly that we attended together. And one thing that didn't come up that you mentioned earlier with Congressman CHANDLER was that, in addition to visiting NATO headquarters in Brussels, we also visited the Landstuhl Medical Facility in Germany where our returning wounded are coming from both Iraq and Afghanistan. And it was important to meet with them and hear from them their firsthand experiences and what brought them there, why they are fighting so hard, and their concern for those in the platoons that are still fighting. And one of the things I wanted to talk about is bringing some accountability to that process.

And I will also mention that there has been a lot in the press recently about Walter Reed and some concerns about infrastructure and investment that I know we are working to address as we look at appropriations. But it was encouraging to see the medical professionals, their commitment to facilities and just the top-notch care that our returning men and women who have been wounded are getting and hear how pleased they were with the level of medical support they are getting.

But the Iraqi War Cost Accountability Resolution which we in the Blue Dogs introduced is what I wanted to touch on, because several of my Blue Dog colleagues and yourself, Mr. SCOTT, have mentioned accountability, and I think it certainly what our constituents expect of us. And one of the reasons we supported this bill is it provides accountability across four different disciplines. It provides spending accountability; it enforces transparency, and requires the Department of Defense Inspector General to provide regular reports on exactly what spending has taken place, what spending hasn't taken place, what projects we are working on, what the status of those projects are, what the contracting process is. And also, not just what we in this country are providing, but also what are other countries that are allied with us are providing to what is going on there as well. It provides contracting accountability in addition to spending accountability, with a commission akin to the Truman Commission that was done in the past to oversee the contracting process, the policies, how they are being carried out, and whether those contractors are fulfilling their obligations as well. And it also puts sanctions in place for any kinds of fraud or abuse that can be happening.

It also provides budget accountability. As you and I know, and we have talked about this in our Blue Dog meetings, there have been six emergency supplementals, and those emergency supplementals have all been for war spending. Given the number of years we have all been engaged in this process in Iraq, it is no longer an emergency. This is an unaccounted for spending; this isn't something that we are surprised by. And so what we are requiring in this bill is on budget war appropriations. And it also requires Iraqi accountability. So let me go through all four of those, and then I will describe what I mean by the Iraqi accountability.

Spending accountability, contracting accountability, budgeting accountability, and Iraqi accountability.

And that means that we need to hold accountable not only the Prime Minister al-Maliki, but the Iraqi government, to be accountable first and foremost to protecting themselves on a sovereign basis. And as you alluded to earlier, it is our job to help contain the situation from insurgents outside, but they need to, for their own security, be first and foremost in assuming a higher degree of responsibility, as many of us supported the President when he said, as the Iraqi people and the Iraqi military stand up, we can stand down. And so we have to hold them accountable to doing that so we can.

I am going to lastly talk about the budget in general and why I am a Blue Dog. You have your sign up there, we all do, and it talks about the $9 trillion of debt that we are now at. And I think Congressman COOPER alluded to the fact that the foreign borrowing that we are doing is contributing to that. We are now borrowing, as a Nation, $7 billion to $8 billion per working day from foreign countries; $2 billion to $3 billion of that is just the government alone. And at that rate, we are going to continue to exacerbate this debt and the individual share that we are passing on to every American.

I think, as a parent, I often remind myself that tough love is important. It is not my job as a parent to tell my kids what they want to hear, but to tell them what they need to hear. And I think the Blue Dogs bring that same kind of tough love to our constituents and to our Nation, and hopefully to our Congress, because we need to be talking about what Americans need to hear, not what they want to hear. And so I am glad to be joining you tonight.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. If the gentlewoman would yield for a moment. I would like very much to engage you in the feeling of that trip. And it was so important to gather with representatives of those 26 other nations and 13 associate nations with NATO, because we have got to understand, we can't go it alone.

Ms. BEAN. Absolutely.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. One of the fundamental charges I felt and responsibilities I felt going, and you did, too, we talked about it, was we have got to improve the image of working with other nations to move forward. But I think that the highlight to me and I think to you was that visit with the soldiers.

Ms. BEAN. Very much so.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. And you and I have talked about that, and I just want to share for a moment the touching experience that we shared going and flying into Ramstein Air Base and going to Landstuhl to the medical center and going from room to room. We went and we talked with soldiers fresh off the battlefield in very serious conditions, and it was a remarkable experience. And I know you joined me in saying that on the floor, we salute those soldiers.

Ms. BEAN. Absolutely we do.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. And we just want to say thank you personally to those soldiers for their sacrifice, for their service, and express to them a great gratitude for a very, very grateful Nation.

Ms. BEAN. Our entire Nation.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. We are so proud to do that.

Ms. BEAN. I would agree. Our entire Nation is grateful to them, and to their families who were there supporting them through their injuries.

And on that note I will yield back, because I know we have Congresswoman SANCHEZ, who is also anxious to speak.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. We certainly thank you. And I hope you might hang around a little bit. We may get into a little soliloquy here.

I would like very much to now recognize one of our longstanding Blue Dogs, certainly established as a leader in this Congress, one who befriended me, one who makes a sterling contribution as a leader of the United States Congress, the young lady from California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ. I yield the young lady as much time as she may need.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I thank my colleague for putting together this hour to discuss what I think is something that is very important; that is, what the Blue Dogs are thinking about in this Congress and what we have been trying to do.

Now, I will tell you that I have been in the Congress for 11 years. This is my 11th year. I have been a Blue Dog the entire time. And that really comes from the fact that before I came to the Congress, I was an investment banker. I am an MBA, I have been in the international finance arena for 14 years before coming to this Congress.

So people ask me, what is the thing that you worry about the most when you go to sleep at night? And the answer is always the same for me: The structural financial debt and deficit that we have in Washington, D.C., because most people have not looked and seen and realized what has been going on here in Washington, D.C., but I have seen it in the last 11 years.

□ 2100

That is why, as a Blue Dog, I also have that sign up that says what today's national debt is and how much of that $29,000, if every man, child, woman in America, would give us $29,000 today, we would be able to bring down the national debt. But the fact of the matter is, we don't. We don't, and the debt keeps climbing.

So a few years ago, we were trying to think about, well, how is it that this has happened? Because when I came, it was in 1997. I had 4 years under President Clinton, and at that time, the debt of this Nation, the interest payments on that, was 18 cents of every dollar that we collected, 18 cents.

That means if we collect a dollar from you in taxes, 18 cents of it we don't spend because we are paying the interest cost on that. Imagine if you did that in your home for every dollar.

So what did we do? We worked hard. We instituted PAYGO. What does that mean? Well, it means you don't make any new spending unless you are going to tax, put in an amount of money for it, or you are going to take it away from some other area you are already spending on in order to spend in your new priority area, much the way people do it at home when we have to decide among the priorities.

Okay, well, this month, September, I have to get the shoes for the kids for school, so that means that there are going to be no days out of that month that we get to go out and eat at a restaurant. I mean, you just make up for it in one way or another.

But the Congress and the United States do not do this. They keep spending, even when they give tax cuts. So that means if your boss told you we are going to give you a 70 percent cut in the amount of money you take home, and you go home and you tell your husband that, but he still keeps spending the same amount of money every month, he doesn't bring his expenses down.

So it is a problem. So we spend, I would say, honestly, about 700 to $800 billion more a year than the monies we take in.

Now, we will throw numbers around, to $143 billion, deficit, $400 billion, deficit, $358 billion. No, no, no, no, no. The reality is that we are overspending by anywhere between 700 and $800 billion every year. That is why this number goes up, because we cannot get this under control.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. If the gentlelady would yield for a moment, I think it very important for us to realize, you also alluded to it, you might want to hit on it a little more, the unfairness of it all, the war being paid on borrowed money. Every dime we are spending in our government, for our services, on borrowed money, it is not going to last that long. Many civilizations and nations have gone down because of ballooning debt.

If you look at all of them that have gone down, ballooning debt is what played such a great part, and the selfishness of the tax cuts, the war, whatever we are doing, and we are selfishly doing that and putting the burden, as you alluded to, on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. I think you make an excellent point there.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Absolutely. So I started in this Congress 11 years ago, and we spent 18 cents of every dollar just on paying interest on interest payments. Then we tightened our belts; we did PAYGO. President Clinton and others, we worked together, we brought it down. In the year 2000 when President Bush took over, we were paying 11 cents of every dollar on interest. So we had brought it down.

Then, of course, the President decided to give tax breaks to some of the wealthiest Americans. I know, because I got a tax break, but not everybody got a tax break. The real people who really needed the tax breaks, I think, did not receive them. That is why I didn't vote for it. I received it because the majority, the Republicans at that time voted it in, but I didn't vote for it because I know what fair is fair.

If you get opportunity in this country and you work hard, and you get a few breaks and a little bit of luck along the way, that can happen in America for almost anybody. And some of it is luck, and you happen to make money. I think you should understand that to keep America full of opportunities, we need to pay our taxes.

So I am willing to do that, but not this President, because he cut the taxes on the people who had lots of money and who were making lots of money. His own comptroller told us several years ago that 70 percent of the deficit every year in this country is due to the tax breaks that the President gave. In other words, we kept spending even though we didn't take in revenue. In fact, we returned back revenue.

Then, of course, we have the $3 billion a week of money we spend in Iraq. I will not tell you the way I feel. This President went into Iraq on the cheap. He didn't think that Americans would really want to spend the kind of money it took to put in 200,000 or 300,000 troops to do the job the day we went in. So he told his Secretary of Defense, despite what the generals told him, Shinseki, who said we need at least 200,000 or more troops in there, they did it at the level of 110, and now we are paying for it. Now we have been in a war much longer than we ever anticipated, much longer than the President ever anticipated.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Especially what was most disheartening was the buildup to that war, to use the credibility of General Colin Powell, and then to abandon what you refer to, with the huge number of troops, the Powell doctrine. You are going to go in, you go in with force.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. So we find ourselves there longer than we are supposed to be, and we ask ourselves, how much longer, $3 billion a week on the credit card? Wait till America really figures out that they have not paid for this war. I think they are going to be very angry at that point. I see I have taken most of your time.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. We thank the young lady from California for your excellent insight on this, and your commentary was certainly well received, and it helped to shed the light on the debt and the importance of it.

So we appreciate this hour, the Blue Dog hour, as we continue each Tuesday night to talk about the budget, to talk about bringing fiscal responsibilities and being good stewards to the taxpayers' money. It has been a good evening.

HONORING FORMER CONGRESSMAN GENE SNYDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRALEY of Iowa). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. The subject of our Special Order tonight is to remember a great man of this Chamber and a great Kentuckian and a great person, a friend to virtually all who knew him. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay tribute to my friend and fellow Kentuckian, Congressman Gene Snyder.

Born in Louisville, Gene Snyder began his political career in 1954 as a city attorney for Jeffersontown, Kentucky, at the age of 26. In 1962 he ran for Congress and was elected to represent the Third District of Kentucky. After losing his bid for reelection in 1964, he turned right around and ran again in 1966. This time, he was elected to the seat that I now hold from Kentucky's Fourth District.

He went on to serve Kentucky and the Nation for another 20 years until his retirement in 1986, bringing a record of credit upon his office and doing great service to the people of Kentucky's Fourth District. Gene had a tireless work ethic, both in Washington and in Kentucky's Fourth District. He was a master political operator and strategist, and his dedication to the conservative cause was without equal in the 1960s and 1970s.

He stood by Barry Goldwater for President and was swept out of office in the 1964 Johnson landslide, only to return 2 years later.

I can personally relate to that and Gene's character and his persistence, having lost my first election and announcing on election night that I was running again and getting up the next morning and going to work for 2 more years to win and to make a difference.

Gene was a great example with his work ethic, with his character, with his devotion and his tenacity. He enjoyed campaigning, and he relayed to me stories of many people who cut their proverbial teeth on his campaigns. I have heard stories literally from hundreds of people across the old Fourth District who remember him, who remember meeting with him.

He worked and reaped the benefits for those who followed him in office. He laid a foundation for those of us in the delegation who came after him. Ground work for a strong Republican Party in the Fourth District, campaigning was not something that Gene did every 2 years. It was a life-style for him.

He was in a constant state of campaigning, reaching out, building friendships, reaching across the aisle, reaching across the fence on an arm, across the wire at the county fair, meeting people in storefronts. He used to tell me how on Saturdays he would often get in his car when he was back in the district and drive Highway 42 from Pewee Valley where he lived on up towards northern Kentucky, stopping in small coffee shops, in storefronts to visit with ordinary people.

He was a man without pretense, one who people simply knew as Gene. Everyone from our region still remembers Gene's famous campaign jingle, and more than one person has nostalgically sung the whole song to me word for word since I got into politics in 2001. We have heard those words: ''Vote for Gene Snyder. He is your working Congressman.''

In fact as recently as the last few years, that jingle, which has not been used in a campaign since 1984, was still considered the best political song in the radio stations in Louisville. Gene thoroughly enjoyed interacting with his constituents, and his enthusiasm for his job showed in his ability to recall the names of thousands with whom he came in contact.

Even more telling was the fact that many of his constituents simply knew him as Gene. They never knew the fact that their Gene was considered by columnist Jack Anderson here in Washington as one of the 10 most influential Members of the House of Representatives because of his work ethic, because of his knowledge of the rules, his knowledge of policy and procedure, and the commitment that he made to the citizens of his district and to this country.

During his time in the House, Gene was an unyielding force whose visionary efforts laid the groundwork to improve our region and the lives of Kentuckians for generations to come. Though a fiscal conservative through and through, he worked tirelessly to bring Federal funds back to Kentucky and the Fourth District.

He did this for one purpose: he understood the value of investment and meaningful infrastructure for economic growth, to lay a foundation for job creation in the future. The key to that is what we see today, areas that were farm fields 25 years ago, 20 years ago, 15 years ago have born the fruits of his investment, the seeds of his vision that were planted in economic development and economic growth that has made this area the Fourth District from the eastern part of Louisville up through northern Kentucky one of the greatest technology growth corridors in the Commonwealth and also in the Ohio Valley.

When my friend Rick Robinson, the new legislative director for Gene's successor, now Senator JIM BUNNING, attended a Congressional Research Service briefing on policy and procedure as a new congressional staffer, he told me recently that many of the examples that were cited by the instructors on parliamentary procedure, on the rules, on the way the House of Representatives works were all centered around Gene Snyder and his efforts, his example of being able to build momentum, his example of being able to force an issue when it was necessary or deter or slow one down and that it was not going to be productive for his party or for the citizens of the Fourth District.

It is rumored that when he would walk into the committee with the Jefferson rules, the rules of the House under one arm, the chairman would simply lean over and ask him, Well, Gene, what do you want this time? As a member of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, he helped secure Federal funding for critical transportation infrastructure in Kentucky.

Some of Gene's projects included the Big Mac Bridge of I–471 from Newport over to Cincinnati dedicated in 1981, Clay Wade Bailey Bridge from Covington to Cincinnati, which opened in 1971. He also secured Federal dollars to protect Bellevue and Dayton from flood waters of the Ohio River. He was responsible for creative engineering to bring about, from a legislative perspective, the construction of the bridge over the Markland Dam.

I would like to highlight his creativity on these for a moment. Gene was a man who built relationships and friendships on both sides of the aisle. He was known for his card games. He was known for a happy hour that he ran out of his office in the days of the old House.

In fact, he told me late one night at his house years ago, the story of how the I–471 bridge came about. He said to me, he said, Geoff, how do you think we got that bridge? Answering as somebody from the outside, I said, Well, I figure you had the studies from the Corps of Engineers and the economic impact and the designs and the budget. He laughed and he said, No, it was the happy hour that got Newport, Kentucky, that bridge.

He told me how Tip O'Neill, who was a good friend of his, would regularly come by, the Speaker of the House, to his office, sit with him, play cards, have an occasional drink. One night he had come by, had a few drinks and sat back in Gene's chair, and the Speaker put his feet up on the desk and said, Gene, you've got your bridge. He built relationships to get results. He built partnerships for success on both sides of the aisle in the House of Representatives.

□ 2115

Markland Lock and Dam is another area that illustrates his creativity in legislation. He made a comment to me on another conversation and he said, you have got to make sure you have

got a legislative director who knows how to read the rules and the laws governing every aspect of projects or investments that you want to make in your district, on guiding legislation that will benefit our citizens. And he cited this as an example. Southern Indiana and the Central Part of the Fourth District near Carrollton and Gallatin County were suffering economically. He was seeking for a way to link that north and south commerce across the river.

What was there was the Markland Lock and Dam, a Corps of Engineers structure that had no bridge. He set his legislative director to work, and his legislative counsel researched for several weeks and came about with an arcane statute from the late 1800s that stated that not a bridge, but an access road could be placed across a Corps of Engineers structure. So laughingly, late in the night he said to me, GEOFF, that is not a bridge down there on the Markland Dam that links Indiana and Kentucky. That is an access road. And if you go and look carefully you will see that.

Well, I drove down there after that conversation just to see for myself, and I started to laugh as I looked and I saw a freestanding bridge simply bolted to the dam. And I think it was is that type of creativity that made a difference, and that dam still today is creating jobs and creating commerce and linking communities on both sides of the Ohio River to the benefit of generations that have come after him.

He secured Federal dollars for a wide variety of projects. Probably the two of his better known legacies are the beltway around Louisville and the Federal courthouse that both bear his name.

Gene was an extremely down-to-earth man. He was without pretense. Literally, what you saw was what you got with him. The only thing that he ever wanted to be named for him was the Federal courthouse in Louisville. This was situated directly across the street from the Louisville Courier Journal, his long time media nemesis and frankly, the media nemesis of Republicans for over a generation. Gene told me that he was thrilled that day and when that opportunity came along, that the editors who so longed to opine against him and his fellow Republicans would have to look at the name of Gene Snyder every day as they left the employees entrance of the Louisville Courier Journal to see the Gene Snyder United States Courthouse.

Ironically, not long after that conversation, one of those editors who was still working for the Courier Journal told me he figured Gene had the building named after himself just to aggravate that specific editor at the Journal.

In 2005, I was proud to carry on the Gene Snyder tradition with a legacy for him to name a new intern fellowship program after him. Working in conjunction with Kentucky University, Northern Kentucky University and Thomas Moore College, my office has had the privilege of bringing talented students interested in politics to work full-time for a semester in Washington, D.C. to see the people's House from the inside, to see that it is not all the writings in a civics book, but it is relationships, it is friendships, it is a process that the Founders gave us to move our government forward and to move the Nation forward.

I thought long and hard about approaching him on the name, and I finally called him and I asked him if I could use his name. And I said, Congressman, we would be honored if we could name this program after you, the Gene Snyder Congressional Internship. He stopped for a moment and he said, well that sounds mighty fine. And then he said, you know, no, GEOFF, you need to name that after yourself. And I was taken aback as a freshman congressman when he said that.

We talked back and forth for a little bit and I finally shared with him that I felt it would be not only somewhat ostentatious and vain for a first time congressman to name an internship program after himself, I just felt it would be inappropriate because of the legacy that Congressman Snyder had. And he stopped and he said, you know, you are right, GEOFF. Naming it after yourself may cause you some problems. So you go ahead and name it after me. I burst out laughing on the phone and I said Congressman, I said Gene, you are just shameless, to which he responded wryly, he said no, GEOFF, I am just looking out for your best interest for the future.

And even today we have Gene Snyder interns working in our office, carrying on the legacy that that man began when he was elected to the Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky in 1966. It is my hope that this program will continue for many years to come and will help foster that spirit of civic service that would make Gene Snyder proud.

In October, 2006, I was part of a historic event that took place in Oldham County, Kentucky during the latter part of my campaign. It was a meeting between Senator JIM BUNNING, Gene Snyder and myself, and it was a humble privilege to be part of the final gathering of three Members of Congress who served the Fourth District of Kentucky. Gene Snyder and Senator BUNNING have been constant encouragers to me and have helped make the Fourth District what it is today.

I am forever in debt to their hard work and service to the commonwealth and to our Nation. To me, the newest person to inherit a piece of this great legacy that Gene gave us, I can share that the highest compliment that I could pay to him is to say that he was real. I became a better campaigner and certainly a better and more effective Member of Congress listening to Gene's advice. In fact, just today we passed our first piece of bipartisan legislation in this new Congress, and I have put the legacy back to the advice that he gave me before I got elected, of building those friendships and those relationships to benefit the people of this country. And I say thank you to Gene Snyder for that legislation that passed today.

At one event when we were together I was trying to talk to him at length because it was just so exciting to see him. In his last years, he was not in good health and was in constant pain and I cherished the few moments that we had. But he leaned on me and he grabbed my arm and leaned over and whispered in my ear he said Geoff, you have got my vote. Now go get theirs, and pushed me towards a crowd of new people that I hadn't talked to yet. Always the campaigner, always the consummate politician, always caring for the stewardship of the office.

As we look at these times and the legacy that was given, I think there is no better person to share a perspective on Gene Snyder than the dean of our delegation. Hal Rogers was elected to Congress in 1980. He knew Gene Snyder during his time coming up in Kentucky politics. He knew him as a colleague here in the House, and many Members have learned from him. And I would like to yield as much time as the gentleman from Kentucky's Fifth District would consume to just share his perspective.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time, and I want to say to him how much I appreciate him taking this Special Order out as the successor to Gene Snyder in that district to allow us to pay tribute to this legendary figure.

I came here in January of 1981, and Congressman Snyder had been here, of course, long before I got here, had been here at that time I guess 14 or so years. But he took me under his arm and taught me many of the same lessons that the gentleman has just referred to. A kind, gentle soul. But when he had a project on his mind you better get out of the way because he was tough, and he knew what he was doing. And he carried in his pocket a list of those who voted against his bill so that if you wanted a favor from Gene Snyder you had better be on his list that he always carried with him. He would always refer to that list when he was thinking about helping his colleagues. And that made him very, very effective.

