

than is known about the deepest parts of the ocean.

This bill will add to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's ability to conduct research and exploration of the ocean. The bill will foster collaboration between the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of the Navy.

The ocean exploration program and the undersea exploration program will drive technological advances and will increase our knowledge about the ocean to help us understand how to best manage, use, and preserve this resource.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and show that the age of discovery is not over.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1834, to authorize the national ocean exploration program and the national undersea research program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

First and foremost, I want to commend my good friend Mr. JIM SAXTON of New Jersey and other cosponsors for introducing this important legislation. I also want to acknowledge the leadership for both the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Science and Technology.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1834, the National Ocean Exploration Program Act, is an important piece of legislation because it will expand ocean exploration and will be a key avenue in understanding better our marine ecosystems and coastal resources and, importantly, maximize effective research relating to the physical, chemical, and biological characteristics of our oceans and lakes. We have succeeded in embarking missions to space but have failed in studying the unknown in our very oceans.

This legislation will provide scientists the necessary equipment to investigate and explore the undersea environment and will allow NOAA to conduct archaeological and scientific voyages of historic shipwrecks and cultural sites important to our academic and local communities.

Again, I thank my colleagues for supporting this bipartisan legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1834, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO THE FEDERAL INSECTICIDE, FUNGICIDE, AND RODENTICIDE ACT

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

Senate bill (S. 2571) to make technical corrections to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 2571

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

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO THE FEDERAL INSECTICIDE, FUNGICIDE, AND RODENTICIDE ACT.

(a) PESTICIDE REGISTRATION SERVICE FEES.—Section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w-8) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(7)—

(A) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may exempt from, or waive a portion of, the registration service fee for an application for minor uses for a pesticide.”; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by inserting “or exemption” after “waiver”; and

(B) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “WAIVER” and inserting “EXEMPTION”;

(ii) by striking “waive the registration service fee for an application” and inserting “exempt an application from the registration service fee”; and

(iii) in clause (ii), by striking “waiver” and inserting “exemption”; and

(2) in subsection (m)(2), by striking “2008” each place it appears and inserting “2012”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) take effect on October 1, 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Senate bill 2571 provides a technical correction to the reauthorization of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act approved by the House and the Senate and that was signed by the President on October 9, 2007.

As my colleagues know, EPA is currently responsible for regulating the sale, use, and distribution of pesticides. In order to facilitate and expedite the approval process, pesticide manufacturers and other registrants have supplemented EPA's annual budget for a number of years. It's a win-win process for both the manufacturer and the end user and a clear example of good government at its best.

Unfortunately, EPA has interpreted the PRIA reauthorization approved by Congress to collect fees for chemicals that are not part of the Interregional Project Number 4, a popular research program that assesses tolerance levels for pest management chemicals applied on specialty crops. These IR-4 chemicals have historically been exempt from fees prior to the enactment of the PRIA reauthorization, and it was not the intention of the House nor the Sen-

ate to suddenly assess fees on all these chemicals.

This bill will simply restore the status quo for these particular products and reassert congressional intent.

Because the program fees are being assessed on IR-4 chemicals as we speak, it is vitally important to address this situation immediately. While the farm bill would be the natural vehicle to make this technical correction, EPA is currently unable to process any registration applications without these fees being paid. Therefore, while this fix is not controversial, it is extremely time sensitive, and the uncertainty of the farm bill process dictates that Congress must take action now.

Restoring congressional intent by passing this technical correction to PRIA will prevent delays and backups of applications and stop EPA from collecting and then reimbursing the fees for these chemicals.

It is important that we continue to encourage the type of public-private partnerships envisioned in PRIA. I urge my colleagues to support this technical fix and the underlying goals of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of S. 2571. Madam Speaker, last fall we passed Senate bill 1983, which reauthorized the highly successful Pesticide Registration Improvement Act. That act had been worked on by a number of Members in the House and Senate, including the chairmen and ranking members of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees as well as the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Horticulture and Organic Agriculture. In developing this legislation, we sought the advice and counsel of the administration, the affected industry, and the environmental community. I was very happy to have the unanimous endorsement of all interested parties as we moved forward with that bill.

As is not uncommon in working on complex legislation, language is included that is subject to interpretation, and in this particular case we included language intending to maintain an existing fee exemption for certain chemicals that have limited uses on specialty crops. Unfortunately, the EPA has interpreted the final language to mean that they would not be able to continue to offer this exemption. This bill that we are considering today would simply restore the status quo for these chemicals, as was the congressional intent.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

□ 1500

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I just want to thank my colleague, the

very capable and wise gentleman from Oklahoma who has been a great friend throughout the years that I have been here and thank him for his assistance in this legislation.

