United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 2007 No. 40

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

All powerful and ever-living God, Your Divine Providence has blessed this Nation from its beginning. Your Divine Providence is evidenced in our Declaration of Independence and speaks through our Constitution to the rest of the world.

Lord, help us to embrace this same truth of Your Provident Love as this country wrestles with national issues today and desires to address problems facing the international community of nations in our times.

May every individual working in Congress see that every moment is given to us by You, Loving Lord, and thereby bears Your holy will for us now.

May each of us seek Your divine purpose for us and be disposed to become Your instrument to accomplish the great task of establishing Your kingdom of peace, Your reign of truth and Your rule of justice by every word we utter, every decision we make and every action we take this very day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. ALTMIRE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to ten 1-minutes on each side.

OVERSIGHT FINALLY IN THE HOUSE

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, with Democrats now in control of Congress, oversight is finally being conducted. The new Democratic Congress has already held 81 separate hearings on important issues involving the war in Iraq, including the billions of dollars that are unaccounted for. The documented pattern of neglect at Walter Reed goes back at least 3 years, yet previous Congresses did nothing. But just this week the new Congress held four separate hearings on the treatment of our wounded soldiers.

Also, this week the House held hearings on the firing of seven U.S. attorneys for purely political reasons. Partisanship and politics have no place in our justice system, and this House is going to aggressively investigate this situation.

Madam Speaker, this level of oversight is part of the Democrats' effort to bring real change to Washington. Two months into the new Congress, we are already delivering on that promise.

CONGRESSIONAL INACTION JEOPARDIZES MALHEUR COUNTY EMERGENCY SERVICES

(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 will have an extensive and extreme impact on more than 1,800 local governments that receive ''Payments in Lieu of Taxes'' funds, also known as PILT. The loss of the county payments program means these counties can now apply for the limited PILT fund, thus reducing funds to counties reliant on PILT, and many counties will see a 20 percent reduction.

For Malheur County, Oregon, which is nearly 10,000 square miles and is 72 percent under Federal ownership and is larger than the States of Vermont, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Connecticut, Delaware and Rhode Island, it can mean real problems.

As we all know, rapid response for emergency services is a life-and-death issue. In many areas of Malheur County, it can take well over an hour to respond to a situation. Loss of critical PILT funds will mean a reduction in vital public services, and that is unacceptable.

County Judge Dan Joyce, who is in Washington today, says loss of PILT funds will devastate our ability to respond rapidly in emergency situations. I call on the new Democrat majority to move H.R. 17. Services are being lost. Libraries are closing. Teachers are being given notices they won't be rehired. It is time for action.

PROTECTING OUR CHILDREN AGAINST INTERNET PREDATORS

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, last month I was proud to be part of an important announcement concerning the safety of our children. And thanks to the tremendous generosity of Quest Foundation, the National Center For Missing and Exploited Children was able to establish netsmartz411.org, a first of its kind online service.

NetSmartz411 provides a direct line for experts at the National Center for

Printed on recycled paper.

Concerned Parents. Through this program, questions and concerns about online safety can be answered quickly and accurately. We are all too familiar with stories of Internet predators making their way into our homes with the simple click of a mouse. More and more teenagers are joining social networking Web sites and roaming the Internet freely, with little or no adult supervision. These Web sites have given predators the freedom to search for pictures, ages, even nearby schools. By empowering more parents than ever before, NetSmartz411 will reinforce our efforts to make the Internet a safer place.

So for those who want more information, my colleagues, and would like to find that out, please visit www.netsmartz411.org, or www.missingkids.com.

OUR VETERANS DESERVE THE BEST

(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, I stand before you as a grateful veteran of the South Carolina Army National Guard, and I have four sons currently serving in the military. You can imagine my concern upon learning of the dire conditions our Nation's wounded service members have recently been made to endure. My appreciation for our troops is as a member of the Armed Services Committee, a veteran and as a parent who expects the best for the courageous troops who protect American families.

While Walter Reed Medical Center is renowned as a world-class facility, recent management neglected to provide adequate care. I appreciate Defense Secretary Robert Gates' decisive action in dealing with this disturbing situation. I was honored to attend President Bush's speech earlier this week to the American Legion where he announced a creation of a bipartisan commission to review military and veterans' care.