He was a dear friend and a mentor of all of us. He was particularly helpful to me as a freshman Member of this body. And I was very, very sad to see him leave the body in 1986. But he deserved a retirement. But we never could get him to come back to Washington to see his friends. When he finished his work here, he was finished with his work here and he retired to his home in Florida.

At his funeral last Saturday in Louisville, a beautiful ceremony, Senator MITCH MCCONNELL, the Republican leader in the Senate, from Louisville,

an intern in Gene Snyder's office, that is where he got his start, paid Gene Snyder one of the most beautiful tributes that I think I have ever heard. The eulogy that Senator MCCONNELL gave to Gene Snyder is memorable.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am going to quote that eulogy because it says what I would like to say myself, except it has been said so well by the Senator. So if you will bear with me, I am going to quote the eulogy that Senator MCCONNELL gave at the funeral Saturday.

''Twenty years have passed since Gene Snyder said goodbye to Washington. We gave him back to Pat, and she took good care of him until the end. We honor you, Pat, for your devotion to Gene on the wonderful journey that was marked by much suffering in these last years, and we share your grief.

''Kentucky politics has been known to produce some fine storytellers. Marion Gene Snyder was one of the best. You wouldn't want to share all of these stories with the League of Women Voters, or the Plague of Women Voters as he called it. But when Gene died last week, one of the greatest Kentucky stories of all time came to a close.

''Born in West Louisville to Marion and Lois Snyder, Gene came of age in a time and a place where you worked hard, went to church on Sunday, and always voted democratic. His dad worked a number of jobs to support the family. Gene summed up his childhood like this: I was a poor boy, he said from the other side of the tracks in a cold water flat.

''But what he lacked in privilege he made up for in smarts. Politics called at an early age and Gene responded in the only way he knew how. He gave it everything he had. He enrolled at the University of Louisville, went to law school. He volunteered as precinct captain before he was old enough to vote and he won his first political appointment as Jeffersontown City Attorney in 1954 at the age of 26.

Continuing to read now from Senator MCCONNELL's eulogy at the funeral, he says, ''party officials saw his talents right away, and 8 years later, they tapped him as a candidate for Congress.

''Youth wasn't the only obstacle he faced. Let's not forget that back then, ''conservative'' was a bad word. When Gene was preparing his run, a famous Harvard economist summed up the national mood. These are the years of the liberal, he said. Almost everyone now so describes himself,

''Not Gene. He was conservative before being conservative was cool. And he made no apologies for it. Most people would have excused him for moderating his views until he got his feet under him. But he wasn't the type to bend in the direction of the crowd. He stood still and watched as the rest of the country bent toward him.

Now, continuing from the eulogy that Senator MCCONNELL paid tribute to Gene on Saturday at the funeral, ''he was 35 when he arrived in Washington with the rest of the class of '63. He had a lot to say and a way of saying it. He saw a lot that year. A President assassinated, a new administration and the stirrings of an anti-American counter culture that he would battle, always with good humor, for much of the rest of his life.

''It was a difficult time, but it was exhilarating too. Young conservatives were quietly developing the ideas that would one day drive the political culture in Washington, and men like Gene Snyder, who dared to speak those ideas in a hostile crowd, gave all of them reason to hope.

''Those were the thoughts that were going through my mind at least, Senator MCCONNELL says, when I applied to be an intern in Gene's office after my junior year at U of L. Like most interns, I spent most of that summer in the mailroom. But I was working for a man who knew what he believed. That appealed to me.

''It appealed to me even more when I saw him lose his seat the following year. Most Republicans were running away from their party's presidential nominee, Barry Goldwater. Gene stood still. He embraced Goldwater, even when it was clear that Lyndon Johnson was about to destroy him in the general election. He brushed off the loss with customary good humor. He took out an ad in The Washington Post that read, ''caught in the LBJ landslide. Congressman must sell three bedroom, one and a half bath home on large lot near schools and churches.''

''When a curious reporter called the number on the ad, Gene picked up on the other end. Johnson carried my district by 64,000 votes, he said. I lost by 16,000. That means I was 48,000 ahead of Goldwater.

''I wouldn't have done anything differently in that campaign, he said. I don't think you should rise above principle just to win an election.

''So he came back home, started over and won again 2 years later as a proud conservative. And for the next 20 years the people around Louisville and Northern Kentucky knew they were home when they heard Gene's campaign jingle come over the radio. I think most folks felt the same way about that jingle as the customer who walks on to the screen in that Head-On commercial and says, the commercial is annoying, but the product is great.

''The gentleman from Kentucky made the most of his time in Washington. He threw himself into his work with the enthusiasm of a child. It was a different time. Slower, more congenial, more fun. Gene Snyder was the perfect man for those times.

Now, continuing from the eulogy that Senator MCCONNELL gave at the funeral Saturday, ''the people around here learned the art of politics by watching him lean over fences and shake hands with tobacco farmers in Carrollton.

□ 2130

They learned to enjoy it, too, the way he did, riding up Dixie Highway in a Lincoln car on warm summer nights, stapling his campaign fliers to telephone poles until the sun went down.

''A master of the practical joke, Gene once told a staffer to find a reception room in the Capitol that hadn't been cleaned up from the night before and to bring back the flowers. A little while later, one of the female staffers on the Public Works Committee found the flowers on her desk with a love note. Gene wrote the note, but he signed it with the name of an unsuspecting male staffer.

''His humor even found its way into legislation. The Kennedy Center was supposed to be a self-sustaining institution. But when it couldn't pay its bills, it would ask the Public Works Committee to help out. Gene was the top Republican on that committee, and he didn't like the idea at all. So he introduced a bill proposing Friday night wrestling at the Kennedy Center as a way of boosting ticket sales.

''A visitor to the House of Representatives in the late 1970s might have noticed a large man in a brightly colored sports coat. Gene liked to dress himself when Pat was out of town. Well, C–SPAN put an end to that. One day three worried viewers from Kentucky called Gene's office to say their Congressman was on fire. The camera made his cranberry and orange jacket look like he was engulfed in flames.

''Gene always enjoyed a relaxing atmosphere. After a late night at the Capitol, Members always knew where they could relax or have a drink. The third floor of the Rayburn House Office Building was a good bet. You might find Gene there playing gin rummy with friends or telling a story. You would just follow the laughter.

''By 1979 most of the Nation had moved firmly in Gene's direction. Goldwater finally won his election in the person of Ronald Reagan, and Republican officials in Louisville were excited. I remember because there were about two of us back then, me and Gene. We announced our support for Reagan together, and Kentucky voters would give our 40th President their endorsement a year later.''

Now, continuing from the eulogy that Senator MCCONNELL gave at the funeral Saturday:

''Gene's good humor was matched by his skills as a lawmaker, though he didn't like to admit it. 'I'm a lawyer,' he'd say, 'but not enough to hurt.'

''Yet anyone who worked with him knew he was one of the great parliamentarians of his day, someone who brought a staggering knowledge of the rules to the Public Works Committee and a lot of good things back to Kentucky.

''He was instrumental in building the Jefferson County Floodwall, the Markland Dam Bridge, the Clay Wade Bailey Bridge in Covington, and the Banklick Creek Watershed Flood Control

Project. He was responsible for the Dayton Floodwall; the Falls of the Ohio Wildlife Conservation Area; the renovation of the Louisville Post Office and the Louisville Courthouse; and a new terminal at Standiford Field; new bridges in Covington and Newport; the Gene Snyder Airport at Falmouth; and, of course, the freeway. That is what Gene called it anyway. Just the freeway.

''Gene embodied the old rule that Members of Congress should be friends after 5 o'clock. He was a committed conservative, but even liberal Members lined up to thank him in his last days in Washington. One of them had this to say: 'Gene Snyder has been devoted to building things like bridges across rivers and streams, but he has also devoted himself to devoting goodwill among people.'

''When the last staffer turned off the lights and pulled the door shut on Gene's Capitol Hill office, an era in Washington ended. The people in the Fourth District saw a lot more of him and Pat. The members of Owl Creek Country Club would hear his stories now. The people at Concordia Lutheran saw him quite a bit.

''But Washington would miss, and still misses, his common touch, his lack of pretense, his principle.

''Age and illness would take their toll in the last years of Gene's remarkable life, but his humor remained. Old friends would call just to hear the recordings on his answering machine.

''But now death has done its work, and a great American story comes to an end. Yet we know it continues. This husband, father, lawmaker, mentor, and friend goes to the Father's house now.

''We take comfort in trusting him to the Lord of Mercy, who tells us that in the life to come, every question will be answered. Every tear wiped away. And we look forward to the day when we see Marion Gene Snyder again, upright, restored in body, healthy and strong, reaching across the fence to take our hands.''

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the eulogy that Senator MITCH MCCONNELL of Kentucky, the senior Senator from Kentucky, the Republican leader in the Senate, as he delivered the eulogy to our friend Gene Snyder Saturday at the funeral in Louisville. I read the eulogy because I could not say it any better.

Gene Snyder was a legend in his own time. He is a legendary Member of this body. He was one of the most powerful Members of this body for many years. But beneath that sometimes publicly crusted personality was that warm, gentle spirit and warm, gentle heart; that helpful person who reached out a hand to help those who needed it, whether it be a Member of Congress or a person back home looking for help on a Social Security claim or a veteran's pension or the like.

We won't see his kind again, unfortunately, but I am glad that I had the honor and privilege of knowing Gene Snyder for many, many years, listening to his advice, laughing at his stories, and enjoying the companionship that we did. God rest his soul.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Congressman ROGERS, I think you captured the emotion and the power of that funeral, the eulogies, the reminiscences that brought so many to laughter. Sitting with Gene and Pat Snyder was always a wonderful journey back to the old House in the days before C–SPAN, before 24-hour news cycles, before multimillion dollar campaigns.

The one thing that struck me about him when I first met him was his complete lack of pretense. As a young man, I couldn't believe this was a Congressman, compared to the image that one would have on TV, somebody so approachable, so transparent, and his great gift of humor. He could teach with humor. He could scold with humor and make his point very clearly. He was a man who built friendships that transcended partisan differences.

As Congressman ROGERS mentioned from Senator MCCONNELL's eulogy, one of his great friends in the House was Congressman Carl Perkins, who represented what is now the western part of the Fourth District, centered in Ashland, Kentucky, in Boyd County. He and Carl Perkins could fight on the floor, fight in the hallways on issues, but at 5 o'clock they were friends, and they were strong friends committed to the Commonwealth, committed to the future of Kentucky.

He was a strong leader. And probably the highest compliment that I could pay him is that he was real. And that fact is never lost on those who knew him. Those who were his foes in legislation had tremendous respect for him and invariably they liked him.

The real fruit in a person's life comes from the seeds that are sowed in many lives, the fruit that is born from that. I think of several names to mention here that come to mind. Congressman ROGERS shared his perspective on Gene's influence in his life. I have shared mine on his influence on me. My wife, Pat, and I used to live in La Grange, Kentucky, down near the Louisville suburbs. My first campaign chairman in Olden County was Harold Smith. Harold Smith, as a young attorney in 1966, managed Gene's first campaign for Congress in the Fourth District, and then he helped manage my first campaign for Congress in 2002 and then again in 2004 and again in 2006. I think about that legacy of friendship and how he reached out and was known by so many in the community.

Another was his staff director on the Public Works Committee, Mike Toohey, who also was with us on Saturday. Mike left government at the time that Gene retired and had a long and distinguished career in government relations, helping Ashland Oil, later Ashland Inc., to reach out and communicate its needs and the needs of our citizens in Kentucky legislatively and was a great friend to the Commonwealth and was also one of those products of Gene's influence and his mentorship.

Another was Joe Whittle, who met Gene the first time in 1975 when he was running for attorney general in Kentucky at a time that it wasn't cool for Republicans to be running on a statewide ticket. Gene called him up on the phone. Joe was a little taken aback to get a phone call from the famed Congressman Gene Snyder, but he invited him to come up to meet him in Louisville and then drive up to Northern Kentucky to give a talk at the Beverly Hills Supper Club to a large group of Republicans there. When Gene got up to introduce Joe Whittle, he used his humor to make that strong point about how he had sized up Joe's character, and he said, This is Joe Whittle. He is a lawyer but not enough to hurt. And they instantly became friends and were close and intimate friends until a week ago when Gene left this Earth. Later Joe Whittle became the United States Attorney for Western Kentucky.

The investment that Gene made in so many lives has transcended their immediate impact and gone to other generations.

Anne Gernstein, who is now the chairman of the Olden County Republican Party, was his office manager at his office in Louisville. And before I first met Gene, I met Anne. She was helping with the local campaign, and I walked in the door as a new volunteer, just wanting to get involved in politics, and I would have never thought at that time that I would have the great honor and privilege to follow in the legacy of that great man.

Gene, we will miss your humor and that twinkle in your eye right before you are about to spring a joke on someone.

To Pat and the children, thank you for sharing this great man with us. Your hospitality and kindness are remembered by so many that you have touched throughout the years.

Gene Snyder left an indelible imprint on Kentucky and our country. With his passing, Kentucky has lost, and the Nation has lost, a great leader and a true statesman; but his legacy continues to live on.

THE 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to address the House.

And to my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, it sounds like our past colleague Mr. SNYDER and his family served our country well, and we appreciate his contributions to our country in serving in public service.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, this is the first night of business, returning back from the Presidents Day break. Before we left we had a week-long debate on the question of Iraq, a nonbinding resolution opposing the troop escalation that the President has put forth at this time.

And the discussion continues, Mr. Speaker, as we start, Democrats and Republicans, molding out the direction that we have to head in in this country. The American people, Mr. Speaker, voted for change and a new direction. And to bring about that kind of change and new direction, there are going to have to be some votes here on this floor that are going to speak volumes back home of how we are going to proceed from this point on and how we are going to assist our men and women in harm's way and how we are going to deal with this issue in Iraq and in Afghanistan and other domestic issues that we have here.

I am very pleased to not only share with the Members, Mr. Speaker, but also with the American people the fact that 246 Members of the House voted in the affirmative to disagree with the President as it relates to the recent troop escalation of some 20,000 combat troops and anywhere from 3,000 to 4,000 support personnel being sent to Iraq, which was announced by the President on January 10 of this year.

□ 2145

I think it is very, very important to note that that was a nonbinding resolution. Even though it was nonbinding, it really set the course for the Congress to play a role.

I think the reason why we are in the majority, and when I say ''we,'' the Democrats are in the majority right now, Mr. Speaker, is not the fact that our message was better than the Republican message in the last election. I think the American people were counting on change and heading in a new direction.

So it is important, and I am encouraging the Members in a bipartisan way, that we work very hard to give the American people what they want and to give the men and women in uniform what they need. I think that is a Congress having oversight hearings; a Congress debating the issues as it relates to troop readiness; a Congress that is willing to take the tough votes when they need to be taken; to be able to provide the kind of leadership from the congressional oversight end.

The President is the commander-in-chief. That is outlined in the Constitution. No one is really trying to bother that or hinder that. We just want to make sure that the troops have what they need when they go into harm's way, need it be Iraq or Afghanistan.

I mentioned a little earlier in my talk about readiness. I think it is important that we identify this, because it is used a lot here on the floor. Being a member of the Armed Services Committee and having had an opportunity to travel to Iraq twice, and looking forward to going back soon and going to Afghanistan and other areas where we have a military presence, readiness is very, very important.

Readiness is almost like if you have an illness and you are going in for a major operation, you want to make sure that that doctor has what he or she needs to be able to carry out your procedure.

I think it is important as we look at our National Guard and we look at our Reservists and we look at our active duty that they have what they need to carry out the mission if they are sent to Iraq. You can't go unless you have up-armored Humvees that are going to match the mission. You should not go and we should not send them if they don't have the Kevlar vests that they need. They should not go and we should not send them if they don't have the kind of backing that they need from a support standpoint that is trained and ready for the mission in Baghdad, need it be door-to-door searches, need it be guerilla warfare, need it be the general equipment one may need to carry out that mission.

There is nothing wrong with the word ''readiness.'' I put it in the category, Mr. Speaker, of responsibility. I think it is important. I think it is irresponsible for us to send men and women into harm's way without the necessary tools that they need.

Now, there are some Members that are saying, well, why do you have Members concerned? A colonel told us or the President told us or I read somewhere in a news release or I saw on the news that they have everything they need, and why would we send them over there in the first place? We all have their best interests at heart.

I am going to share with Members, Mr. Speaker, that being a member of the Armed Services Committee in the last two Congresses and this Congress too, I have seen the Secretary of Defense say they have what they need. ''Anything the troops need, we will give it to them.'' And later I will pick up a news account that they don't have what they need, or go to Walter Reed and talk to a soldier that ended up being blown up in a Humvee because of an improvised explosive device, because that Humvee did not have the up-armor that it needed. It is the total opposite of what I hear here on Capitol Hill and what I have seen at Walter Reed.

Let's take Walter Reed out. I have gone to Germany, Mr. Speaker. I have seen service men and women without legs. They didn't have what they needed. We were told they had what they needed, but they didn't have it.

Just 2 weeks ago, last week during the debate, I think it was on Tuesday or Wednesday, I was at the White House for a meeting and we had an opportunity to ask the President questions and I had an opportunity to ask the President a question. And I shared with the President, we talked the nonbinding resolution. The President agreed he thought that it would pass here on the floor because the votes were there. He has people that are counting these votes.

I said, ''Mr. President, I think it is important as we look at this as being a nonbinding resolution, there will be a binding resolution or a binding supplemental, emergency supplemental for the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, and there will be language in there, and you shouldn't have a problem with it, to say that we should not send the troops unless they are ready. I am not talking about mentally, I am talking about having the equipment they need to carry out the mission and not find themselves in harm's way without having the kind of backing that they need to be able to carry out the mission once again.''

Of course, the President came back in a very roaring voice saying, ''KENDRICK, do you believe that I would send men and women into harm's way? I hear about the funerals. I write the letters and I call the families. You believe that I would do that?''

I don't believe that the President would do that. But let me just share this with you: It has happened, and I think it is important that we realize that it is happening.

Yes, if I am talking to a friend of mine and they are saying, well, you know, I know there have been reports of the new car that I bought, that it has some sort of problem with the engine that has come out in the auto report or what have you, but I am going to be okay regardless.

Maybe it is not the best analogy that I can come up with at this point, but we have been told that the troops have what they need, we have been told they are ready for the mission that they are being sent to, and we found out otherwise later.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it gives me no pleasure, and Members, it gives me no pleasure, we are at 3,154 men and women in uniform that are dead now. We appreciate their contributions to our country and we appreciate the way that they have applied themselves on behalf of what we sent them over to do. But I will tell you standing here as a Member of Congress, that some of these deaths could have been prevented if they had what they needed.

Now, Members can go back and forth on how you feel about leadering up, manning up and womaning up to be able to do what you need to do as a Member of Congress to fight on behalf of these individuals. I am not questioning anyone's patriotism. I am not questioning anyone's integrity. I am not even questioning any Member of Congress' will or desire to make sure that we give the troops what they need.

I believe we all are well-intended. But we have to make sure that when that man or woman leaves their family on a tarmac, need it be at an active duty military camp or at a commercial airport where you have Reserve and

National Guard individuals that are leaving to go into harm's way, it is our duty and our responsibility as Members of Congress that have oversight of the taxpayer dollars to make sure, even though someone has said it is going to be okay, but to make sure that they have what they need. It is that simple.

So, I was not shocked, Mr. Speaker, by seeing the bipartisan vote before we left on President's break. I am definitely not a prophet and I am not a psychic, but I knew, based on the message from the American people, Democrats and Republicans, I am not just talking about proud Democrats kind of got together and said hey, let's do this. We don't have 246 Members here in this House on the majority right now, so it took 17 Republicans to come along with Democrats or to be with Democrats or to be with individuals that understood that message last November from the American people.

As far as I am concerned, in the 30-something Working Group, we don't focus on issues, ''let's go to the floor and make sure we gain a greater majority.'' Not when it comes to national security. Not when it comes to the very heartbeats and the way of life of those individuals that put their lives on the line and those that have put their lives on the line in the past, and I am going to talk about them a little later, Mr. Speaker.

You don't play politics with that. That is national security. That is someone's daddy, that is someone's mother, that is someone's son, that is someone's daughter that may not come home because someone told someone else in Washington, D.C. that it was going to be okay.

Now, there are a lot of folks around here editorializing on what Mr. MURTHA is talking about from Pennsylvania, who is an outstanding Member of the Congress and also happens to be the chairman of the Defense Appropriations subcommittee.

I think it is important that we look at someone who is a decorated Marine, that has fought for us to salute one flag, who served in Congress double digit years, that still is willing to serve this country. We have someone that is willing to say I voted for the war, as Mr. MURTHA did, and to say that I have been to Iraq, I have had oversight hearings, and I must add that he has had more oversight hearings since this Congress has been active in the last 2 months than they had in the entire 109th Congress with 2 years combined and then some.

And that the committee is hard at work to make sure that when those family members look at those men and women that are going into harm's way, that they know, not maybe, not, well, you know, I am trying to get there.

I heard what the President said. I heard what the Secretary of Defense said. I even heard a member of the brass say it. When they go out on patrol, and I am not a military person and I am not going to represent myself as someone who has served in uniform. I have just been a State trooper and I have been an elected official for 13 years, and I have served here in this Congress for the last 4 years and a couple of months. And I have been federalized by the people that elected me from the Seventeenth Congressional District.