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. CARDOZA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2571.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

PROTECT AMERICA ACT OF 2007 EXTENSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 976, proceedings will now resume on the bill (H.R. 5349) to extend the Protect America Act of 2007 for 21 days.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed earlier today, 13½ minutes remained in debate.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has 7 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I would begin by yielding myself as much time as I may consume.

Members of the House, after delaying consideration of the House-passed RESTORE Act for months, just last night the other body has passed a very troubling FISA bill. Their action comes only 3 days before the expiration of the temporary bill which expires this Saturday, and we have a number of problems with the legislation coming from the other side.

First, it provides blanket retroactive amnesty for telecom companies that took part in warrantless surveillance programs. Now I have never heard, in my legal experience, that retroactive immunity, or immunity of any kind, can be given when you don't know what it is being given for, and that presents quite a large problem. Then there is no FISA Court review of certain au-

thorizations generally referred to as "basket warrants" until after the wiretapping starts. It creates a problem that we would use the additional 21 days that we are asking for, I think that would come under very close examination.

And then there are much weaker provisions on stopping other warrantless wiretapping, for example, reverse targeting of U.S. citizens and the question of sufficient congressional oversight.

So based on the documents that have been provided so far, and they are far from complete, I have letters of requests in great detail, the case for amnesty has really not been made.

The administration's bluster and fear-mongering don't do any of us very well. That doesn't serve the purpose of our legislative function and our relationship with the several branches of government. And it should be understood as perhaps another attempt to use national security for partisan ends.

The administration's view is that the President, as Commander in Chief, can spy on Americans in the United States without a warrant, a proposition that is very seriously contested by many of our constitutional and civil liberties authorities. Congress is committed to providing the executive branch the tools it needs. But we need to do so to make sure that the power to spy on Americans is not subject to abuse or misuse. All of us in this body think that that is of paramount concern.

The administration has requested that the Congress rubber-stamp its proposed legislation but has refused to provide Congress the information that would even purport to support the legislation. It is the administration that has unfortunately played politics with this issue. The administration still hasn't provided us with all of our requested documents.

Just yesterday, another letter was sent requesting the same information we have been asking for for so long. The House can't simply be stonewalled or ignored. And it cannot exercise its constitutional responsibility and then be bullied to rubber-stamp complicated and important legislation that impacts on national security.

We hope that the measure before us today will be passed resoundingly in a bipartisan way.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Madam Speaker, this extension does nothing more than contribute uncertainty to our intelligence community and put our foreign surveillance activities at risk. We have a bill we can pass right now. Yesterday, the Senate approved its bipartisan FISA bill by an overwhelming majority of 68-29. The Senate bill addresses the concerns of our intelligence community and has strong bipartisan support.

The intelligence community needs a long-term fix to gaps in our intelligence laws now, not 21 days from

now. What message does it send that we lack confidence in our intelligence community? Why are we making ourselves vulnerable to those who want to hurt us? Spies and terrorists don't operate by deadlines and sunsets. Neither should our intelligence laws.

We cannot allow the Protect America Act to expire and return to the status quo, unable to begin any new foreign surveillance. The time to act is now. Another extension represents a failure by the House Democratic majority to protect the American people.

We should reject this extension and urge the Democratic leadership to allow the House to consider the Senate bill, which has majority support in the House.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I reserve my time at this point.

□ 1515

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

Madam Speaker, what we try to do in the Intelligence Committee is to define the threat that is out there. We know that radical jihadists, al Qaeda, that it is a real threat. We attempt to provide our intelligence community with the tools that are necessary to give us, as policymakers, and others the information that is necessary to keep America safe. And at least some of us are in the business of prevention, making sure that there is not another successful attack against the United States; others are in the mode of, well, let another attack, if it happens, we want to be in a position to prosecute.

When we get down to FISA, I went through this earlier, October 25, 2001; November 14, 2001; March 5, 2002; June 12, 2002, Members of the House of Representatives were briefed on this program. Our Speaker of the House was briefed on this program, understanding what the program was, or hopefully understanding or at least asking the questions to get understanding about what the program was, what it intended to do, and the kind of information it was going to get, and the legal boundaries, the legal ramifications, and who was participating in these programs.

Now what they want to do and some want to do is throw these companies that were the Good Samaritans that decided they were going to help us, just throw them under the bus, even though, on a bipartisan basis, the legislative branch and the executive branch asked these folks and decided that these were the things that needed to be done.

The impact of this is this is having a chilling effect on all of those individuals and corporations that, from time to time, are being asked to help to keep us safe. It is like saying we saw what you did to these other folks. We are not going to be next. We are going to have to wield a fiduciary responsibility to our shareholders.