I will tell you this: I know what my job is, and I know what Mr. MURTHA's job is, and I know what the job of all of the Members of Congress, including the Members of the Senate and the President of the United States and the people that he appoints, that we need to make sure, we need to make sure beyond 100 percent, we need to make sure 160 percent, if we can, 200 percent, that those men and women that go into war, that their chance to come back to this country the way they left is our paramount duty.

So, I am not really tied up in a debate, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think here on this side of the aisle and even some of the Members on the other side of the aisle are tied up in the debate about the details of the obvious.

The obvious is, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the troops should have what they need when they go into harm's way. Why are we even talking about that? Why are some Members objecting to that being in the emergency supplemental, to say that they should have what they need to go into war? If it wasn't so serious, it would be funny. So I think the Members, we need to kind of put that to the side and say that there are other issues that we have to deal with.

Profiteering of the war, reams and reams of paper, Inspector General reports of how U.S. contractors have been fleecing of the U.S. taxpayer dollar. Our paramount, one of our fiscal paramount responsibilities is to make sure that the Federal tax dollar is not only appropriated, but disseminated in the right way to make sure that ultimate accountability is paramount once again.

So I am excited about what is happening here, Mr. Speaker, I am excited about the debate that is taking place, and I am excited about the forward progress that we are making in that area.

I just want to address one more thing before I turn it over to my colleague, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Mr. Speaker, I was very disturbed last week and have been disturbed, and here in the 30-Something Working Group, we have been talking quite a bit about our veterans. Now, I mentioned that a little earlier because the veterans, we say we are the 30-something Working Group. A lot of those veterans are 30-something now. Many of them are even 20-something, because of their service. Some of them are 40 and 50-something. And they are coming back.

In the last Congress, in the 109th and 108th, those were the only two Congresses I can account for, because beyond that it was my mother serving here, and I am pretty sure that I can get a good account from her about what happened or I can research in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we have Members coming to the floor chest-beating, ''Oh, I support the men and women in uniform and our veterans, and I am going to be in the veterans parade and I am going to wave and carry on and I am going to let them know that I love them.''

Well, let me just say this: In the 108th and the 109th Congresses, veteran benefits were cut, period. They were cut. And as we continue to talk about it, as we continue to dissect the President's budget, this document here, as we continue to dissect this budget here, find out what is in it and what is not in it, what is going to be given to the American people and what is going to be taken away, we are going to find out where this administration falls and the old majority in this House falls on the issue of veterans.

□ 2200

Now, I can speak, and I know we can speak, in a very bold voice when we talk about our commitment to veterans. I have a veterans hospital in my district. I have actually two. When I go and visit, I look at those men and women. They could have served back in Korea, World War II. I even met a gentleman who served in Grenada, Haiti, 82nd Airborne. You have these individuals that are there. Vietnam, that are there. Some folks may not know that they served, but we know they served.

Our responsibility in Congress is not to just carry on and talk about how we support the men and women in uniform and those who have served, and we honor them and we appreciate them; but I think it is important that we speak with our dollars and our commitment here as Members of Congress.

In January of 2003, the Bush administration cuts off veterans health care for 164,000 veterans. That is on our Web site.

March 2003, the Republican budget cuts $14 billion from veterans health care. That was passed by Congress with 199 Democrats voting against that measure of cutting the $14 billion.

In March 2004, the Republican budget shortchanged veterans health care again by $1.5 billion. That was passed by the Congress, 201 Democrats voting against that measure.

March 2005, President Bush's budget shortchanges veterans health care again by more than $2 billion. Again, 201 Democrats voted against that. This was House Resolution 95. The vote number was 98.

In the 30-Something Working Group, we actually pull information from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think it is important that Members and the American people realize that.

Again, November 2005, the Bush administration as it relates to the shortfall, Democrats fought that summer to be able to get back the $2.7 billion that was taken out. And we have a member

of the Appropriations Committee here, but in the last continuing resolution because the Republicans did not do their job, Mr. Speaker, in making sure that the work was done when the Democratic Congress took over, they couldn't get all of the bills passed. They just kept punting down the street. In our continuing resolution, we retooled Members' projects and other nonissues that weren't a priority because of the thirst that veterans have and the Department of Veterans has to provide the services for our men and women that serve. The Democrats increased the VA health care budget by $3.6 billion in a joint funding resolution. I say all of that to indicate it is important that we do this.

One last point. While we were on break, The Washington Post: ''Soldiers face neglect and frustration at Army top medical facility'' here in Washington, D.C., Walter Reed Hospital. This is a Washington Post article, Sunday, February 18, 2007. It was dropped here on my doorstep in Washington, D.C. I read this, and it was a follow-up article. I think it is important that the American people and Members of Congress pay close attention to what is happening.

You have patients and outpatients that are saying that Walter Reed, they are encountering a messy bureaucratic battlefield that reminds them of the real one that they faced overseas.

It also talks in this article about rats and mice and dead insects in this hospital. Smells and carpet stains.

Again, Mr. Speaker, our job, yes, we say we support the troops. Yes, we say we support veterans. We are supposed to say that. But when we come here and we take our voting card out and we go to these committees, we have to make sure that we follow through on what we say.

So I am excited by the fact that by reading everything that I have read about what has happened in the last two Congresses and beyond, that we have already put $3.6 billion, and we haven't had a full cycle to be able to even dissect the budget and to appropriate. So saying that, I want to pass it over to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), a good friend of mine. I am glad she is here to shed light on our message here tonight.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much. It is a pleasure to join my 30-something colleagues, Mr. MEEK and Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. MEEK, you started talking about the travesty that was revealed by The Washington Post just before last weekend about what is going on at Walter Reed Medical Center and the campus and its facilities.

I had the privilege of going to visit our men and women that are at Walter Reed who have come back from Iraq injured. Almost every soldier I met with was an amputee and went through a devastating experience, devastating injury. But the ward that they take you through, like this article says, is spit-polished and brand-spanking clean. There is not a shadow of what is described in this third-party validator, which is how we refer to our information that we bring out here to demonstrate the facts.

I want to read just a paragraph from the article. I want to highlight some of the things, and we have been joined by our good friend Mr. ALTMIRE from Pennsylvania.

This article hit me like a ton of bricks: ''Life beyond the hospital bed,'' and this is what is going on at Walter Reed that is not what they show us as Members of Congress and that they show the President and Vice President about what is going on at Walter Reed. ''Life beyond the hospital bed is a frustrating mountain of paperwork. The typical soldier is required to file 22 documents with eight different commands, most of them off post, to enter and exit the medical processing world, according to government investigators. Sixteen different information systems are used to process the forms, but few of them can communicate with one another. The Army's three personnel databases cannot read each other's files and can't interact with the separate pay system or the medical record keeping databases. The disappearance of necessary forms and records is the most common reason soldiers languish at Walter Reed longer than they should,'' and it goes on.

That is just unbelievable. A mountain of red tape and bureaucracy is what our troops come back to the United States to and have to deal with. I thought we well established after 9/11 that interoperability and communication between systems was an obstacle that was intolerable.

How could we allow this to happen and just let our veterans, who fought for us so valiantly, and the analogy I will make is while our troops might not come home, and thank good they are not coming home to the same reaction as our Vietnam veterans came home to, how is this not as bad? It is actually worse, in a way, because instead of just having to suffer the wrath of their fellow Americans, which was a travesty and certainly hurtful and harmful, instead they come home and suffer the wrath of their government, the benign wrath of their government. ''Benign'' meaning not specifically intended to harm, but it is like death by a thousand cuts.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. If the gentlelady would yield for a moment, let us also think about what this message is to those that would sign up for this volunteer military force being sent to defend our country overseas. Not only is this unconscionable to those who have sacrificed everything to fight for this country in Afghanistan and Iraq, but think about those who we are asking to join the Armed Forces. We don't have a draft any more, and many people are thankful for that. We rely on the decisions by courageous men and women across this country to join voluntarily our Armed Forces.

So when they see people coming back from these wars, being treated without the basic dignity that any of us would expect those men and women to be treated with, I would think, I hope it doesn't, but I would think it might give pause to those that would join our military.

So I think of this from a point of conscience deep inside me, and I also think about it from a standpoint of national security. What kind of signal are we sending to those who are going to be the next generation of troops when this is how we treat them when they come back.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you. That is a very important and valid point.

I want to read a quote, and that quote is this: ''So let's get something straight right now. To point out that our military has been overextended, taken for granted and neglected, that is no criticism of the military, that is a criticism of the President and Vice President and their record of neglect.''

Who do you think said that? I will tell you who said that, George W. Bush, as a candidate, said that on November 3, 2000, in an interview on CNN.

I think it is pretty clear that he was right almost 7 years ago, and it is just sad that he didn't mean it. It is sad that he didn't actually do anything more than say those words instead of taking to heart what he supposedly believed at the time and making sure that it didn't happen when he became President.

Clearly Walter Reed, the lack of body armor and preparation and training that we are sending, that we have been sending and he was willing to send our troops over to Iraq and Afghanistan without, is clearly still something that he is willing to do. Unfortunately, all the President has been is a candidate who spews words with really not too much meaning behind them. It looks like Mr. ALTMIRE would like to say something.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida and the 30-something Working Group.

I was in my office doing some work after the district work period, and I heard the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) speaking on veterans and the problems at Walter Reed. I had to come down here and join in the conversation, and I appreciate your offer to do so.

I want to tell you about a few things that happened in my district back home. I had several meetings with organizers and folks in the veterans community in my district. I toured a VA hospital that is undergoing a major expansion. As we were doing this throughout the week last week, the articles from The Washington Post about what was happening at Walter Reed appeared.

I have to tell you that the veterans community in my district, and I am sure in other districts around the country, my veterans were outraged at what was happening there because

there has been a lot of talk during the debate on Iraq and other forums that certain individuals are not supporting the troops and not displaying the right commitment to the troops, and there is a partisan affiliation with that. But I want to tell you, we have a situation taking place at Walter Reed where we have veterans returning from Iraq and from Afghanistan, as has been pointed out, with severe injuries. These are 19 and 20 year olds, with severe, long-term, lifelong injuries. These are the people that we are talking about when we are having the debate on Iraq and Afghanistan and who is supporting the troops and who is not.

I would leave it to others to determine who is at fault here. That is not what this is all about. What this is about is protecting our veterans and finding a way to improve the system.

I have to say I shared the outrage of the veterans in my communities when I heard about these articles because these are the people that are fighting for us overseas that are in harm's way, and the situation in Iraq and Afghanistan is going to be the subject of another debate coming up on funding and we are going to hear some rhetoric thrown around I am sure on this floor and other places about support of our troops and who has been supportive of our troops.

As the gentlewoman from Florida knows, during the debate on the budget, the continuation resolution, I was one who pushed very hard for increased funding for our Nation's veterans. I want to say that our leadership was able to put in $3.6 billion in funding increases for the VA health system. I have said many times, and I will say it here again tonight, Mr. Speaker, that I will never support a budget bill that does not fund the VA health system to maintain the current level of services every year that that budget funds.

□ 2215

They have been neglected for far too long, and we have seen what has happened at Walter Reed. We have seen the situation as outlined in great detail, and I do want to commend The Washington Post for the job that they did in putting forward these facts because these are things that needed to be known.

We have a backlog in the VA of 400,000 cases. A 400,000-case backlog in the VA health care system. Mr. Speaker, that is just unacceptable in this time.

So I will yield back, but I did want to say that I was in my office, and I just could not resist the opportunity to come down one more time and say that I share the frustration of the Members here, the 30-something Working Group, on this issue because I personally am a little bit tired of the rhetoric that certain people are not supporting the troops. I agree that there are people who are not supporting the troops, and I will leave it to others to determine who that is, but I do not think that that has a place in the debate when we have a situation at Walter Reed that has been outlined. We have a budget situation where we have not funded our veterans as we should have in past years, but we are going to make up for it with this year's budget and continuing budgets.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ALTMIRE. Your veterans in your district and veterans across this country have you to thank, along with others, that you helped rally to the cause to make sure that the continuing resolution that we passed here, which is effectively the Act that keeps the government operating, that provides the resources to different agencies, including the Veterans Administration, you made sure that that bill had the proper resources in it for our veterans.

Here is the good news. We are talking about what is past and we also have to talk about the prologue as well. A new sheriff is in town, and the good news for veterans and for the American people is that we are going to make those investments in veterans health care. We are going to change things in this Congress. Mr. ALTMIRE and I ran in part to make those changes, and Mr. MEEK and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ stood up here night after night after night making the case for that change.

If the American people spoke out about many things, one of them certainly was that part of our change in foreign policy had to be doing justice to those veterans. So I hope that when people hear us talk about some of the bad things happening within our veterans system here, they understand that we are only saying it because we are part of the movement which is going to change that.

The Disabled Veterans of America were in my office today, and they shared with me a pretty remarkable statistic, and I hope I get it right. In previous foreign conflicts, the ratio of those killed to those that were wounded in battle was 3 to 1 wounded to killed in action. In this conflict, it is 16 to 1. Now, that is great news, that we have made advances in protection for our soldiers, in armor, in the ability of our medical professionals to intervene on the battlefield that we are saving that many lives. It is a tragedy that one is lost, never mind the 3,000.

The stress, though, that that puts on our system is a great one. We have more and more wounded, more severely wounded coming into our hospitals, and it means that we have to step up to meet that new obligation. We are so lucky to have people coming back that can still go on to lead productive lives, but only if we provide them with those resources.

The other story that they told me was of the number of young soldiers just back from this war who are ending up in in-patient care in our State veterans hospitals, those that have been afflicted not just by the physical wounds, but by the mental wounds as well.

Our obligation has to be not just to treat the broken bones, the damaged bodies, but also to the mental stress that these brave men and women have come back with.

I just want to talk for a minute about who we are talking about here, because we have fought previous battles in a very different way. We have relied largely on our enlisted men and women to fight these wars, and I think we need to remember who we are asking to go over to Iraq and to Afghanistan to fight because no longer is it just our enlisted men.

We are treating our National Guard basically like they are our normal Army today. Sometimes we forget that. It is good we are the 30-something Working Group here because sometimes young people that have only seen this conflict think that that is how things are, that the National Guard and the Reserve are sort of like everybody else and they get sent over there, and that is what they signed up for. Well, that is not what they signed up for. That is not how we have conducted our military interventions in the past.

We have zero active duty or Reserve brigades in the United States right now that are considered combat ready. We have 84,000 members of the National Guard and Reserve that have been deployed two times or more since 2001. The average mobilization for a Reserve or National Guard member is 18 months, and now, as we are learning that the President is once again going to rely on National Guard forces to be part of this new escalation in Iraq, we are finding out that these forces, as they get ready in their hometowns and their home States, are not even close to combat ready in terms of the equipment they need.

The Oklahoma National Guard reports that one-third of their members do not have the M–4 rifles.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. On that point, just to focus on the National Guard and how correct you are about how they are being treated versus what they signed up for, there are now 14,000 National Guard troops being deployed earlier than they were originally scheduled to meet the demands of the President's proposed plans to escalate the war.

National Guard and Army units are being called up sooner than previously scheduled, and that is even though some of these units do not have the equipment that they need. They do not have the training, and some of them are having to go over there foregoing the training.

Mr. MEEK and I are going to be meeting with our general, who is in charge of our National Guard in Florida very soon. I just saw the request today, and I am looking forward to meeting with him. I met with him in my district in Florida as well last year, and the conversations that I have had with him and with others about the condition of the equipment, not just the condition of the equipment that is going over

there, but what happens to the equipment once it comes back because we are not replacing the equipment and sending them new equipment after it has been through 5, 6 years of an Iraq War.

So the equipment that they are working on and that they are utilizing has been through war literally. I mean, we are not making sure that they have the equipment that they need. We are sending them over there two, three and four times now.

When I went to Walter Reed a couple of weeks ago, every single guy I met had been through three tours, three. One of the guys I met, his little boy was there, and literally his dad had been on three tours. His little boy was six, which means that this dad missed half of his child's life already, half. I mean, that is just inexcusable. That is not what our volunteers sign up for. I mean, even if you signed up for the regular standing Army, it is unreasonable to expect that they would have to have that kind of pressure, physical, mental, emotional pressure put on them as well as their families, especially in the middle of the situation in a war that we are involved in under dubious circumstances to begin with.

I do not know if Mr. MEEK wants to jump in here now, but he is still sitting so I imagine not. So I will go back to Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. We are talking about the best of the best. If anyone was able to operate and achieve under the strain, it is the men and women in our Armed Forces, and so we expect a lot of them because we know the training they have been through. We know the kind of people they are, but we have asked so much of them that we can ask very little more.

We do differentiate at some level between our enlisted men and our National Guard and Reserve troops, and I think it is appropriate because when you are talking about them, you are talking about ripping somebody out of a family, out of a community.

These are not just fathers and mothers. These are small businessmen. These are employees. These are employers. These are members of the PTA. These are members of the Elks Club. These are people who hold communities together. That is the type of people that our members of the Armed Forces are. Those people that sign up for the Reserve and National Guard do that because they have this commitment to their community, and it does not end with their commitment to their military service. They are part of the community in ways that a lot of other people are not.

So when you talk about bringing people out two or three times to serve in the Reserve and National Guard, you are breaking up families and communities. That is why we had an enlisted service.

I think one of the discussions that we will have going forward, and one that I think will be bipartisan agreement on, as there has been with most everything we have done here, is that we need to have an honest conversation about increasing the troop strength of our military, increasing numbers of troops that are enlisted and doing this as a permanent job, because it has gotten to the end of the limit of a lot of the people who are serving in our National Guard and our Reserve.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I would add to that, the gentleman from Connecticut has eloquently outlined the types of people that we are talking about, that find themselves in this situation in our veterans hospitals. We are talking about people who really are American heroes. These are the best and brightest of our society. These are people who have left their families, as the gentlewoman from Florida has outlined. They have left their children. They are taking three, sometimes more, four tours, and they come back home.

They find themselves in a military hospital. They find themselves backlogged on waiting lists. It takes 6 months to 2 years to access your health benefits at the VA. This is shameful treatment for people who are our heroes in this country. We need to have a national commitment to supporting our veterans.

These are people who put their lives on the line for us. These are people who have left their family, as we have talked about, and we have had a situation in recent years where we had not given them the help that they need on the VA health side. We have made a commitment in the new Congress that we are going to make up for that as we have talked about.

But I do want to make clear that everyone in this House realizes, both Republican and Democrat, that these are the heroes of our society. Nobody is going to argue with that. These are folks that we applaud them for their efforts. We thank them and we cannot show our gratitude in any more forceful way than to give them the funding that they need when they come back home and find themselves in a VA health care facility or receiving treatment at the veterans facility, even on an outpatient basis.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I want to follow up on what you are saying and emphasize and demonstrate what we are doing to our best, and I do mean doing to our best and brightest once they have come back. You have been an eloquent champion of our veterans.

I think it is important to recall a private conversation that you and I had on the floor during the run-up to the adoption of the supplemental. It happens that I am a member of the whip team, and you were my assignment that day. I had an opportunity to talk to you about whether we could count on your support for the supplemental and how important it was.

Your answer, which was the appropriate answer, was, well, Debbie, the answer is no, unless you can assure me that there was an increase for veterans health care. Because at that moment, I could not assure you because I did not have the information at my fingertips, I had to get back to you and was proud to be able to report that we did provide a significant increase that we were able to bump up beyond the continuing resolution significantly the health care we are providing to our veterans. But it is to your constituents' credit and the veterans that you represent that you do that.

But let us just go through some facts that we know. The percentage of Army servicemembers receiving medical retirement and permanent disability benefits back in 2001 was 10 percent. The percentage of the same Army servicemembers receiving medical retirement and permanent disability benefits in 2005 down to 3 percent. Army Reservists receiving medical retirement and permanent disability in 2001, 16 percent; same group in 2005, 5 percent.

Let us go to the case backlog at the Veterans Administration on new benefit claims in fiscal year 2006. 400,000-case backup. This is from the Army Times, third party validator. Average length of time veterans wait before receiving monthly benefits, 6 months to 2 years. That was in the Los Angeles Times.

The number of soldiers at Walter Reed navigating the medical and physical evaluation process since 2001 has doubled. The average length of time it takes for Army soldiers to convalesce and go through the military medical and physical evaluations, nine to 15½ months.

□ 2230

The increase in the Army's physical disability caseload since 2001, 80 percent. The number of veterans from the global war on terror expected to enter the military and veterans health care systems in the coming years, 700,000. And I will just read the quote again from Candidate Bush: ''So let's get something straight right now. To point out that our military has been overextended, taken for granted, and neglected, that's no criticism of the military; that is the criticism of a President and a Vice President and their record of neglect.''

Well, it sure is. And these statistics from the time that this President has been in the office are evidence of that.

I would be happy to yield to one of the three gentlemen here.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank you, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I just want to bring up one other topic here as well before we yield back to Mr. MEEK, and that is also, when we ask our men and women to go over there and fight, and then when they come home and they are not taken care of, we also need to remember who we are sending over there, our Reservists and National Guard, but who is joining them over there. This is a tangential but important topic. President Bush has talked a lot about this coalition of the willing, and we need to understand

that the American people, when they hear about the allied forces over there, know who they are now, because people are jumping ship faster than the evening news can keep up with it. Great Britain, Poland, Lithuania, South Korea. By the week, somebody else walks away. And as we make decisions in Iraq, like this plan for escalation in which there is not even a pretext of reaching out and forming some international consensus, remember when we went into Iraq in the first place, at least we tried to pretend that we were going to go through some international decision-making process. At least we sort of gave some faint illusion of using the United Nations as a forum for which to have this discussion. You didn't even hear a conversation about trying to reach out to our allies with this plan to escalate this war. I mean, we didn't. Because why? Because we knew if we asked Great Britain or Poland or South Korea or Lithuania to be part of this force, the answer would be pretty simple.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If the gentleman would yield for a question. It is somewhat rhetorical, but if you know the answer, feel free to tell me what it is. Do you know what percentage of the troops that are over in Iraq that we will have as a Nation once Great Britain pulls out?

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. If you sort of listen to the rhetoric coming out of the administration, you would think this grand coalition has, what, 50 percent American troops, 60 percent, 70 percent, 80 percent? No. Ninety-two percent. Ninety-two percent of the troops on the ground in Iraq are American forces. We went from a high of coalition troops, those are non-American troops, of 25,000, and now down to almost below 15,000 troops and dropping by the day.

So I think that is just a point of information that we have now decided on a path that isn't even going to have a hint of coalition-building. We have decided to go this on our own. And, frankly, I think that has grievous consequences for what is happening on the ground in Iraq, frankly has just as important consequences for the future of foreign policy when we have gotten to a point where we don't even talk to our allies about our strategy there.

And I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I thank you so very much for yielding. I think it is important for us to also realize that the next action that we will probably, no probably, we will have on Iraq, Mr. Speaker and Members, will be the $99.6 billion emergency supplemental to the war. And I think it is important that we pay very close attention to this vote that is coming up and what leads up to that vote.

I spoke earlier about making sure that troop readiness, that troops have what they need when they go. I spoke of going to get a procedure done. You have a medical procedure that needs to be done, the first thing you want to check and make sure is the doctor has what he or she needs to be able to complete the procedure, because you do want to get up from that table one day.

This is very, very important. And I think that as we continue to talk about this issue of Iraq, it is our responsibility; we cannot critique the present administration or the past majority in this House if we do the same thing they did and expect different results. That is just not going to happen. We know that those that have come before us, whatever authority they might have been from the executive branch, and said they have what they need, we have the up-armored Humvees, we have all the things that they need when they get there. We were told that. And, better yet, we still have men and women at Walter Reed and other veterans hospitals, military hospitals throughout this country and even in Germany, and I visited twice, that are without legs because they didn't have the up-armored Humvees that they needed.

So saying all of that, the debate is going to be: Are we going to do the same thing that the Republican majority did, saying that we talk a good game about standing up on behalf of the troops and we disagree with the President on certain issues as it relates to Iraq? But if we do what they did, which was very little, then what happened in November will not reach its full potential in making sure that we head in a new direction.

So I think it is important that we take this in a very strong way, and I am glad that we had 17 Republicans join us on a nonbinding resolution before we left here, the last big action that we took before we left on Presidents' break. And I encourage more of my Republican colleagues to be a part of this movement in the new direction. I think it is very, very important. I think there have been a lot of things that have been highlighted. I know that the whole coalition of the willing will soon be the coalition of one, because we are going to be the only country that is left. There is a lot of rhetoric going on, we have to be there because we have to fight them over there so we don't have to fight them here. I don't hear Great Britain saying that. I don't hear some of the other countries that have announced their departure and those that have left Iraq.

I am one to believe, just as a single Member, that there will be a U.S. presence for some time in the region. But at the levels that we are now, over 143,000 troops and counting, it is going to be very difficult for us to continue to sell to the American people that there is a great need to keep those kinds of levels there. And as you spoke earlier about the readiness issue, this is very, very important. This is very, very important. I mean, we wouldn't want to get the word out to the undesirables here in the United States of America to say that law enforcement here is not ready to deal with major crimes here in the United States of America. We definitely don't want to get the word out to the rest of the world that we are not prepared to defend ourselves in a way that we should and need to be prepared to be able to defend ourselves or help our allies in the future.

So I think that is important. It is something not to take lightly. A lot of work has to be done here. A lot of tough votes have to be taken. And we have to communicate with the Members and the American people to not let them fall behind as we go through reforming this House and reforming the legislative presence in this whole debate on Iraq.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Could the gentleman yield for a moment? And then I will yield to the gentlewoman from Florida. On that point, I wanted to tell another story that happened when I was back in the district.

I was at a fire hall meeting some folks, volunteer firemen and firewomen, and we were discussing the budget and one of them talked about how there needed to be support for our first responders. And I said, well, I completely agree, and I was disappointed to see that in the budget that the President submitted he cut funding for first responders, and in fact he cut fire grants by 55 percent. And the people around just couldn't believe that. They said, well, that can't possibly be true. That is not what they had heard; that is not what they had been led to believe. So, thankfully, the miracle of modern technology, I had my BlackBerry in my pocket and I pulled up the House Budget Committee, and Chairman SPRATT has put together a wonderful Web site. If you go to house.gov, any of your constituents can pull up the Budget Committee's Web site and look at the President's budget, and there is a specific page on there on what the President's cuts proposed are for first responders. And sure enough, there is a 54.7 percent reduction in grants for firefighters. He almost completely zeroes out the COPS program.

So when the gentleman from Florida talks about how important it is that we have homeland security funding back home and we fund our first responders, well, somewhere along the line there is a disconnect when it comes to what they are proposing down on the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, because they don't seem to be getting that message.

So I did want to tell that anecdote, that our men and women who are courageous in the communities and serving as volunteer firefighters depend on these grants and they depend on the help that they need, and we in the Democratic majority are going to make sure that they get it. But there does seem to be a disconnect on some sides as to what has been the case.

I would yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you. Just to quickly help close us out,

the bottom line is that our veterans come home and face devastating treatment from their government. We have outlined that tonight. We send them over there with equipment that in many cases is faulty. We are not adequately preparing them and giving them enough time to be well trained to do their best over there. And they are doing their level best given the assignment that we give them. We are not providing them with the resources, and we are not providing them with the equipment. And, fortunately, we have a Democratic Congress now that is not going to give this President a blank check any longer, not going to let him run roughshod over our duty to be a check and balance on the administration. And that is what the 30-something Working Group is designed to outline. We are going to make sure that we get the message out and that we help our colleagues and anyone who might also hear this conversation between us understand what is really going on.

Mr. MURPHY, I would yield to you to give out the Web site and Mr. MEEK for closing.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I think the real lesson from Mr. ALTMIRE's story is that he is like a Boy Scout, he is always prepared. He has the information at his fingertips that his constituents need. You can learn something every day from our colleagues.

To get in touch with the 30-something Dems, the e-mail is 30SomethingDems@mail.house.gov. And then on the Web site where a lot of the information we are talking about here tonight and in previous nights can be found is www.speaker.gov/30Something. And with that, I will yield for final thoughts back to Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you so very much, Mr. MURPHY. And I want to thank Mr. ALTMIRE for joining us and also Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I want to thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have one more 30-something Working Group hour.

With that, Mr. Speaker, it was an honor addressing the House of Representatives.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Western Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to be recognized by the gentleman from Eastern Iowa and privileged to have the opportunity and the honor to address you, Mr. Speaker, on the floor of the United States Congress.

A lot of things have transpired since we took the week off from this Congress for the Presidents' recess, we call it, which was really a work period back in the district. And our constituents and those in the State of Iowa and in some of the areas north and east of us went through a severe, severe ice storm that tens of thousands of them are without power as we speak. And I know that you and I have an eye on that very closely, and we do though have a great confidence in the resiliency of the human spirit back in the Midwest, and friends and neighbors will step forward to do all they can. And what is within human possibility will be done and things will be taken care of there, Mr. Speaker.

So having that off my mind, I take up the subject matter that I came to address this evening. And it has been some time since I stepped here on the floor of the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, to talk about an issue that is the number one issue as I go around western Iowa and Iowa and other places in the country and have meetings with individuals, town hall-type meetings.

Whenever a group of people come together, if you ask questions, stand and listen, eventually the subject of immigration will come up. And it has been the most intensely watched subject and discussed subject perhaps over the last 3 years or a little more, Mr. Speaker.

I recall when President Bush gave his speech that laid out his vision on the immigration reform, and I believe the date was January 6 of 2004. I am not off by more than a day, if that. And that speech started us down this path and this Nation of having an open dialogue about what kind of a Nation we are and what kind of a Nation we are to become. And this is something that has embroiled most of the discussion across the country. Everybody has an opinion. It is a good thing, Mr. Speaker, a healthy debate.

I recall when Pat Buchanan ran for the Presidency back in 1966, he said: I will call for hearings. I will force a debate on this country. We have got to have a national debate so that we can come to a consensus and put this country down the path towards its future.

□ 2245

We have been intensively debating this issue of immigration for the last 3 years, and that would be all of 2004, 2005 and 2006 and we find ourselves now into 2007. So I would say we are about 38 months into this intense discussion, and the results we have from this are hard to measure at this point. One of the reasons is because it is a very convoluted and complicated issue.

We have a configuration here in America that doesn't necessarily promote the right kind of policy. I say that, I am cautious about how I address it, because first of all, I will recognize that there are employers who have premised their business plan on hiring illegal labor.

I can recall in an agricultural hearing that I attended in Stockton, California last year, there was a lady there, there was a witness, before our Agriculture Committee who ran, I believe it was organic, a truck farming operation where they raised peppers and those kinds of vegetables down south of Yuma near the border.

Her complaint was, well, we set up these farms in processing and we need over 900 people a day to operate the harvesting and the sorting and the packaging and the shipments of this crop every day. Now that we have done a better job of enforcing the border, then her lament was that they have a turnover of 9 percent per week, 9 percent of their labor supply per week, it is about 80, and they are having trouble filling their labor supply.

So I asked the question, where did you expect your labor supply to come from when you placed your business close to the border? And the answer was, of course, well we expected our labor to come over from Mexico and come work on our farms and then go back to their homes. Well, that would be illegal labor working on farms south of Yuma with the idea that was the plan from the beginning.

Now, the request was, come to Congress and ask us to legalize this illegal behavior. It was a planned strategy from the very beginning of the setup of the business operation.

I lay this out because this is not a unique circumstance across this country. In fact, it is becoming a standard practice. I am seeing it more and more again as businesses set up to run their operation, whether it is going to be food processing or farming or maybe a dairy operation, and they decide, we are going to need labor to do this.

We would like to go forward with our plan and put our infrastructure in place, invest our capital, buy our cows, get our equipment up and get an order in. We will have to hire some illegal labor to milk the cows.

I had a dairyman tell me a couple of weeks ago that 51 percent of the milk in this country are milked by people that don't speak English. That doesn't necessarily indicate they are illegal immigrants in America, but that would indicate that a significant percentage of them most likely are.

That is some of the scenario. Some of the scenario on the one side is business interests that can capitalize on cheap labor. Believe me, when you pour millions of people into a labor market that are illiterate and unskilled that will work cheaper than anybody else, you are going to drive that labor down.

There was a report that was issued here within the last few weeks that shows that the unskilled labor in America has lost 12 percent of its earning capacity because they are flooded. There was a report on Fox News about a month ago that we have a 30 percent high school dropout rate in America, 30 percent dropout rate.

So if the students in high schools are dropping out at a 30 percent rate, and we are bringing in illegal labor that will work for the cheapest price, it seemed to me, and we know this to be a fact, that the competition between our high school dropouts and the people that didn't go to school, many of

them, from foreign countries that come in, would be clashing in competition for those jobs that require a low education. Maybe they require a strong back and some resilience and persistence.

But the opportunity for undereducated, especially young people in America, those dropouts, those that go on to get a college education, those opportunities, are going to people that are living sometimes 22 or 30 to a house. They will work cheaper than anybody else.

What has happened is our young people that don't want to go off to college, maybe they are not blessed with the ability to do that, maybe they just decide, I want to punch a clock, I want to wear a blue collar, not a white collar. I am happy enough to go do some labor for my life, but leave me alone. Let me take care of my wife and my family. Let me go fishing once in a while, but I don't really want to go off to college and study. Those opportunities are diminishing significantly in America. What that spells is the narrowing of the middle class in America.

We are doing a good job of educating the people in the higher end, those that go off and get their master's and their doctorate. Those will become professional people that often start out at college at six figures and go up from there. That part, that percentage of our population is growing significantly. I am grateful that is the case. We have encouraged a lot of young people to move off into the professions, and they are doing that. That is to the credit of our educational system in this country.

So the upper class is expanding, and there is money being made. We have had unprecedented economic growth thanks to the Bush tax cuts, both rounds in 2001 and in 2003. We have had this unprecedented string of growth. That has helped lift investors up, lift entrepreneurs up, and, of course, the professionals have been lifted up also because there is more money in the market.

So the upper class of America is growing and expanding and prospering. The lower class in America, that unskilled cheap labor, is also growing in numbers, but not growing in prosperity.

As we see the stratification of this society, and think of it in terms of a healthy America that once had a growing ever-more-prosperous middle class is now becoming an America that has a growing, ever-more-prosperous upper class, a growing ever-more-prosperous lower class, and a shrinking more suppressed, more constrained middle class.

That is the scenario that is driven by illegal immigration in America, and illegal immigration in America keeps us from having a legitimate debate on the subject matter of how we might go about recruiting the best people we can find to come into the United States, those that will assimilate the most easily, those that bring their already trained skills, those that will be contributors instead of those that are drawing down off of the public system. Those will be contributors in the first day, the first week, the first month, the first year.

They are across this world with good educations, and they would love to come to America, and they fit into our economy. All you have to do is teach them their ZIP code and their area code and hand them a cell phone, and in a week you wouldn't know that they were not born here. They would assimilate into this culture and into this civilization.

But we can't carry on a reasonable discussion about how to skim the cream of the world off like we used to do, bring them into America so that we can enhance this American exceptionalism. We can't get there because the entire debate has clouded because we are not controlling our borders. We are not stopping the illegal traffic at our borders. We are not doing an adequate job of employer sanctions, although we have had some significant efforts of late, and that means that there is a magnet that draws people across the border. That is the issue that we are dealing with, and the price for Americans is horrendous.

I went back down to the border last week. I spent 2 days down there. I flew into Phoenix and then took a ride from Phoenix on down to Yuma. I joined Secretary Chertoff there at the Yuma station along with the chief of the Border Patrol, David Aguilar, and a number of Members of Congress and a couple of Senators. We went down south, just on the south edge of San Luis, which is the most southwesterly town in Arizona on the Mexican border.

There, for some time, they have had about a 12-foot high steel landing mat wall placed almost exactly on the border. That has been the only barrier that they have had between the two semiurban areas that are there.

Well, here in Congress, last fall, we passed the Secure Fence Act, and the Secure Fence Act mandates that the administration build not 700 miles of fence, but 854 miles of double fence/wall on our southern border in the most priority areas that are defined in the bill. Those priority areas, when you go back and you measure the distances there in the bill, it adds up to 854 miles. One of those priority areas is San Luis where we went to visit.

At that priority area, they are beginning to construct fencing there, and at least it is a start. I can't call it a great start or a good start, but at least it is a start. They have a start to building the kinds of structures we need to stop the illegal crossings that are taking place at our border.

There with about 12-foot high steel landing mat wall which each of us stopped and took a turn welding on there a little bit, I wish I could have stayed and gotten a little work done, it felt kind of good, but there we lent a hand to continuing construction of the wall on the border. Inside about 100 feet, they had constructed a 16-foot high steel mesh fence, and that has got a metal frame on top of it. The steel mesh is essentially impenetrable unless you take a torch or something to cut it with.

So from the steel wall on the border, 100 feet back, 16-foot high steel mesh fence or wall, and then another about 40 feet and there is about a 10-foot high chain link fence with three to four barbs on top, it looks like a playground fence, actually. As we discussed the effectiveness of the structures that they had put in place, and we are continuing to construct at San Luis, Arizona, I asked the question if anyone had made it through that area since they had gotten the triple fencing up.

The answer came back, well, we have had several that have made it through here; but 2 years ago, there were 138,000 illegal crossers who were interdicted by the Border Patrol in that area.

Since October of last year, until just last week, they were now down to 15,000 that had passed across the border. Now that is not a full year, obviously, so it is not quite apples to apples, but it is significantly fewer illegal crossings there.

But then I asked the specific question again, has anyone gone through this area where the triple fencing is? The answer is, well, we think, maybe, yes, three. How did they get through here? A couple of them perhaps went through the waterway and maybe one went around.

The next question, of course, was more finely tuned which is, has anyone defeated this triple fencing yet? The answer is, no, they have not defeated the triple fencing, but they said they will; all structures we put in place will be defeated. We have to work, we have to maintain them.

I have to agree. I think you have to maintain them. I think you have to patrol them. I think you need to put sensors on them so you can identify if somebody is trying to climb through over the top or under the bottom or cut through, and that, I believe, is in the mix.

So we did a driving tour on the border and from there, San Luis, drove along the east, along the border, and the triple fencing reduces down to double fencing. The 10-foot chain link doesn't go all that far yet. It is being extended. Then pretty soon the 16-foot high second layer of fence is under construction, but it is not there either.

You are just down to the steel wall, and not very long after that, the steel wall is gone, and you are left with the construction of the steel wall that is being put in place. It extends from San Luis off to the east. If I remember right, they were going to extend it about 19 miles to the east. We are a long ways to go on that yet.

But we got up, in a couple of Black Hawks, and flew the border then going east from there, in the southwest corner, all the way almost to Nogales and

then turned around and went on up to Tucson. As you fly along the border, you will see there are places the border isn't even marked. There is just sand, not a fence. There is a little trail on our side, and there is a Highway 2 on their side. But there is not a mark of where the border is in many of those locations.

It has been an easy prospect for people on the Mexican side of the border to drive along on Highway 2 in Mexico, decide they want to go to the United States, turn the steering wheel off of Highway 2, go out across the desert to the north, and end up on a road 10 or 20 miles to the north, driving through the desert and come out on that road, and, voila, they are home free in the United States of America.

That has been going on consistently and continually. It is being done by people smugglers; it is being done by drug smugglers. So along that stretch, they are constructing also a vehicle barrier. And this vehicle barrier exists of, I believe it is 5 inch by 5 inch steel tubing that is driven in on about 5 or 6 foot centers with that tubing welded to it at about bumper high on a vehicle or on a pickup truck, and then concrete poured inside those posts.

That does keep most of those vehicles from crashing through, so it makes pedestrians of people who want to come to the United States. It is a little slower way to travel through the desert. We happen to have discovered, I don't know, 25 or 50 miles east of San Luis, a group of about 20 illegals who were perhaps about half a mile into the United States, and they had clustered around the base of a mesquite tree. As we turned the helicopters around and we turned back to take a look, the rotor wash on a Black Hawk is pretty severe in the desert, and it was something that encouraged them to head south rather briskly. So they headed south towards the Mexican border, and we apparently called for backup and then moved on.

But there in broad daylight, a half a mile north of the border with traffic going back and forth on the Mexican highway on Highway 2, were a group of about 20 illegals, working their way across the desert. If we run across them with the type of, I will say, helicopter caravan we were in, then that was not an anomaly. That was something I would say would be standard practice that goes on a daily basis.

□ 2300

But most of the activity, Mr. Speaker, takes place at night. And I have gone down on the border at night and sat on the fence in the dark and listened, and just listened, not with night vision equipment but just listened. And over time, you hear vehicles come in from the Mexican side and drive with their lights off down through the mesquite brush, stop by a big mesquite tree about 150 yards south of the border, let their cargo out, which were people and packs and you can hear them get out. You can hear them drop their pack on the ground. Presumably they pick them back up again. There will be some hushed whispers and then, Mr. Speaker, they will, single file, come walk through the mesquite brush through the fence, and I am talking about a place further east in Arizona where there is a fence, and climb through the five barbed wire fence.

You can hear the fence kind of squeak and you see the shadows. You can't really count shadows, especially when you are sitting there in the dark. It is awfully hard to be certain of what you see, but it is not that hard to be certain of what you hear in an environment like that. So I will say dozens infiltrated around me the night that I sat down there, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps 20 there in broad daylight as we flew by with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Chief of the Border Patrol, and two Blackhawk helicopters that make a lot of noise, and you can hear them coming quite a long ways off, still didn't deter the daylight illegal crossings taking place.

And as I look at the numbers of those who are coming across that southern border, and I would direct anyone's attention to the testimony before the Immigration Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee in the 109th Congress, Mr. Speaker, and also in the 108th Congress, where we had a number of witnesses that testified for the Border Patrol or the Border Patrol Union when asked what level of interdiction do you have of those that are crossing the border illegally, what percentage are you able to arrest? And their answer has consistently been 25 to 30 percent is all that would be interdicted.

So, Mr. Speaker, their testimony also shows that last year, the Border Patrol on the southern border, the 2000 miles of our Mexican border, intercepted, 1,188,000 illegal immigrants who were seeking to cross our southern border. Intercepted, 1,188,000, and now we are to that point where we fingerprint them all, at least that is what the testimony says, and that their fingerprints go into the record so we can track them if their's are duplicate or triplicate or have been stopped a number of times at the border. And at some point we need to be running out of patience and bringing charges against them, lock them up, make them serve their time and then deport them. Some of that is happening, but our patience level is very high.

But of the 1,188,000, I don't have the precise numbers committed to memory, but as close as I can recall, it was about 742,000 that were first time crossers, and the balance of that, the difference between 1,188,000 and 742,000, that 400-some thousand number represents those who crossed the border illegally that year more than once, two times, three times, four times, seven, eight times on up to 17 times, would be one of the numbers that I have heard as they looked at those records, Mr. Speaker. This is something that we are spending $8 billion to protect our southern border. That is $4 million a mile.

And we are getting 25 percent to 33 percent efficiency out of that. And we are picking people up over and over again. And if they voluntarily deport, we simply take their fingerprints, identify them, take a digital photograph of them and take them back to the border and let them go back through the turnstile, say, at Nogales or Naco or San Luis or wherever there might be a port of entry. This enforcement at the border has been weak and it hasn't been relentless. The year before it was a 1,159,000. And this stopping one-third, one fourth to a third calculates out to be something like four million illegal border crossers a year. Four million. If you take the 1,188,000 and you say it is a fourth, multiply it times four and then just kind of round it back to four million, that four million illegal crossers turns out to be 11,000 a night, Mr. Speaker.

And we are in a discussion across this country today about 7,000 Iraqis that the administration wants to provide refuge in the United States for by doing background checks and clearing them and bringing them here so that they will not be under the gun, so to speak, in Iraq and they can be pulled away if they happen to be targeted by the insurgents and the enemy for helping the United States.

That concerns me that we would be bringing people out of Iraq when they need people there to help rebuild their country. And it concerns me that we would have a number that large, and I would seek to reduce that number, if we could, shrink it down as much as possible, do background checks as intensively as we can because I think it is a national security issue and how many al Qaeda could be infiltrated into that 7,000 Iraqis that would want to come in here that would be authorized by the administration, and how many more might there be if we open for 7,000.

But by the same token, the relative risk of having 7,000 Iraqis that we would have identified by name, by fingerprint and been able to at least verify some of their activities over the last 5 years or longer in Iraq, the relative danger to the United States pales in comparison to 11,000 illegal immigrants a night trickling, pouring, infiltrating across our southern border. 11,000. I mean, we are approaching twice, some nights it is twice as many as the 7,000 Iraqis. The 7,000 Iraqis are still a significantly sized number. But the southern border takes on a number approaching twice that many every single night, without any background check, without any check whatsoever, people coming into this country; some to come to work, some to pick lettuce, some to get jobs working in food processing and restaurants and hotels and motels and you name it across the country. It is still a violation of American law. It is still a crime, Mr. Speaker.

But the worst parts of this aren't rooted in individuals that are seeking a better life, although we must enforce our laws if we are going to be a Nation that has the rule of law. But what is really chilling is the elements that come with that mass of humanity, those elements that come in with that $65 billion worth of illegal drugs that comes across our Mexican border every year.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, $65 billion, with a B, dollars worth of illegal drugs being brought into the United States across our southern border. And the drugs are, the four major drugs, methamphetamine, heroin, cocaine and marijuana. And the sources of them work out to be about like this, the methamphetamines, many of them manufactured in Mexico, from Chinese pseudoephedrine products. Now we have taken the Sudafed off the shelves here in the United States, most places in an effective way so that we have taken the local meth cooker pretty much out of business. And the meth that was coming into my part of the country in Iowa and your part, Mr. Speaker, was about 90 percent Mexican meth until we passed the law that took those pseudoephedrines off the shelf in our pharmacies and in our grocery stores, limited those quantities.

People can still have access in limited quantities. When we did that the DEA tells me now that the methamphetamines that are being sold in our part of the country, in Iowa, Nebraska and that Midwest area, it was 90 percent Mexican. Now it is 97 percent, and the balance of that trickles in from other places, maybe a California lab, maybe a few local labs, but not much. 97 percent now out of Mexico. We expected that. And we freed up a lot of officers time that are not having to clean up the dangerous meth labs, and put those officers in a better position to interdict the drug dealers. But the meth coming from Mexico, made from Chinese pseudo ephedrine that gets brought into Mexico in numbers way beyond the level of colds that they have down there for the number of people that they have, and that ought to set off some alarm bells. But that is being smuggled in. The meth is being smuggled across the border into the United States in massive supplies, numbers at least over 90 percent of the meth that is used in the United States now coming through, the raw product, the base product out of China to Mexico, manufactured in Mexico, shipped into the United States. That is the facts of methamphetamines. Much of the marijuana comes from any place south, a lot of it raised right in Mexico, and tons and tons of it hauled across the border. I happen to have been down there, it was in the middle part of last May when we interdicted a pickup truck that had about, let's see, it had about 200 pounds of marijuana packaged up in bales and sealed up in tape that was underneath a false floor in a pickup truck, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2310

That was just simply a decoy load that was designed to pull the enforcement off so the larger load could go through. I don't know if it actually made it through, but that is the kind of thing that is going on. Tons and tons of marijuana coming into the United States across the border, Mr. Speaker, a lot of it raised right in Mexico. And then we have the heroin that is smuggled in, and that heroin, a lot of it, also comes out of China.

And those of us that have visited over in Afghanistan in the poppy fields understand how that works. We have the Taliban that are engaged in the poppy and in the opium trade. They will front the crops in Pakistan, walk out into those farming areas along on the east side of Afghanistan that match up against the border with Pakistan, and pay for half of that crop upfront to the grower, to the farmer. It is a nice little crop agreement, and they pay for half the crop upfront. They come back when the harvest is done. They load up the poppy seeds/opium and pay for the other half of the crop. The farmer comes off fine because he doesn't have to haul any crop. He doesn't have to take anything to town. He gets paid upfront for his input costs and he gets paid for his harvest.

And off goes the opium then, hauled away by the Taliban, who sell it out of Pakistan into China and out of China over into Mexico and up into the United States. And, again, we are funding our enemies, Mr. Speaker. And the smuggling routes that go from Afghanistan through Pakistan through China and across into Mexico, up into the United States, are routes that are understood pretty well by our DEA.

And let me see. I left off one other drug, Mr. Speaker, and that is cocaine. And if one would notice, a lot of that cocaine was getting into the United States perhaps through our airports before 9/11. We shut that down and provided a significant amount of security at our airports after that. Drug dog sniffers, a lot more sophisticated screening process. When that happened, the Colombians had difficulty delivering their cocaine into the United States, and finally they cut a deal with the Mexicans so that they could use the distribution of the Mexican drug cartel families to flow their cocaine up into the United States.

So across our southern Border comes 90 percent of the illegal drugs that are used in the United States of America because those conduits that come out of Colombia, out of China, two different varieties out of China, and then the marijuana that is mostly raised in Mexico, all of that coming across the border, coming through illegal border crossings, coming across places where the border is not marked at all, and the drug cartel families that control those crossings fight for those. And the numbers that we have seen that have been killed in the drug wars in Mexico for 2006 exceed the number 2,000 deaths, the people that were murdered in the struggle for who is going to control the turf, who is going to control the profit. And the cities on the south side, Nuevo Laredo for one of those, that area has become a lawless land that is controlled by the drug cartels.

I will say that the new President of Mexico has stepped in to crack down on some of that. The jury is still out on how successful he might be. But these are important components here for us in the United States of America.

So here we are with this dynamic growing economy, the strongest economy we have seen in my lifetime. The continual growth quarter by quarter by quarter that is stimulated, of course, by having a competitive low tax environment. And with an economy that has this kind of dynamism, we are able to pay for two things that come from foreign countries that have hurt us greatly: one is the illegal drugs, the $65 billion worth coming across the Mexican border; and another one is paying for Middle Eastern oil and enriching the people over in that part of the world, many of whom are our sworn enemies, not our sworn friends. So we are funding our enemies by purchasing illegal drugs in America, and we are funding many of our enemies just simply because we are involved in purchasing oil to come into the United States. And we are more and more dependent on Middle Eastern oil, not less and less dependent.

But I am here to talk about the immigration issue, the illegal border crossing, Mr. Speaker, and the component of illegal drugs that are part of that. And I mentioned the 2,000 murder victims on the Mexican side of the border that were killed in the drug wars. And we will hear the testimony continually about how many people die in the Arizona desert trying to come into the United States. And as the weather warms up and we get into May, June, July, and August, the hotter and hotter it gets, the more victims there are in the desert. And it is sad and it is a tragedy, and we are doing some things to stop that. But I will argue that if we build some more fence, we build some more barrier, we can save some more lives down on that border. Those lives are a concern, Mr. Speaker, and we talk about them regularly and continually here in this Congress.

The lives that we don't talk about are the lives of the Americans who die at the hands of the criminal elements that come into the United States. And it has been politically incorrect to discuss such a thing as if we should just sit back and watch our citizens killed on a daily basis. Preventable crimes and we shouldn't utter a peep because somehow or another it might be interpreted as something that is based upon anything other than a love for the rule of law and the enforcement of law and the respect for the value of human life.

But I stand firmly in respect for the unique intrinsic value of human life, from conception, fertilization, to natural death. That is my record for more

than 10 years in public life, Mr. Speaker, and it is my stand today. It has not changed. It will not change. And I stand for the defense of the American people so that they can be safe in their homes, on the streets in their communities, in their schools, in their workplaces, in their churches, wherever they gather. The American people need to be safe.

So I began to ask the question, Mr. Speaker: How many Americans die at the hands of those who do make it across the border and across the desert? I didn't have a concept of what that number would be, Mr. Speaker, until such time as I asked the question in the immigration hearing. I asked it a number of times of different ranks of witnesses that were there. The question again was: How many Americans die at the hands of those who do make it across the desert?

And one of the witnesses, his answer was: ''I don't know the answer to that question, but I can tell you it would be in multiples of the victims of September 11.'' Now, that, Mr. Speaker, is a stopper when you think about such a concept. And when he uttered that concept, it started me thinking, and shortly thereafter I commissioned a GAO study, and the study was specifically designed to ask that question, how many Americans die at the hands of those who do make it illegally across the border? The study came back. It took about a year to get the study done. It wasn't quite apples to apples. That is the nature of things in government sometimes.

But it did put some facts in place that could be indexed to other existing studies and other existing data that the government has produced. So I shut myself up in the Library of Congress sometimes for several days to be able to concentrate hard enough to pull that data out of that report and use other reports and match them in so I would be able to compare apples to apples. And it comes down to something like this, Mr. Speaker: twenty-eight percent of the inmates in the prisons in the United States, Federal and State, are criminal aliens. Twenty-eight percent. Now, if you presume that those 28 percent are committing crimes in the same proportion of the rest of the inmates, since there are no records out there, you have to presume that 28 percent of the rape; 28 percent of the robberies; 28 percent of the grand theft auto; 28 percent of the first, second, and third degree murder, manslaughter, all of that is committed by criminal aliens. And there is no rationale that it could be anything else unless it would be more rather than less.

So I take that 28 percent, and I multiply it, and we have about 16,400 murders in the United States annually. And you take that times .28 and you come up with a number of something like 4,513, perhaps, would be the number of American murder victims representing that 28 percent, which is the population of our prisons that are criminal aliens. Now, that is a huge number and already that is more than the victims of September 11 on one day. But that would be an annual number.

And then if you look at some of the other fatalities out there, the highest group of fatalities are those victims of negligent homicide.

□ 2320

Most times, negligent homicide, Mr. Speaker, is the case of the victims of drunk drivers; not the drunks themselves, but the victims of the drunk drivers.

So as people come into the United States illegally, climb behind a steering wheel, drink and drive, often uninsured, not knowing our traffic laws, not having a sense of responsibility, but running into victims on the streets of America, that number is a number a little higher than the 4,500 or so that are victims of first and second degree murder and manslaughter. But the negligent homicide, mostly victims of drunk drivers, runs a little higher.

But it boils down to, when you do the math, shake it down to a day, about 12 Americans every day murdered at the hands of criminal aliens. Statistically, that is a solid number that has been tested across this country. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is a number that the liberals hate to hear, but they have produced no competing data that can challenge this GAO study data that has been multiplied into other government data like crime rates to come up with these numbers: About 12 Americans a day, first and second degree murder victims or manslaughter victims, dead, buried; about 13 Americans a day die at the hands because of negligent homicide, most of them victims of drunk driving.

All of these crimes, Mr. Speaker, all of them are preventible if we enforce our immigration laws. If we would deport those people when they run afoul of the law, if we are able to control our borders, get operational control of our borders, force all traffic, all human traffic, all contraband, all cargo, everything that is coming across the border through the ports-of-entry, and then beef up the ports-of-entry, focus our surveillance there, probably have to widen them and put more personnel down so we are not backing traffic up, but if we could force all the traffic through the ports-of-entry and do a good job there, we would theoretically interdict all illegal human traffic, all illegal drug traffic.

We would also occasionally interdict a terrorist who is seeking to sneak into the United States. I happen to know of seven individuals who were persons of interest from nations of interest, which is a government euphemism, Mr. Speaker, for someone who is a likely terrorist who hails from a terrorist spawning or terrorist sponsoring country. I know of seven.

When they are identified, picked up by the Border Patrol or whatever the arresting officer happens to be, there is a little window there to find out about it. Then they are handed over to the FBI, which then makes that case classified. At that point those officers can't talk to me or anyone about it after that.

So if they told me about something that happened today and the FBI picks them up 5 minutes from now and takes them into custody and says this is now a classified case, 10 minutes from now they can no longer even repeat the things they said to me 10 minutes ago, because it is now formally a classified case. So I have a little 24 hour window to hear about this.

My network is not that good, but I know of seven. I don't know how many that is altogether. It might be 70. It is probably well more than 70 persons of interest from nations of interest, people who we think are at least likely terrorist suspects coming across our southern border, sneaking into the United States, wishing us ill will, ready to act on that ill will. That threat is there too.

The crime element, the drug element, the terrorist element, all of that is added to the depression of the value of our labor force here in the United States, in fact the lower skilled being pushed down by reducing their wages by 12 percent because of the millions who have been injected into that market. We have gotten dependent upon it over the years.

Mr. Speaker, this part about the violence perpetrated against Americans is something that I have given the broad statistics of 12 victims a day of murder, 13 of negligent homicide, 25 altogether. Almost every single day the casualties of Americans at the hands of criminal aliens, most of that preventible if we enforce our laws, those casualties are almost every day greater than the numbers of American casualties in Iraq. They absolutely total up to be something that are in multiples of the victims of September 11.

These are Americans that need to have their lives protected. We need to have our laws enforced, we need to get operational control of the border, we need to have cooperation at the local law enforcement level, Mr. Speaker.

To personalize this a little bit, statistics are one thing. We can talk about statistics. Some people understand the magnitude of that. Some people understand personal pain and evil people. So, I have picked a selection of evil people here, Mr. Speaker.

My number one evil person is this individual here. His name is Angel Maturino Resendiz. He is known as, and we will recognize his name, the Railroad Killer. This individual for nearly 2 years, a 39-year-old illegal alien from Mexico, literally followed America's railroad tracks to rape and kill unsuspecting victims.

Resendiz struck near the rail lines that he illegally rode and then he stowed away on the next freight train that came his way. He is responsible

for as many as 15 serial murders, and the victims' ages range from 16 to 81. He attacked his victims with rocks, sledgehammers, shotguns and tire irons, sometimes in their homes, and sometimes he stole money for alcohol or drugs. Most of these murders took place in central Texas, but it is suspected he killed as far north as Kentucky and Illinois.

He has been apprehended by the Border Patrol in Texas and New Mexico eight times within 18 months, and he had been, and I emphasize this, voluntarily returned to Mexico each of those eight times in those 18 months.

Eight times he volunteered to return to Mexico when he was stopped by the Border Patrol, and then he would come back into the United States, and sometimes it happened quite quickly, come back to kill again.

On June 1, 1999, there were State and Federal warrants outstanding for Resendiz and there were intensive efforts underway to arrest him. Border Patrol agents in Santa Teresa, New Mexico, apprehended Resendiz. He was illegally crossing the border again, and he voluntarily was returned to Mexico, even though there were outstanding warrants on him. The Border Patrol was unaware that there were warrants out, but he was on the FBI's top 10 list. Still, picked up as an illegal border crosser and voluntarily returned, self-deportation, so-to-speak, back to Mexico.

How does this happen, that an individual that is in the FBI's top 10 most wanted list, we have him in our hands eight times, and this time, on June 1, 1999, while there were outstanding Federal warrants, we couldn't index his fingerprints to that data there with the system we had in 1999 and put this man behind bars before he killed again? But we couldn't under those circumstances.

I am advised that today, everyone that is picked up is printed and their fingerprints are run through the database, Mr. Speaker, and presumably we would catch the next Resendiz perpetrator. It didn't happen in 1999.

So they released him, and Resendiz, after he had gone back to Mexico, immediately found his way back into the United States, where within 48 hours he killed four more innocent people.

He was finally traced and captured by a determined Texas ranger in July of 1999, and then he was ultimately executed at Huntsville, Texas, June 27, 2006.

This man here, Angel Maturino Resendiz, killed at least 15 people. Now he has been executed as of June 27, 2006. But it is something that could have been prevented, Mr. Speaker, if we had had an intense effort to enforce our border. When they come through the second time, if we are not willing to use the fullest extent of the law at that point and provide a deterrent, these kind of things happen.

What was he afraid of? He surely wasn't afraid to be picked up again on the border. He knew he would be returned back to Mexico again. Finally a determined Texas ranger hunted him down. Thank God for that kind of effort and that kind of man.

Now, that is Resendiz, Mr. Speaker. That is the face of evil. It is not the only face of evil, but that is a face of evil.

□ 2330

He is one of those who contributes to those thousands of Americans who have been victimized in the fashion I have described.

This is another one, Mr. Speaker, Raul Gomez-Garcia. Many of us know this story, and this will take us into the discussion of the situation that exists in Denver and in many of the cities across America that have established a sanctuary policy.

This case has been brought to a conclusion with a conviction and a sentencing, and I can talk straight up about it. Raul Gomez-Garcia, a cop killer. He was sentenced to 80 years in prison for second degree murder, not first degree murder. But as the police officers that were guarding a family celebration which I understand was Raul Gomez-Garcia's family celebration, I believe it was a christening or a baptism of a daughter of his, Raul Gomez-Garcia left the party and went to come back in and they would not let him back in because he didn't have identification or whatever the reason was. At any rate, Gomez-Garcia lost his temper and on May 8, 2005, ambushed two officers, Officer Donnie Young who was shot in the back of the neck, I believe, and killed, and Officer Jack Bishop, whose bulletproof vest saved him when he was shot in the back by Mr. Gomez-Garcia, and who immediately escaped to Mexico.

The way I recall this case, we knew he was heading that way. As he got into Mexico, he believed he had sanctuary there. The policy was Mexico wouldn't extradite murderers to the United States if they were faced with a death penalty, which would be the case here for this kind of a crime.

And then over time because the Mexican courts had ruled that the death penalty was cruel and unusual punishment and therefore they were not going to send their citizens to the United States to face a death penalty, no matter what kind of a crime they committed, and the disrespect for the laws here in the United States that come from the courts in Mexico I think cannot be overlooked, either, Mr. Speaker, but that was the position that the Mexican courts took, that the death penalty was cruel and unusual, and so they found some people that they wouldn't encourage to come to the United States. That was those people who were provided sanctuary within Mexico who hid behind the decisions made by the Mexican courts and Mexican laws.

Then over time the same court ruled that life in prison was also cruel and unusual punishment. So what would be appropriate punishment for an individual like this, Raul Gomez-Garcia, who shot two cops, killed one, the other one saved by his bulletproof vest, ripped Donnie Young out of his family's life, left a daughter without a father, and put all of that pain and agony on the community and on the family and the neighborhood and put a wound into this Nation, and absconded to Mexico and the Mexican courts say even life in prison is too cruel and unusual for someone who commit such a cruel and unusual act?

So the prosecuting attorney had to cut a deal. He had to lower the charge to second degree murder where the maximum sentence was 80 years in prison which Raul Gomez-Garcia received at his sentencing that took place last October 26 in Denver.

But the big problem with this is Raul Gomez-Garcia had been stopped a number of times by the Denver Police Department. The sanctuary laws that they have in Denver say that they can't inquire into the lawful presence or the immigration status of anyone that they stop. Therefore, Raul Gomez-Garcia was released each time he was stopped for his traffic violations, car accidents, whatever the incidents of confrontation might have been. Gomez-Garcia was allowed to go back on the streets, back behind the steering wheel, back behind a gun, back behind the backs of two police officers and shoot them in the back, killing Officer Donnie Young.

All of this could have been prevented if we sealed our borders, stopped the bleeding at the borders; and failing that, when Gomez-Garcia arrived in Denver with his first encounter with the Denver Police Department, he should have been picked up and deported back to Mexico on the spot. That is what the law says. But Denver says they are a sanctuary city, and that means they want to be a welcoming place for people who come here illegally.

The price that is paid is the life of Donnie Young. I think it is a tragedy and it is amazing to me that the citizens of Denver will put up with a policy that will protect murderers within their midst and not enforce our Federal law. And the very idea that because you are local law enforcement and you have a few city ordinances and speed limits and issues like that to enforce, the very idea that because you are a city police officer you don't cooperate or enforce Federal law is anathema to a Nation that is founded upon the rule of law.

I grew up in a law enforcement family, and there was no concept in those years that any law enforcement officer was absolved from enforcing any of our laws.

Can you imagine a Nation or a world where only Federal agents could enforce Federal laws, and only State agents could enforce State laws, and Highway Patrol officers could only enforce the State speeding laws, not the

local speed limits, and your city police officers could only enforce the city ordinances and the local traffic laws? And county officers, what are they going to do? They don't have enough ordinances to enforce anything. All they could do under this kind of rationale would be serve papers and keep the jail and maybe leave us otherwise alone. It is not conducive to a free state to have sanctuary policy or to live under the delusion that you don't have the responsibility to enforce immigration laws because you happen to be wearing a blue uniform of a Denver Police Department.

The result is Denver police officers, shot, killed by Gomez-Garcia, who had no business being in the United States and we had many opportunities to send him back to his own country and keep him there or incarcerate him here in the United States until he had paid the price for the others crimes he had committed.

Here is what is shocking to me, Mr. Speaker. Denver Police Chief Gerry Whitman said the case, Gomez-Garcia, ''sends the message that Denver and its criminal justice system stand behind the police.'' How does that work? How can you stand behind the police when you have Gomez-Garcia standing behind the police and putting bullets into them, and you have picked up and turned the very man loose that you had the opportunity to stop before he took one of your fellow officers?

That is what happens with a sanctuary policy. Donnie Young was one of thousands. The face here is another face of evil, Mr. Speaker. And the face of the victims are not here on this floor tonight, but it is a tragedy just the same.

And I have another tragedy.

This is Jose Luis Rubi-Nava.

Now, this individual has been arrested and he has I believe been indicted on other charges, so we are going to say ''allegedly.'' I am going to put allegedly ahead of the things I say about this individual, understanding I don't believe he has been convicted at this point. He is innocent until proven guilty, but these are the news reports that I am referencing.

He was arrested in April 2006 for other crimes. He is an illegal immigrant. He could have been deported back to his home country. He could have been incarcerated for the other violations he had, but he was released back into the community, again because of a sanctuary policy, and again this is Denver, the suburbs of Denver.

So we have Jose Luis Rubi-Nava of Glendale, Colorado, who is charged with one of the most horrendous crimes that I have heard about in my years in dealing with these things, and that is the dragging death of a female whom we believe was perhaps his common-law wife, a live-in, or a romantic friend whom he allegedly tied a rope around her neck and drug her behind the car for over a mile and left her body about 20 feet outside a driveway in a suburban area, in a suburb of Denver.

In reading the report, the gory streaks on the street were more than a mile long and they had to wash the streets to clean things up after the perpetration of this horrible crime allegedly committed by Rubi-Nava.

□ 2340

This crime is just among the most horrible things that I have ever heard, and yet the Denver police persist. They buried one of their own, Donnie Young. The mayor's sanctuary policy is what they have to live by I recognize. I am not hearing from the police department that we should stop all of these sanctuary policies. Instead, I am hearing the police chiefs say we take care of our own; we enforce the law.

But I hear things like statements made in this case, Denver police have no reason to believe someone is in the country illegally; therefore, they do not contact Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents. If they stop somebody, and any common-sense person, anyone with half a brain, could figure out that they had an illegal immigrant on their hands because of the identification, because of maybe a Mexican driver's license, maybe because of a matricula consular card, which is almost proof positive of unlawful presence in the United States. There is no reason to have a matricula consular card unless you are here illegally, Mr. Speaker.

No, the Denver police would argue we have no reason to believe he is here illegally, and therefore, we cannot take action; therefore, we will release an individual back on the streets again and hope he does not drag somebody to death or shoot somebody in the back or run over them as a drunken driver.

This kind of tragedy, this kind of evil, Mr. Speaker, has got to be stopped. I have laid out just three cases, and I have discussed perhaps about 17 murder victims in these three cases. That average, I do not know if it is high or low across the perpetrators of capital crime.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that if you are the family members of any of those victims, you are not thinking in terms of numbers or whether it is a high or a low number of people that were killed. You are thinking in terms of your loved one that you have lost, that devastating, wrenching that a family goes through and a that grief that goes on for a lifetime, that hole that is there for a lifetime, the hole that I talked about in the family of Donnie Young, that hole multiplied by thousands in this country because we do not have the will to enforce our immigration laws, because we do not have the will because we have people that see the massive numbers of low-income, cheap wages as a political power base. On the other side of that, we have people that are making a lot of money off of cheep labor, and they believe they have a right.

So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will continue this discussion in future evenings, and I appreciate the privilege to address you on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROSS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. SPACE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and February 28 on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FARR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CHANDLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. YARMUTH, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURGESS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and February 28 and March 1.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today and February 28.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today and February 28 and March 1.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and February 28 and March 1.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, February 28.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today and February 28.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 171. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 301 Commerce Street in Commerce, Oklahoma, as the ''Mickey Mantle Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on February 16, 2007, she presented to the President of the United states, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 742. To amend the Antitrust Modernization Commission Act of 2002, to extend the term of the Antitrust Modernization Commission and to make a technical correction.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 28, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

616. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Halosulfuron-methyl; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0205; FRL-8113-8] received February 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

617. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Orthosulfamuron; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0010; FRL-8113-4] received February 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

618. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sethoxydim; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0321; FRL-8115-8] received February 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

619. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Revised Format for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference for North Dakota [R08-ND-2006-0001; FRL-8274-6] received February 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

620. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York; Motor Vehicle Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance Program [Docket No. EP-R02-OAR-2006-0695, FRL-8275-5] received February 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

621. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [WV101-6038; FRL-8273-7] received February 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

622. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-8281-3] received February 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

623. A letter from the Director, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 01-07 informing of an intent to sign a Project Arrangement concerning the Joint Studies on Adversary Countermeasures to Ballistic Missile Defense between the United States and the United Kingdom, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

624. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

625. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

626. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a report in accordance with Section 25(a)(6) of the Arms Export Control Act(AECA), describing and analyzing services performed during FY 2006 by full-time USG employees who are performing services for which reimbursement is provided under Section 21(a) or Section 43(b) of the AECA; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

627. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the Department's report entitled, ''Report on the Effectiveness of the United Nation to Prevent Sexual Exploitation and Abuse and Trafficking in Persons in UN Peacekeeping Missions,'' pursuant to Public Law 109-164, section 104(e); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

628. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Pursuant to section 565(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for FY 1994 and 1995 (Pub. L. 103-236), certifications and waivers of the prohibition against contracting with firms that comply with the Arab League Boycott of the State of Israel and of the prohibition against contracting with firms that discriminate in the award of subcontracts on the basis of religion, and accompanying Memorandum of Justification; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

629. A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report covering current military, diplomatic, political, and economic measures that are being or have been undertaken to complete out mission in Iraq successfully, pursuant to Public Law 109-163, section 1227; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

630. A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting determination that North Korea detonated a nuclear explosive device on October 9, 2006, pursuant to section 102(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 129 of the Atomic Energy Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

631. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-19, ''Lower Georgia Avenue Job Training Center Funding Authorization Temporary Act of 2007,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

632. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-17, ''Ballpark Hard and Soft Costs Cap Temporary Act of 2007,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

633. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-18, ''Exploratory Committee Regulation Temporary Amendment Act of 2007,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

634. A letter from the Senior Associate General Counsel, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

635. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to Section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, notification for countries listed as approved for funding for the FY 2007 International Military Education and Training (IMET) program; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

636. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Copperation Agency, transmitting notification of program changes, pursuant to the American Serviemembers' Protection Act of 2002 as amended by Section 1222 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

[Pursuant to the order of the House of February 16, 2007, the following report was filed on February 23, 2007]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRANK: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 556. A bill to ensure national security while promoting foreign investment and the creation and maintenance of jobs, to reform the process by which such investments are examined for any effect they may have on national security, to establish the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–24 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

[The following report was filed on February 27, 2007]

Mr. ARCURI: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 195. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 556) to ensure national security while promoting foreign investment and the creation and maintenance of jobs, to reform the process by which such investments are examined for any effect they may have on national security, to establish the Committee on Foreign Investment in the Untied States, and for other purposes; (Rept. 110–25). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[The following action occurred on February 23, 2007]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Foreign Affairs discharged from further consideration. H.R. 556 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Alabama (for himself and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 1190. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to

community cancer care by Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RENZI:

H.R. 1191. A bill to authorize the National Park Service to pay for services rendered by subcontractors under a General Services Administration Indefinite Deliver/Indefinite Quantity Contract issued for work to be completed at the Grand Canyon National Park; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MEEK of Florida (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. ORTIZ):

H.R. 1192. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance public and health professional awareness and understanding of lupus and to strengthen the Nation's research efforts to identify the causes and cure of lupus; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WYNN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 1193. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the benefits under the Medicare Program for beneficiaries with kidney disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on telephone and other communications services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. MICA, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 1195. A bill to amend the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to make technical corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REYES:

H.R. 1196. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1197. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide improved benefits for veterans who are former prisoners of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 1198. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act regarding early detection, diagnosis, and treatment of hearing loss; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARDOZA (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. HOOLEY):

H.R. 1199. A bill to extend the grant program for drug-endangered children; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 1200. A bill to provide for health care for every American and to control the cost and enhance the quality of the health care system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 1201. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to promote innovation, to encourage the introduction of new technology, to enhance library preservation efforts, and to protect the fair use rights of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CARTER):

H.R. 1202. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit an authorized committee of a winning candidate for election for Federal office which received a personal loan from the candidate from making any repayment on the loan after the date on which the candidate begins serving in such office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 1203. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit the use of any contribution made to a candidate for election for Federal office, or any donation made to an individual as support for the individual's activities as the holder of a Federal office, for the payment of a salary to the candidate or individual or to any member of the immediate family of the candidate or individual; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. GOODE):

H.R. 1204. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose penalties for the failure of 527 organizations to comply with disclosure requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 1205. A bill to reauthorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself, Mr. KELLER, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 1206. A bill to name the Logistics Automation Training Facility of the Army Quartermaster Center and School at Fort Lee, Virginia, in honor of General Richard H. Thompson, who is the only quartermaster to have risen from private to full general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 1207. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an excise tax on any tax-exempt organization which accepts any contribution which may be used to relocate property held by the organization if the relocation is contrary to the intent of the donor of the property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLMOR (for himself and Mr. BAKER):

H.R. 1208. A bill to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to require improved disclosure of corporate charitable contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1209. A bill to provide Capitol-flown flags to the immediate family of fire fighters, law enforcement officers, emergency medical technicians, and other rescue workers who are killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 1210. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain land in Grand, San Juan, and Uintah Counties, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SHULER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. FARR, and Mr. LANTOS):

H.R. 1211. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide entitlement to educational assistance under the Montgomery GI Bill for members of the Selected Reserve who aggregate more than two years of active duty service in any five year period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MELANCON:

H.R. 1212. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize the Administrator of

the Small Business Administration to waive the prohibition on duplication of certain disaster relief assistance; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. POE (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. HARE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 1213. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax equal to 50 percent of the compensation paid to employees while they are performing active duty service as members of the Ready Reserve or the National Guard and of the compensation paid to temporary replacement employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAMSTAD (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 1214. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand and enhance educational assistance for survivors and dependents of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 1215. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to make certain loan guarantees for advanced conservation and fuel efficiency motor vehicle technology projects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1216. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations to reduce the incidence of child injury and death occurring inside or outside of light motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. HAYES, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE):

H.R. 1217. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to certain concentrated animal feeding operations for the cost of complying with environmental protection regulations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 1218. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate for lower prices for Medicare prescription drugs and to eliminate the gap in coverage of Medicare prescription drug benefits, to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to promulgate regulations for the reimportation of prescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 1219. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide geographic equity in fee-for-service reimbursement for providers under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.J. Res. 38. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to authorize the line item veto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mr. HONDA):

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the global use of child soldiers is unacceptable and that the international community should find remedies end this practice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CARSON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HARE, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HODES, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. KUCINICH):

H. Res. 194. A resolution apologizing for the enslavement and racial segregation of African-Americans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Res. 196. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of World Water Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H. Res. 197. A resolution commending Vice President Al Gore on his well-deserved recognition for the Academy Award-winning documentary, ''An Inconvenient Truth''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LEE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. CARSON, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. WATT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. WU, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. POE, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina):

H. Res. 198. A resolution recognizing the significance of Black History Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. REYES (for himself and Mr. HOEKSTRA):

H. Res. 199. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in the One Hundred Tenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Mr. DREIER):

H. Res. 200. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Rules in the One Hundred Tenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

9. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 33 memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt S. 520 and H.R. 1070, the Constitution Restoration Act of 2005, which will limit the jurisdiction of the federal courts and preserve the right to acknowledge God to the states and to the people and resolve the issue of improper judicial intervention in matters relating to the acknowledgment of God; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution 16 memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt the Constitution Restoration Act, to limit the jurisdiction of the federal courts and preserve the right to the states and to the people to acknowledge God and resolve the issue of improper judicial intervention in matters relating to the acknowledgment of God, all as authorized by Article III, Section 2, of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. LATOURETTE introduced a bill (H.R. 1220) for the relief of Michael Dvorkin; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 40: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 60: Ms. CASTOR and Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 65: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 73: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 89: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. JINDAL.

H.R. 140: Ms. HOOLEY.

H.R. 146: Mr. TERRY and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 178: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 180: Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. WATERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HODES, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 192: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 201: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 237: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 241: Mr. BOEHNER.
H.R. 251: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 303: Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KIRK, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. HERSETH.
H.R. 319: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 328: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 352: Ms. NORTON and Mr. HARE.
H.R. 358: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 359: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 370: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. TANCREDO.
H.R. 402: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 405: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 410: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 423: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 454: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 457: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 464: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. WU.
H.R. 468: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RUSH, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 471. Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. BOUCHER, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 477: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EMANUEL, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 493: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 505: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 508: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 511: Mr. PORTER, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 522: Mr. MEEHAN and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 526: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 539: Mr. PAUL, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 552: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. GINGREY.
H.R. 566: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 579: Mr. JINDAL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, and Mr. BONNER.
H.R. 618: Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 621: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. BOREN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. Tim MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. CANNON.
H.R. 628: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 642: Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 643: Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 644: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 661: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 662: Mr. WELLER, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 664: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 667: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 670: Mr. NADLER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 676: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 677: Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 684: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 689: Mr. POE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 690: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. WALSH of New York.
H.R. 694: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 695: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 697: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 701: Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 718: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 722: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 723: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 770: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. OLVER, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 784: Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 787: Ms. HIRONO and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 803: Mr. DENT, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 811: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 819: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HODES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 829: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 836: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 837: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 840: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CLAY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 845: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 846: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 851: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 854: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 869: Ms. HERSETH and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 876: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 884: Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 891: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 897: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 901: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 910: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 916: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 926: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. SALAZAR.
H.R. 939: Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 947: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 957: Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. HARMAN, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 960: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 962: Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 984: Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 985: Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 990: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HARE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 996: Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 998: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHULER, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 1010: Mr. BERMAN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1013: Mr. EVERETT.
H.R. 1014: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. TERRY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HERSETH, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. REYES, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WU, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1023: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 1034: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1035: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
H.R. 1038: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1051: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1061: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1063: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. MURTHA.
H.R. 1072: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1074: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1076: Mr. PETRI and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1077: Mr. KUHL of New York and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 1080: Ms. HERSETH.
H.R. 1086: Ms. HOOLEY and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1097: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 1107: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1118: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 1120: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. UPTON, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
H.R. 1152: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1153: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. TANCREDO.
H.R. 1157: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KIND, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. REYES, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1169: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1188: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.J. Res. 6: Mr. GOODE.
H.J. Res. 19: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.J. Res. 21: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 9: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H. Con. Res. 19: Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H. Con. Res. 39: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. EMANUEL.
H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. DENT.
H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. BURGESS.

H. Con. Res. 53: Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. ISSA, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MICA, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BONO, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DENT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. SALI.

H. Con. Res. 71: Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. LANTOS.

H. Con. Res. 74: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H. Res. 37: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 42: Mr. BURGESS.

H. Res. 53: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 55: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 79: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H. Res. 87: Mr. SPACE.

H. Res. 95: Mr. MEEK of Floridad Ms. HIRONO.

H. Res. 100: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 111: Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H. Res. 118: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. SIRES.

H. Res. 119: Ms. CARSON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 125: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. POE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MACK, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H. Res. 126: Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 128: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 137: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Res. 143: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. FATTAH, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H. Res. 146: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H. Res. 162: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. CLARKE Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COOPER and Mr. GORDON.

H. Res. 163: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 169: Ms. HARMAN.

H. Res. 185: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. WEINER.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 556

OFFERED BY: MR. BLUNT

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Security Foreign Investment Reform and Strengthened Transparency Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. UNITED STATES SECURITY IMPROVEMENT AMENDMENTS; CLARIFICATION OF REVIEW AND INVESTIGATION PROCESS.

Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following new subsections:

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

''(1) COMMITTEE.—The term 'Committee' means the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States.

''(2) CONTROL.—The term 'control' has the meaning given to such term in regulations which the Committee shall prescribe.

''(3) COVERED TRANSACTION.—The term 'covered transaction' means any merger, acquisition, or takeover by or with any foreign person which could result in foreign control of any person engaged in interstate commerce in the United States.

''(4) FOREIGN GOVERNMENT-CONTROLLED TRANSACTION.—The term 'foreign government-controlled transaction' means any covered transaction that could result in the control of any person engaged in interstate commerce in the United States by a foreign government or an entity controlled by or acting on behalf of a foreign government.

''(5) CLARIFICATION.—The term 'national security' shall be construed so as to include those issues relating to 'homeland security', including its application to critical infrastructure.

''(b) NATIONAL SECURITY REVIEWS AND INVESTIGATIONS.—

''(1) NATIONAL SECURITY REVIEWS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving written notification under subparagraph (C) of any covered transaction, or on a motion made under subparagraph (D) with respect to any covered transaction, the President, acting through the Committee, shall review the covered transaction to determine the effects on the national security of the United States.

''(B) CONTROL BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENT.—If the Committee determines that the covered transaction is a foreign government-controlled transaction, the Committee shall conduct an investigation of the transaction under paragraph (2).

''(C) WRITTEN NOTICE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Any party to any covered transaction may initiate a review of the transaction under this paragraph by submitting a written notice of the transaction to the Chairperson of the Committee.

''(ii) WITHDRAWAL OF NOTICE.—No covered transaction for which a notice was submitted under clause (i) may be withdrawn from review unless—

''(I) a written request for such withdrawal is submitted by any party to the transaction; and

''(II) the request is approved in writing by the Chairperson, in consultation with the Vice Chairpersons, of the Committee.

''(iii) CONTINUING DISCUSSIONS.—The approval of a withdrawal request under clause (ii) shall not be construed as precluding any party to the covered transaction from continuing informal discussions with the Committee or any Committee member regarding possible resubmission for review pursuant to this paragraph.

''(D) UNILATERAL INITIATION OF REVIEW.—The President, the Committee, or any member of the Committee may move to initiate a review under subparagraph (A) of—

''(i) any covered transaction;

''(ii) any covered transaction that has previously been reviewed or investigated under this section, if any party to the transaction submitted false or misleading material information to the Committee in connection with the review or investigation or omitted material information, including material documents, from information submitted to the Committee; or

''(iii) any covered transaction that has previously been reviewed or investigated under this section, if any party to the transaction or the entity resulting from consummation of the transaction intentionally materially breaches a mitigation agreement or condition described in subsection (l)(1)(A), and—

''(I) such breach is certified by the lead department or agency monitoring and enforcing such agreement or condition as an intentional material breach; and

''(II) such department or agency certifies that there is no other remedy or enforcement tool available to address such breach.

''(E) TIMING.—Any review under this paragraph shall be completed before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of the receipt of written notice under subparagraph (C) by the Chairperson of the Committee, or the date of the initiation of the review in accordance with a motion under subparagraph (D).

''(2) NATIONAL SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In each case in which—

''(i) a review of a covered transaction under paragraph (1) results in a determination that—

''(I) the transaction threatens to impair the national security of the United States and that threat has not been mitigated during or prior to the review of a covered transaction under paragraph (1); or

''(II) the transaction is a foreign government-controlled transaction;

''(ii) a roll call vote pursuant to paragraph (3)(A) in connection with a review under paragraph (1) of any covered transaction results in at least 1 vote by a Committee member against approving the transaction; or

''(iii) the Director of National Intelligence identifies particularly complex intelligence concerns that could threaten to impair the national security of the United States and Committee members were not able to develop and agree upon measures to mitigate satisfactorily those threats during the initial review period under paragraph (1),

the President, acting through the Committee, shall immediately conduct an investigation of the effects of the transaction on the national security of the United States and take any necessary actions in connection with the transaction to protect the national security of the United States.

''(B) TIMING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Any investigation under subparagraph (A) shall be completed before the end of the 45-day period beginning on the date of the investigation commenced.

''(ii) EXTENSIONS OF TIME.—The period established under subparagraph (B) for any investigation of a covered transaction may be extended with respect to any particular investigation by the President or by a rollcall vote of at least 2/3 of the members of the Committee involved in the investigation by the amount of time specified by the President or the Committee at the time of the extension, not to exceed 45 days, as necessary to collect and fully evaluate information relating to—

''(I) the covered transaction or parties to the transaction; and

''(II) any effect of the transaction that could threaten to impair the national security of the United States.

''(3) APPROVAL OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSONS REQUIRED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A review or investigation under this subsection of a covered transaction shall not be treated as final or complete until the findings and the report resulting from such review or investigation are approved by a majority of the members of the Committee in a roll call vote and signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of Commerce (and such authority of each such Secretary may not be delegated to any person other than the Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, the Deputy Secretary of Homeland

Security, or the Deputy Secretary of Commerce, respectively).

''(B) ADDITIONAL ACTION REQUIRED IN CERTAIN CASES.—In the case of any roll call vote pursuant to subparagraph (A) in connection with an investigation under paragraph (2) of any foreign government-controlled transaction in which there is at least 1 vote by a Committee member against approving the transaction, the investigation shall not be treated as final or complete until the findings and report resulting from such investigation are signed by the President (in addition to the Chairperson and the Vice Chairpersons of the Committee under subparagraph (A)).

''(4) ANALYSIS BY DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Intelligence shall expeditiously carry out a thorough analysis of any threat to the national security of the United States of any covered transaction, including making requests for information to the Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control within the Department of the Treasury and the Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network. The Director of National Intelligence also shall seek and incorporate the views of all affected or appropriate intelligence agencies.

''(B) 30-DAY MINIMUM.—The Director of National Intelligence shall be provided no less than 30 days to complete the analysis required under subparagraph (A), except in any instance described in paragraph (2)(A)(iii).

''(C) INDEPENDENT ROLE OF DIRECTOR.—The Director of National Intelligence shall not be a member of the Committee and shall serve no policy role with the Committee other than to provide analysis under subparagraph (A) in connection with a covered transaction.

''(5) RESUBMITTALS OF NOTICE AND REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW OR INVESTIGATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No provision of this subsection shall be construed as prohibiting any party to a covered transaction from—

''(i) submitting additional information concerning the transaction, including any proposed restructuring of the transaction or any modifications to any agreements in connection with the transaction, while any review or investigation of the transaction is on-going; or

''(ii) requesting a review or investigation of the transaction after any previous review or investigation of the same or a similar transaction has become final if information material to the prior review or investigation and not previously submitted to the Committee becomes known or if any material change in circumstances to the covered transaction has occurred since the review or investigation.

''(B) APPROVAL OF REQUEST.—In the case of a request referred to in subparagraph (A)(ii), the Committee shall determine by consensus whether to grant a request.

''(6) REGULATIONS.—Regulations prescribed under this section shall include standard procedures for—

''(A) submitting any notice of a proposed or pending covered transaction to the Committee;

''(B) submitting a request to withdraw a proposed or pending covered transaction from review; and

''(C) resubmitting a notice of proposed or pending covered transaction that was previously withdrawn from review.''.

SEC. 3. STATUTORY ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended by striking subsection (k) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(k) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States established pursuant to Executive Order No. 11858 shall be a multi-agency committee to carry out this section and such other assignments as the President may designate.

''(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be comprised of the following members or the designee of any such member:

''(A) The Secretary of the Treasury.

''(B) The Secretary of Homeland Security.

''(C) The Secretary of Commerce.

''(D) The Secretary of Defense.

''(E) The Secretary of State.

''(F) The Attorney General.

''(G) The Secretary of Energy.

''(H) The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors.

''(I) The United States Trade Representative.

''(J) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

''(K) The Director of the National Economic Council.

''(L) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

''(M) The President's Assistant for National Security Affairs.

''(N) Any other designee of the President from the Executive Office of the President.

''(3) CHAIRPERSON; VICE CHAIRPERSONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall be the Chairperson of the Committee. The Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Commerce shall be the Vice Chairpersons of the Committee.

''(4) OTHER MEMBERS.—Subject to subsection (b)(4)(B), the Chairperson of the Committee shall involve the heads of such other Federal departments, agencies, and independent establishments in any review or investigation under subsection (b) as the Chairperson, after consulting with the Vice Chairpersons, determines to be appropriate on the basis of the facts and circumstances of the transaction under investigation (or the designee of any such department or agency head).

''(5) MEETINGS.—The Committee shall meet upon the direction of the President or upon the call of the Chairperson of the Committee without regard to section 552b of title 5, United States Code (if otherwise applicable).

''(6) COLLECTION OF EVIDENCE.—Subject to subsection (c), the Committee may, for the purpose of carrying out this section—

''(A) sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, administer such oaths; and

''(B) require the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Chairperson of the Committee may determine advisable.

''(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury for each of fiscal years 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010, expressly and solely for the operations of the Committee that are conducted by the Secretary, the sum of $10,000,000.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The first sentence of section 721(c) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''material filed with'' and inserting ''material, including proprietary business information, filed with, or testimony presented to,''; and

(2) by striking ''or documentary material'' the second place such term appears and inserting '', documentary material, or testimony''.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL FACTORS REQUIRED TO BE CONSIDERED.

Section 721(f) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170(f)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall''; and

(B) by striking ''among other factors'';

(2) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (4);

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(6) whether the covered transaction has a security-related impact on critical infrastructure in the United States;

''(7) whether the covered transaction is a foreign government-controlled transaction; and

''(8) such other factors as the President or the President's designee may determine to be appropriate, generally or in connection with a specific review or investigation.''.

SEC. 5. NONWAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.

Section 721(d) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The United States shall not be held liable for any losses or other expenses incurred by any party to a covered transaction as a result of actions taken under this section after a covered transaction has been consummated if the party did not submit a written notice of the transaction to the Chairperson of the Committee under subsection (b)(1)(C) or did not wait until the completion of any review or investigation under subsection (b), or the end of the 15-day period referred to in this subsection, before consummating the transaction.''.

SEC. 6. MITIGATION, TRACKING, AND POST-CONSUMMATION MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT.

Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended by inserting after subsection (k) (as amended by section 3 of this Act) the following new subsection:

''(l) MITIGATION, TRACKING, AND POSTCONSUMMATION MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT.—

''(1) MITIGATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Committee or any agency designated by the Chairperson and Vice Chairpersons may negotiate, enter into or impose, and enforce any agreement or condition with any party to a covered transaction in order to mitigate any threat to the national security of the United States.

''(B) RISK-BASED ANALYSIS REQUIRED.—Any agreement entered into or condition imposed under subparagraph (A) shall be based on a risk-based analysis of the threat to national security of the covered transaction.

''(2) TRACKING AUTHORITY FOR WITHDRAWN NOTICES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If any written notice of a covered transaction that was submitted to the Committee under this section is withdrawn before any review or investigation by the Committee under subsection (b) is completed, the Committee shall establish, as appropriate—

''(i) interim protections to address specific concerns with such transaction that have been raised in connection with any such review or investigation pending any resubmission of any written notice under this section with respect to such transaction and further action by the President under this section;

''(ii) specific timeframes for resubmitting any such written notice; and

''(iii) a process for tracking any actions that may be taken by any party to the transaction, in connection with the transaction, before the notice referred to in clause (ii) is resubmitted.

''(B) DESIGNATION OF AGENCY.—The Committee may designate an appropriate Federal department or agency, other than any entity of the intelligence community (as defined in the National Security Act of 1947), as the lead agency to carry out the requirements of subparagraph (A) with respect to any covered transaction that is subject to such subparagraph.

''(3) NEGOTIATION, MODIFICATION, MONITORING, AND ENFORCEMENT.—

''(A) DESIGNATION OF AGENCY.—The Committee shall designate a Federal department or agency as the lead agency to negotiate, modify, monitor, and enforce any agreement entered into or condition imposed under paragraph (1) with respect to a covered transaction based on the expertise with and knowledge of the issues related to such transaction on the part of the designated department or agency.

''(B) REPORTING BY DESIGNATED AGENCY.—

''(i) IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS.—The Federal department or agency designated by the Committee as a lead agency under subparagraph (A) in connection with any agreement entered into or condition imposed under paragraph (1) with respect to a covered transaction shall—

''(I) provide periodic reports to the Chairperson and Vice Chairpersons of the Committee on the implementation of such agreement or condition; and

''(II) require, as appropriate, any party to the covered transaction to report to the head of such department or agency (or the designee of such department or agency head) on the implementation or any material change in circumstances.

''(ii) MODIFICATION REPORTS.—The Federal department or agency designated by the Committee as a lead agency under subparagraph (A) in connection with any agreement entered into or condition imposed with respect to a covered transaction shall—

''(I) provide periodic reports to the Chairperson and Vice Chairpersons of the Committee on any modification to any such agreement or condition imposed with respect to the transaction; and

''(II) ensure that any significant modification to any such agreement or condition is reported to the Director of National Intelligence and to any other Federal department or agency that may have a material interest in such modification.''.

SEC. 7. INCREASED OVERSIGHT BY THE CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT ON ACTIONS.—Section 721(g) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS.—

''(1) REPORTS ON COMPLETED COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 days after the completion of a Committee investigation of a covered transaction under subsection (b)(2), or, if the President indicates an intent to take any action authorized under subsection (d) with respect to the transaction, after the end of 15-day period referred to in subsection (d), the Chairperson or a Vice Chairperson of the Committee shall submit a written report on the findings or actions of the Committee with respect to such investigation, the determination of whether or not to take action under subsection (d), an explanation of the findings under subsection (e), and the factors considered under subsection (f), with respect to such transaction, to—

''(i) the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate;

''(ii) the Speaker and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives; and

''(iii) the chairman and ranking member of each committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction over any aspect of the covered transaction and its possible effects on national security, including the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

''(B) NOTICE AND BRIEFING REQUIREMENT.—If a written request for a briefing on a covered transaction is submitted to the Committee by any Senator or Member of Congress who receives a report on the transaction under subparagraph (A), the Chairperson or a Vice Chairperson (or such other person as the Chairperson or a Vice Chairperson may designate) shall provide 1 classified briefing to each House of the Congress from which any such briefing request originates in a secure facility of appropriate size and location that shall be open only to the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate, the Speaker and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, (as the case may be) the chairman and ranking member of each committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate (as the case may be) with jurisdiction over any aspect of the covered transaction and its possible effects on national security, including the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and appropriate staff members who have security clearance.

''(2) APPLICATION OF OTHER PROVISION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The disclosure of information under this subsection shall be consistent with the requirements of subsection (c). Members of Congress and staff of either House or any committee of the Congress shall be subject to the same limitations on disclosure of information as are applicable under such subsection.

''(B) PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—Proprietary information which can be associated with a particular party to a covered transaction shall be furnished in accordance with subparagraph (A) only to a committee of the Congress and only when the committee provides assurances of confidentiality, unless such party otherwise consents in writing to such disclosure.''.

(b) SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended by inserting after subsection (l) (as added by section 6 of this Act) the following new subsection:

''(m) SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chairperson of the Committee shall transmit a report to the chairman and ranking member of each committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction over any aspect of the report, including the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, before January 31 and July 31 of each year on all the reviews and investigations of covered transactions conducted under subsection (b) during the 6-month period covered by the report.

''(2) CONTENTS OF REPORT RELATING TO COVERED TRANSACTIONS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall contain the following information with respect to each covered transaction:

''(A) A list of all notices filed and all reviews or investigations conducted during the period with basic information on each party to the transaction, the nature of the business activities or products of all pertinent persons, along with information about the status of the review or investigation, information on any withdrawal from the process, any rollcall votes by the Committee under this section, any extension of time for any investigation, and any presidential decision or action under this section.

''(B) Specific, cumulative, and, as appropriate, trend information on the numbers of filings, investigations, withdrawals, and presidential decisions or actions under this section.

''(C) Cumulative and, as appropriate, trend information on the business sectors involved in the filings which have been made, and the countries from which the investments have originated.

''(D) Information on whether companies that withdrew notices to the Committee in accordance with subsection (b)(1)(C)(ii) have later re-filed such notices, or, alternatively, abandoned the transaction.

''(E) The types of security arrangements and conditions the Committee has used to mitigate national security concerns about a transaction.

''(F) A detailed discussion of all perceived adverse effects of covered transactions on the national security or critical infrastructure of the United States that the Committee will take into account in its deliberations during the period before delivery of the next such report, to the extent possible.

''(3) CONTENTS OF REPORT RELATING TO CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to assist the Congress in its oversight responsibilities with respect to this section, the President and such agencies as the President shall designate shall include in the semi-annual report submitted under paragraph (1) the following:

''(i) An evaluation of whether there is credible evidence of a coordinated strategy by 1 or more countries or companies to acquire United States companies involved in research, development, or production of critical technologies for which the United States is a leading producer.

''(ii) An evaluation of whether there are industrial espionage activities directed or directly assisted by foreign governments against private United States companies aimed at obtaining commercial secrets related to critical technologies.

''(B) CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'critical technologies' means technologies identified under title VI of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 or other critical technology, critical components, or critical technology items essential to national defense or national security identified pursuant to this section.

''(C) RELEASE OF UNCLASSIFIED STUDY.—That portion of the semi-annual report under paragraph (1) that is required by this paragraph may be classified. An unclassified version of that portion of the report shall be made available to the public.''.

(c) INVESTIGATION BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department of the Treasury shall conduct an independent investigation to determine all of the facts and circumstances concerning each failure of the Department of the Treasury to make any report to the Congress that was required under section 721(k) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (as in effect before the date of the enactment of this Act).

(2) REPORT TO THE CONGRESS.—Before the end of the 270-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of the Treasury shall submit a report to the chairman and ranking member of each committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction over any aspect of the

report, including the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, on the investigation under paragraph (1) containing the findings and conclusions of the Inspector General.

(d) STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) STUDY REQUIRED.—Before the end of the 120-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, shall conduct a study on investments in the United States, especially investments in critical infrastructure and industries affecting national security, by—

(A) foreign governments, entities controlled by or acting on behalf of a foreign government, or persons of foreign countries which comply with any boycott of Israel; or

(B) foreign governments, entities controlled by or acting on behalf of a foreign government, or persons of foreign countries which do not ban organizations designated by the Secretary of State as foreign terrorist organizations.

(2) REPORT.—Before the end of the 30-day period beginning upon completion of the study under paragraph (1) or in the next semi-annual report under section 721(m) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (as added by subsection (b)), the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a report to the Congress, for transmittal to all appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, containing the findings and conclusions of the Secretary with respect to the study, together with an analysis of the effects of such investment on the national security of the United States and on any efforts to address those effects.

SEC. 8. CERTIFICATION OF NOTICES AND ASSURANCES.

Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended by inserting after subsection (m) (as added by section 7(b) of this Act) the following new subsection:

''(n) CERTIFICATION OF NOTICES AND ASSURANCES.—Each notice required to be submitted, by a party to a covered transaction, to the President or the President's designee under this section and regulations prescribed under such section, and any information submitted by any such party in connection with any action for which a report is required pursuant to paragraph (3)(B)(ii) of subsection (l) with respect to the implementation of any mitigation agreement or condition described in paragraph (1)(A) of such subsection, or any material change in circumstances, shall be accompanied by a written statement by the chief executive officer or the designee of the person required to submit such notice or information certifying that, to the best of the person's knowledge and belief—

''(1) the notice or information submitted fully complies with the requirements of this section or such regulation, agreement, or condition; and

''(2) the notice or information is accurate and complete in all material respects.''.

SEC. 9. REGULATIONS.

Section 721(h) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170(h)) is amended to read as follows:

''(h) REGULATIONS.—The President shall direct the issuance of regulations to carry out this section. Such regulations shall, to the extent possible, minimize paperwork burdens and shall to the extent possible coordinate reporting requirements under this section with reporting requirements under any other provision of Federal law.''.

SEC. 10. EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.

Section 721(i) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170(i)) is amended to read as follows:

''(i) EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.—No provision of this section shall be construed as altering or affecting any other authority, process, regulation, investigation, enforcement measure, or review provided by or established under any other provision of Federal law, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, or any other authority of the President or the Congress under the Constitution of the United States.''.

H.R. 556

OFFERED BY: MR. BLUNT

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Security Foreign Investment Reform and Strengthened Transparency Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. UNITED STATES SECURITY IMPROVEMENT AMENDMENTS; CLARIFICATION OF REVIEW AND INVESTIGATION PROCESS.

Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended by striking subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting the following new subsections:

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

''(1) COMMITTEE.—The term 'Committee' means the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States.

''(2) CONTROL.—The term 'control' has the meaning given to such term in regulations which the Committee shall prescribe.

''(3) COVERED TRANSACTION.—The term 'covered transaction' means any merger, acquisition, or takeover by or with any foreign person which could result in foreign control of any person engaged in interstate commerce in the United States.

''(4) FOREIGN GOVERNMENT-CONTROLLED TRANSACTION.—The term 'foreign government-controlled transaction' means any covered transaction that could result in the control of any person engaged in interstate commerce in the United States by a foreign government or an entity controlled by or acting on behalf of a foreign government.

''(5) CLARIFICATION.—The term 'national security' shall be construed so as to include those issues relating to 'homeland security', including its application to critical infrastructure.

''(b) NATIONAL SECURITY REVIEWS AND INVESTIGATIONS.—

''(1) NATIONAL SECURITY REVIEWS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving written notification under subparagraph (C) of any covered transaction, or on a motion made under subparagraph (D) with respect to any covered transaction, the President, acting through the Committee, shall review the covered transaction to determine the effects of the transaction on the national security of the United States.

''(B) CONTROL BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENT.—If the Committee determines that the covered transaction is a foreign government-controlled transaction, the Committee shall conduct an investigation of the transaction under paragraph (2).

''(C) WRITTEN NOTICE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Any party to any covered transaction may initiate a review of the transaction under this paragraph by submitting a written notice of the transaction to the Chairperson of the Committee.

''(ii) WITHDRAWAL OF NOTICE.—No covered transaction for which a notice was submitted under clause (i) may be withdrawn from review unless—

''(I) a written request for such withdrawal is submitted by any party to the transaction; and

''(II) the request is approved in writing by the Chairperson, in consultation with the Vice Chairpersons, of the Committee.

''(iii) CONTINUING DISCUSSIONS.—The approval of a withdrawal request under clause (ii) shall not be construed as precluding any party to the covered transaction from continuing informal discussions with the Committee or any Committee member regarding possible resubmission for review pursuant to this paragraph.

''(D) UNILATERAL INITIATION OF REVIEW.—Subject to subparagraph (F), the President, the Committee, or any member acting on behalf of the Committee may move to initiate a review under subparagraph (A) of—

''(i) any covered transaction;

''(ii) any covered transaction that has previously been reviewed or investigated under this section, if any party to the transaction submitted false or misleading material information to the Committee in connection with the review or investigation or omitted material information, including material documents, from information submitted to the Committee; or

''(iii) any covered transaction that has previously been reviewed or investigated under this section, if any party to the transaction or the entity resulting from consummation of the transaction intentionally materially breaches a mitigation agreement or condition described in subsection (l)(1)(A), and—

''(I) such breach is certified by the lead department or agency monitoring and enforcing such agreement or condition as an intentional material breach; and

''(II) such department or agency certifies that there is no other remedy or enforcement tool available to address such breach.

''(E) TIMING.—Any review under this paragraph shall be completed before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of the receipt of written notice under subparagraph (C) by the Chairperson of the Committee, or the date of the initiation of the review in accordance with a motion under subparagraph (D).

''(F) LIMIT ON DELEGATION OF CERTAIN AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Committee or any member of the Committee to initiate a review under subparagraph (D) may not be delegated to any person other than the Deputy Secretary or an appropriate Under Secretary of the department or agency represented on the committee or by such member (or by a person holding an equivalent position to a Deputy Secretary or Under Secretary).

''(2) NATIONAL SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In each case in which—

''(i) a review of a covered transaction under paragraph (1) results in a determination that—

''(I) the transaction threatens to impair the national security of the United States and that threat has not been mitigated during or prior to the review of a covered transaction under paragraph (1); or

''(II) the transaction is a foreign government-controlled transaction;

''(ii) a roll call vote pursuant to paragraph (3)(A) in connection with a review under paragraph (1) of any covered transaction results in at least 1 vote by a Committee member against approving the transaction; or

''(iii) the Director of National Intelligence identifies particularly complex intelligence concerns that could threaten to impair the national security of the United States and Committee members were not able to develop and agree upon measures to mitigate satisfactorily those threats during the initial review period under paragraph (1),

the President, acting through the Committee, shall immediately conduct an investigation of the effects of the transaction on

the national security of the United States and take any necessary actions in connection with the transaction to protect the national security of the United States.

''(B) TIMING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Any investigation under subparagraph (A) shall be completed before the end of the 45-day period beginning on the date of the investigation commenced.

''(ii) EXTENSIONS OF TIME.—The period established under subparagraph (B) for any investigation of a covered transaction may be extended with respect to any particular investigation by the President or by a rollcall vote of at least 2/3 of the members of the Committee involved in the investigation by the amount of time specified by the President or the Committee at the time of the extension, not to exceed 45 days, as necessary to collect and fully evaluate information relating to—

''(I) the covered transaction or parties to the transaction; and

''(II) any effect of the transaction that could threaten to impair the national security of the United States.

''(C) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A)(i)(II), an investigation of a foreign government-controlled transaction shall not be required under this paragraph if the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of Commerce determine, on the basis of the review of the transaction under paragraph (1), that the transaction will not affect the national security of the United States and no agreement or condition is required, with respect to the transaction, to mitigate any threat to the national security (and such authority of each such Secretary may not be delegated to any person other than the Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, of Homeland Security, or of Commerce, respectively).

''(3) APPROVAL OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSONS REQUIRED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A review or investigation under this subsection of a covered transaction shall not be treated as final or complete until the results of such review or investigation are approved by a majority of the members of the Committee in a roll call vote and signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of Commerce (and such authority of each such Secretary may not be delegated to any person other than the Deputy Secretary or an appropriate Under Secretary of the Treasury, of Homeland Security, or of Commerce, respectively).

''(B) ADDITIONAL ACTION REQUIRED IN CERTAIN CASES.—In the case of any roll call vote pursuant to subparagraph (A) in connection with an investigation under paragraph (2) of any foreign government-controlled transaction in which there is at least 1 vote by a Committee member against approving the transaction, the investigation shall not be treated as final or complete until the findings and report resulting from such investigation are signed by the President (in addition to the Chairperson and the Vice Chairpersons of the Committee under subparagraph (A)).

''(C) PRESIDENTIAL ACTION REQUIRED IN CERTAIN CASES.—In the case of any covered transaction in which any party to the transaction is—

''(i) a person of a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined, for purposes of section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act), section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or other provision of law, is a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism;

''(ii) a government described in clause (i); or

''(iii) person controlled, directly or indirectly, by any such government,

a review or investigation under this subsection of such covered transaction shall not be treated as final or complete until the results of such review or investigation are approved and signed by the President.

''(4) ANALYSIS BY DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Intelligence shall expeditiously carry out a thorough analysis of any threat to the national security of the United States of any covered transaction, including making requests for information to the Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control within the Department of the Treasury and the Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network. The Director of National Intelligence also shall seek and incorporate the views of all affected or appropriate intelligence agencies.

''(B) TIMING.—The Director of National Intelligence shall be provided adequate time to complete the analysis required under subparagraph (A), including any instance described in paragraph (2)(A)(iii).

''(C) INDEPENDENT ROLE OF DIRECTOR.—The Director of National Intelligence shall not be a member of the Committee and shall serve no policy role with the Committee other than to provide analysis under subparagraph (A) in connection with a covered transaction.

''(5) SUBMISSION OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—No provision of this subsection shall be construed as prohibiting any party to a covered transaction from submitting additional information concerning the transaction, including any proposed restructuring of the transaction or any modifications to any agreements in connection with the transaction, while any review or investigation of the transaction is on-going.

''(6) REGULATIONS.—Regulations prescribed under this section shall include standard procedures for—

''(A) submitting any notice of a proposed or pending covered transaction to the Committee;

''(B) submitting a request to withdraw a proposed or pending covered transaction from review; and

''(C) resubmitting a notice of proposed or pending covered transaction that was previously withdrawn from review.

''(c) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.—Any information or documentary material, including proprietary business information, filed with, or testimony presented to, the President or the President's designee pursuant to this section shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and no such information, documentary material, or testimony may be made public, except as may be relevant to any administrative or judicial action or proceeding. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent disclosure to either House of Congress or to any duly authorized committee or subcommittee of the Congress.''.

SEC. 3. STATUTORY ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended by striking subsection (k) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(k) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States established pursuant to Executive Order No. 11858 shall be a multi-agency committee to carry out this section and such other assignments as the President may designate.

''(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be comprised of the following members or the designee of any such member:

''(A) The Secretary of the Treasury.

''(B) The Secretary of Homeland Security.

''(C) The Secretary of Commerce.

''(D) The Secretary of Defense.

''(E) The Secretary of State.

''(F) The Attorney General.

''(G) The Secretary of Energy.

''(H) The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors.

''(I) The United States Trade Representative.

''(J) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

''(K) The Director of the National Economic Council.

''(L) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

''(M) The President's Assistant for National Security Affairs.

''(N) Any other designee of the President from the Executive Office of the President.

''(3) CHAIRPERSON; VICE CHAIRPERSONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall be the Chairperson of the Committee. The Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Commerce shall be the Vice Chairpersons of the Committee.

''(4) OTHER MEMBERS.—Subject to subsection (b)(4)(B), the Chairperson of the Committee shall involve the heads of such other Federal departments, agencies, and independent establishments in any review or investigation under subsection (b) as the Chairperson, after consulting with the Vice Chairpersons, determines to be appropriate on the basis of the facts and circumstances of the transaction under investigation (or the designee of any such department or agency head).

''(5) MEETINGS.—The Committee shall meet upon the direction of the President or upon the call of the Chairperson of the Committee without regard to section 552b of title 5, United States Code (if otherwise applicable).

''(6) COLLECTION OF EVIDENCE.—Subject to subsection (c), the Committee may, for the purpose of carrying out this section—

''(A) sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, administer such oaths; and

''(B) require the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Chairperson of the Committee may determine advisable.

''(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury for each of fiscal years 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 expressly and solely for the operations of the Committee that are conducted by the Secretary, the sum of $10,000,000.''.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL FACTORS REQUIRED TO BE CONSIDERED.

Section 721(f) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170(f)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall''; and

(B) by striking ''among other factors'';

(2) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (4);

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(6) whether the covered transaction has a security-related impact on critical infrastructure in the United States;

''(7) whether the covered transaction is a foreign government-controlled transaction; and

''(8) such other factors as the President or the President's designee may determine to be appropriate, generally or in connection with a specific review or investigation.''.

SEC. 5. NONWAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.

Section 721(d) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The United States shall not be held liable for any losses or other expenses incurred by any party to a covered transaction as a result of actions taken under this section after a covered transaction has been consummated if the party did not submit a written notice of the transaction to the Chairperson of the Committee under subsection (b)(1)(C) or did not wait until the completion of any review or investigation under subsection (b), or the end of the 15-day period referred to in this subsection, before consummating the transaction.''.

SEC. 6. MITIGATION, TRACKING, AND POST-CONSUMMATION MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT.

Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended by inserting after subsection (k) (as amended by section 3 of this Act) the following new subsection:

''(l) MITIGATION, TRACKING, AND POSTCONSUMMATION MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT.—

''(1) MITIGATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Committee or any agency designated by the Chairperson and Vice Chairpersons may, on behalf of the Committee, negotiate, enter into or impose, and enforce any agreement or condition with any party to a covered transaction in order to mitigate any threat to the national security of the United States that arises as a result of the transaction.

''(B) RISK-BASED ANALYSIS REQUIRED.—Any agreement entered into or condition imposed under subparagraph (A) shall be based on a risk-based analysis, conducted by the Committee, of the threat to national security of the covered transaction.

''(2) TRACKING AUTHORITY FOR WITHDRAWN NOTICES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If any written notice of a covered transaction that was submitted to the Committee under this section is withdrawn before any review or investigation by the Committee under subsection (b) is completed, the Committee shall establish, as appropriate—

''(i) interim protections to address specific concerns with such transaction that have been raised in connection with any such review or investigation pending any resubmission of any written notice under this section with respect to such transaction and further action by the President under this section;

''(ii) specific timeframes for resubmitting any such written notice; and

''(iii) a process for tracking any actions that may be taken by any party to the transaction, in connection with the transaction, before the notice referred to in clause (ii) is resubmitted.

''(B) DESIGNATION OF AGENCY.—The Committee may designate 1 or more appropriate Federal departments or agencies, other than any entity of the intelligence community (as defined in the National Security Act of 1947), as a lead agency to carry out, on behalf of the Committee, the requirements of subparagraph (A) with respect to any covered transaction that is subject to such subparagraph.

''(3) NEGOTIATION, MODIFICATION, MONITORING, AND ENFORCEMENT.—

''(A) DESIGNATION OF AGENCY.—The Committee shall designate 1 or more Federal departments or agencies as the lead agency to negotiate, modify, monitor, and enforce, on behalf of the Committee, any agreement entered into or condition imposed under paragraph (1) with respect to a covered transaction based on the expertise with and knowledge of the issues related to such transaction on the part of the designated department or agency.

''(B) REPORTING BY DESIGNATED AGENCY.—

''(i) IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS.—Each Federal department or agency designated by the Committee as a lead agency under subparagraph (A) in connection with any agreement entered into or condition imposed under paragraph (1) with respect to a covered transaction shall—

''(I) report, as appropriate but not less than once in each 6-month period, to the Chairperson and Vice Chairpersons of the Committee on the implementation of such agreement or condition; and

''(II) require, as appropriate, any party to the covered transaction to report to the head of such department or agency (or the designee of such department or agency head) on the implementation or any material change in circumstances.

''(ii) MODIFICATION REPORTS.—Any Federal department or agency designated by the Committee as a lead agency under subparagraph (A) in connection with any agreement entered into or condition imposed with respect to a covered transaction shall—

''(I) provide periodic reports to the Chairperson and Vice Chairpersons of the Committee on any modification to any such agreement or condition imposed with respect to the transaction; and

''(II) ensure that any significant modification to any such agreement or condition is reported to the Director of National Intelligence and to any other Federal department or agency that may have a material interest in such modification.

''(iii) COMPLIANCE.—The Committee shall develop and agree upon methods for evaluating compliance with any agreement entered into or condition imposed with respect to a covered transaction that will allow the Committee to adequately assure compliance without—

''(I) unnecessarily diverting Committee resources from assessing any new covered transaction for which a written notice has been filed pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(C), and if necessary reaching a mitigation agreement with or imposing a condition on a party to such covered transaction or any covered transaction for which a review has been reopened for any reason; or

''(II) placing unnecessary burdens on a party to a covered transaction.''.

SEC. 7. INCREASED OVERSIGHT BY THE CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT ON ACTIONS.—Section 721(g) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS.—

''(1) REPORTS ON COMPLETED COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 days after the completion of a Committee investigation of a covered transaction under subsection (b)(2), or, if the President indicates an intent to take any action authorized under subsection (d) with respect to the transaction, after the end of 15-day period referred to in subsection (d), the Chairperson or a Vice Chairperson of the Committee shall submit a written report on the findings or actions of the Committee with respect to such investigation, the determination of whether or not to take action under subsection (d), an explanation of the findings under subsection (e), and the factors considered under subsection (f), with respect to such transaction, to—

''(i) the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate;

''(ii) the Speaker and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives; and

''(iii) the chairman and ranking member of each committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction over any aspect of the covered transaction and its possible effects on national security, including, at a minimum, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

''(B) NOTICE AND BRIEFING REQUIREMENT.—If a written request for a briefing on a covered transaction, or on compliance with a mitigation agreement or condition imposed with respect to such transaction, is submitted to the Committee by any Senator or Member of Congress who receives a report on the transaction under subparagraph (A), the Chairperson or a Vice Chairperson (or such other person as the Chairperson or a Vice Chairperson may designate) shall provide 1 classified briefing to each House of the Congress from which any such briefing request originates in a secure facility of appropriate size and location that shall be open only to the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate, the Speaker and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, (as the case may be) the chairman and ranking member of each committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate (as the case may be) with jurisdiction over any aspect of the covered transaction and its possible effects on national security, including, at a minimum, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and appropriate staff members who have security clearance.

''(2) APPLICATION OF OTHER PROVISION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The disclosure of information under this subsection shall be consistent with the requirements of subsection (c). Members of Congress and staff of either House or any committee of the Congress shall be subject to the same limitations on disclosure of information as are applicable under such subsection.

''(B) PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—Proprietary information which can be associated with a particular party to a covered transaction shall be furnished in accordance with subparagraph (A) only to a committee of the Congress and only when the committee provides assurances of confidentiality, unless such party otherwise consents in writing to such disclosure.''.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended by inserting after subsection (l) (as added by section 6 of this Act) the following new subsection:

''(m) ANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chairperson of the Committee shall transmit a report to the chairman and ranking member of each committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction over any aspect of the report, including, at a minimum, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, before July 31 of each year on all the reviews and investigations of covered transactions completed under subsection (b) during the 12-month period covered by the report.

''(2) CONTENTS OF REPORT RELATING TO COVERED TRANSACTIONS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall contain the following information with respect to each covered transaction:

''(A) A list of all notices filed and all reviews or investigations completed during the period with basic information on each party to the transaction, the nature of the business

activities or products of all pertinent persons, along with information about the status of the review or investigation, information on any withdrawal from the process, any rollcall votes by the Committee under this section, any extension of time for any investigation, and any presidential decision or action under this section.

''(B) Specific, cumulative, and, as appropriate, trend information on the numbers of filings, investigations, withdrawals, and presidential decisions or actions under this section.

''(C) Cumulative and, as appropriate, trend information on the business sectors involved in the filings which have been made, and the countries from which the investments have originated.

''(D) Information on whether companies that withdrew notices to the Committee in accordance with subsection (b)(1)(C)(ii) have later re-filed such notices, or, alternatively, abandoned the transaction.

''(E) The types of security arrangements and conditions the Committee has used to mitigate national security concerns about a transaction, including a discussion of the methods the Committee and any lead departments or agencies designated under subsection (l) are using to determine compliance with such arrangements or condition.

''(F) A detailed discussion of all perceived adverse effects of covered transactions on the national security or critical infrastructure of the United States that the Committee will take into account in its deliberations during the period before delivery of the next such report, to the extent possible.

''(3) CONTENTS OF REPORT RELATING TO CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to assist the Congress in its oversight responsibilities with respect to this section, the President and such agencies as the President shall designate shall include in the annual report submitted under paragraph (1) the following:

''(i) An evaluation of whether there is credible evidence of a coordinated strategy by 1 or more countries or companies to acquire United States companies involved in research, development, or production of critical technologies for which the United States is a leading producer.

''(ii) An evaluation of whether there are industrial espionage activities directed or directly assisted by foreign governments against private United States companies aimed at obtaining commercial secrets related to critical technologies.

''(B) CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'critical technologies' means technologies identified under title VI of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 or other critical technology, critical components, or critical technology items essential to national defense or national security identified pursuant to this section.

''(C) RELEASE OF UNCLASSIFIED STUDY.—That portion of the annual report under paragraph (1) that is required by this paragraph may be classified. An unclassified version of that portion of the report shall be made available to the public.''.

(c) STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) STUDY REQUIRED.—Before the end of the 120-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, shall conduct a study on investments in the United States, especially investments in critical infrastructure and industries affecting national security, by—

(A) foreign governments, entities controlled by or acting on behalf of a foreign government, or persons of foreign countries which comply with any boycott of Israel; or

(B) foreign governments, entities controlled by or acting on behalf of a foreign government, or persons of foreign countries which do not ban organizations designated by the Secretary of State as foreign terrorist organizations.

(2) REPORT.—Before the end of the 30-day period beginning upon completion of each study under paragraph (1) or in the next annual report under section 721(m) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (as added by subsection (b)), the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a report to the Congress, for transmittal to all appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, containing the findings and conclusions of the Secretary with respect to the study described in paragraph (1), together with an analysis of the effects of such investment on the national security of the United States and on any efforts to address those effects.

(d) INVESTIGATION BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department of the Treasury shall conduct an independent investigation to determine all of the facts and circumstances concerning each failure of the Department of the Treasury to make any report to the Congress that was required under section 721(k) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (as in effect before the date of the enactment of this Act).

(2) REPORT TO THE CONGRESS.—Before the end of the 270-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of the Treasury shall submit a report to the chairman and ranking member of each committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction over any aspect of the report, including, at a minimum, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, on the investigation under paragraph (1) containing the findings and conclusions of the Inspector General.

SEC. 8. CERTIFICATION OF NOTICES AND ASSURANCES.

Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended by inserting after subsection (m) (as added by section 7(b) of this Act) the following new subsection:

''(n) CERTIFICATION OF NOTICES AND ASSURANCES.—Each notice required to be submitted, by a party to a covered transaction, to the President or the President's designee under this section and regulations prescribed under such section, and any information submitted by any such party in connection with any action for which a report is required pursuant to paragraph (3)(B)(ii) of subsection (l) with respect to the implementation of any mitigation agreement or condition described in paragraph (1)(A) of such subsection, or any material change in circumstances, shall be accompanied by a written statement by the chief executive officer or the designee of the person required to submit such notice or information certifying that, to the best of the person's knowledge and belief—

''(1) the notice or information submitted fully complies with the requirements of this section or such regulation, agreement, or condition; and

''(2) the notice or information is accurate and complete in all material respects.''.

SEC. 9. REGULATIONS.

Section 721(h) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170(h)) is amended to read as follows:

''(h) REGULATIONS.—The President shall direct the issuance of regulations to carry out this section. Such regulations shall, to the extent possible, minimize paperwork burdens and shall to the extent possible coordinate reporting requirements under this section with reporting requirements under any other provision of Federal law.''.

SEC. 10. EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.

Section 721(i) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170(i)) is amended to read as follows:

''(i) EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.—No provision of this section shall be construed as altering or affecting any other authority, process, regulation, investigation, enforcement measure, or review provided by or established under any other provision of Federal law, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, or any other authority of the President or the Congress under the Constitution of the United States.''.

SEC. 11. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply after the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 556

OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 20, line 12, insert '', conducted by the Committee,'' after ''analysis''.

Page 22, line 17, strike ''provide periodic reports'' and insert ''report, as appropriate but not less than once in each 6-month period,''.

Page 23, line 23, strike the closing quotation marks and the 2nd period.

Page 23, after line 23, insert the following new clause:

''(iii) COMPLIANCE.—The Committee shall develop and agree upon methods for evaluating compliance with any agreement entered into or condition imposed with respect to a covered transaction that will allow the Committee to adequately assure compliance without—

''(I) unnecessarily diverting Committee resources from assessing any new covered transaction for which a written notice has been filed pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(C), and if necessary reaching a mitigation agreement with or imposing a condition on a party to such covered transaction or any covered transaction for which a review has been reopened for any reason; or

''(II) placing unnecessary burdens on a party to a covered transaction.''.

Page 25, line 6, insert '', at a minimum,'' after ''including''.

Page 25, line 12, insert '', or on compliance with a mitigation agreement or condition imposed with respect to such transaction,'' after ''covered transaction''.

Page 26, beginning on line 5, strike ''the Committee on International Relations'' and insert '', at a minimum, the Committee on Foreign Affairs''.

Page 27, beginning on line 10, strike ''the Committee on International Relations'' and insert '', at a minimum, the Committee on Foreign Affairs''.

Page 28, line 23, insert '', including a discussion of the methods the Committee and any lead departments or agencies designated under subsection (l) are using to determine compliance with such arrangements or conditions'' before the period.

Page 30, line 21, insert ''and annually thereafter'' after ''of this Act''.

Page 31, line 13, strike ''completion of the study'' and insert ''completion of each study''.

Page 31, line 21, insert ''described in paragraph (1)'' after ''to the study''.

Page 31, after line 24, insert the following new subsection:

(d) INVESTIGATION BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department of the Treasury shall conduct an independent investigation to determine all of the facts and circumstances concerning each failure of the Department of the Treasury to make any report to the Congress that was required under section 721(k) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (as in effect before the date of the enactment of this Act).

(2) REPORT TO THE CONGRESS.—Before the end of the 270-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of the Treasury shall submit a report to the chairman and ranking member of each committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction over any aspect of the report, including, at a minimum, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, on the investigation under paragraph (1) containing the findings and conclusions of the Inspector General.

H.R. 556

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 18, after line 20, insert the following new paragraph (and redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

''(7) the potential effects of the covered transaction on the efforts of the United States to curtail human smuggling (and such term, for purposes of this paragraph, means any act constituting a violation of section 274(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act) and to curtail drug smuggling with regard to any country which is not described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1003(a) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act.''.

H.R. 556

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCAUL

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 30, line 17, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period.

Page 30, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

''(4) CONTENTS OF REPORT RELATED TO BARRIERS TO INVESTMENT INTO THE UNITED STATES.—In order to assist the Congress in its oversight role of ensuring the national security of the United States by ensuring a healthy investment climate, the President, and such agencies as the President shall designate, shall include in the annual report submitted under paragraph (1) a detailed discussion of factors, including the effective rate of taxation on entrepreneurs and businesses and other sources of capital in the United States as compared to other countries, that affect the number of filings, changes in the types of business sectors involved in filings, and changes in the number of investments originating from specific countries.''.

H.R. 556

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCAIN

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 30, line 17, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period.

Page 30, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

''(4) CONTENTS OF REPORT RELATED TO BARRIERS TO INVESTMENT INTO THE UNITED STATES.—In order to assist the Congress in its oversight role of ensuring the national security of the United States by ensuring a healthy investment climate, the President, and such agencies as the President shall designate, shall include in the annual report submitted under paragraph (1) a detailed discussion of factors, including the amount of burdensome regulation in the United States as compared to other countries, that affect the number of filings, changes in the types of business sectors involved in filings, and changes in the number of investments originating from specific countries.''.

H.R. 556

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCAUL

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 30, line 17, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period.

Page 30, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

''(4) CONTENTS OF REPORT RELATED TO BARRIERS TO INVESTMENT INTO THE UNITED STATES.—In order to assist the Congress in its oversight role of ensuring the national security of the United States by ensuring a healthy investment climate, the President, and such agencies as the President shall designate, shall include in the annual report submitted under paragraph (1) a detailed discussion of factors, including a detailed discussion, including trend information on the number of jobs in the United States related to foreign investment resulting from covered transactions, that affect the number of filings, changes in the types of business sectors involved in filings, and changes in the number of investments originating from specific countries.''.

H.R. 556

OFFERED BY: MR. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 11, line 2, strike ''in a rollcall vote''.

H.R. 556

OFFERED BY: MR. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY

AMENDMENT NO. 9: Page 11, beginning on line 7, strike ''or an appropriate Under Secretary'' and insert ''or an appropriate Senate confirmed official''.

H.R. 556

OFFERED BY: MR. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY

AMENDMENT NO. 10: Page 28, line 3, strike ''in a rollcall vote''.

H.R. 556

OFFERED BY: MR. BARROW

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 14, line 18, strike the closing quotation marks and the 2nd period.

Page 14, after line 18, insert the following new paragraph:

''(7) NOTICE TO THE CONGRESS.—

''(A) RECEIPT OF WRITTEN NOTIFICATION.—Before the end of the 5-day period beginning on the day the Chairperson of the Committee receives a written notice under paragraph (1)(C) of a proposed covered transaction, the Chairperson shall provide notice of the receipt of such written notice to the Members of Congress referred to in subparagraph (D).

''(B) COMMENCEMENT OF INVESTIGATION.—Not later than 1 day after commencing an investigation under paragraph (2) of a covered transaction, the Chairperson shall provide notice of the investigation and relevant information regarding the covered transaction, including relevant ownership records, to the Members of Congress referred to in subparagraph (D).

''(C) ACCESS TO INVESTIGATIONS.—The Chairperson of the Committee shall—

''(i) provide responses in a timely manner to any inquiries made by the Members of Congress referred to in subparagraph (D) regarding an investigation; and

''(ii) notify such Members of Congress promptly of the decision of the Committee upon completion of the investigation.

''(D) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—The Members of Congress referred to in this paragraph are as follows:

''(i) The Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

''(ii) The Majority and Minority Leader of the Senate.

''(iii) The Chairs and Ranking Members of the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

''(iv) The Chairs and Ranking Members of the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

''(v) The Senators representing States and the Members of Congress representing districts affected by the proposed covered transaction.''.

H.R. 556

OFFERED BY: MR. BARROW

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 24, line 26, strike ''and'' after the semicolon.

Page 25, line 9, strike the period at the end and insert ''; and''.

Page 25, after line 9, insert the following new clause:

''(iv) Senators representing States and Members of Congress representing congressional districts that would be significantly affected by the covered transaction.''.