We in Congress are committed to ensuring our military heroes are well cared for and receive the medical attention they deserve.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

BUSH ADMINISTRATION NOT PROPERLY FUNDING THE NEEDS OF OUR MILITARY PERSONNEL

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

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when we send our Nation's young men and women into harm's way, it is always with the commitment that we will provide them with all the care they need if they are wounded in combat. Unfortunately, this administration has broken its commitment to our soldiers. Saying that they support the troops is easy for the President and the Vice President; actually coming up with examples is becoming more difficult every day.

Dana Priest, the Washington Post reporter who uncovered the conditions at Walter Reed Hospital recently, said that money is the root of the problem exposed at Walter Reed. Yet in testimony before the House Oversight Government Reform Committee on Monday, top military brass said they were given all the money that they needed. How could this be? If they indeed have all the money they need, then why are we attempting to nickel-and-dime the injured soldiers who have put their life on the line for our country?

Mr. Speaker, this is just another example of this administration's inability to make government work. Fortunately, this Democratic Caucus is not going to let them get away with it.

LET THE JURY HEAR ALL THE EVIDENCE

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, if the prosecution negligently or intentionally or by incompetence fails to give beneficial information to the defense, then our law says a new trial should be ordered. In the Ramos and Compean border agents trial, the prosecution based its whole case on the testimony of a drug smuggler who not only brought in $1 million worth of marijuana to the United States but was given immunity for it. He was portrayed as just a mule trying to get some money for his poor sick mama. Well, now it seems that after he got immunity for his crimes and while waiting to testify against Ramos and Compean, he brought in another large load of marijuana.

Here is the DEA report on the second case. I have read it. This case is simple enough that a third-year law student could prosecute it. But the U.S. Attorney's Office refused to prosecute the drug smuggler in the second case, and the jury never heard about this matter. The jury should have known about the second case to judge the credibility of the drug smuggler's testimony. The border agent should receive a new trial. Let the jury hear the truth about the star witness the Federal Government made a backroom deal with.

And that's just the way it is.

THE KUCINICH PLAN, H.R. 1234

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

Mr. KUCINICH. In a few short days, this Congress will make a momentous decision as to whether or not to fund the continuation of the war in Iraq. And yet, at this time, the American people clearly want our troops brought home. Funding the war will keep the troops there. Stopping the funding will enable us to bring them home.

BARBARA LEE has an amendment that will fund the orderly return of our troops. I have offered H.R. 1234, which is compatible with the Lee amendment. The money is there right now in the pipeline to bring the troops home. Once we bring the troops home or a plan is put forth to bring the troops home, we have to have a plan to stabilize Iraq. That's what H.R. 1234 will do.

This Congress cannot stand by as the casualties pile up. We have to remember that the families of the troops are waiting for us to take action. Let's act now. Support the Lee amendment and support H.R. 1234.

WE NEED SPENDING RESTRAINT, NOT TAX HIKES

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, we are anxiously awaiting the arrival of the 2008 budget that the Democrats are putting together. In all likelihood, it will require a spending of $2.9 trillion. Let me put that money in perspective. That is $90,000 plus every second of the fiscal year. It is a lot of money.

Tax rates will be going up under current law unless this Congress acts to not do that. There is a myth being purported by the other side that we can somehow tax the rich and balance the budget. That is a myth. The top 10 percent of taxpayers already pay two-thirds of the taxes that are being paid in this country.

Spending restraint is far more impactful on balancing the budget than raising taxes. We have a spending problem, not a tax-raising problem. I urge my colleagues to work on spending restraint as the true measure of how we fix this deficit.

PRESIDENT BUSH CANNOT TURN HIS BACK ON SOLDIERS WHO'VE BEEN WOUNDED IN HIS WAR

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

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, when President Bush sent American troops to war in Iraq, he had an obligation to ensure they were cared for if they came home wounded. Unlike in past wars, medical technology and protective gears have advanced to the point that soldiers who would have died in the past are now surviving devastating combat injuries. Their survival, of course, is a great development. Unfortunately, as the case at Walter Reed shows, many of our injured soldiers are not receiving the treatment they need and deserve when they return home.

We should all be outraged at what is happening at our military hospitals. Fortunately, this Congress is taking action. At the end of this week, House

committees will have held four hearings on the inadequate treatment our wounded soldiers are receiving at Walter Reed. We are now learning that this is more widespread than Walter Reed, and we must explore major reform options that fix this problem immediately.

Inadequate oversight of the Bush administration by past Congresses allowed these conditions to develop. The new Democratic Congress is going to hold those responsible accountable and ensure that our soldiers receive the help they have more than earned.

UNT WINS TO EARN FIRST NCAA BID SINCE 1988

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, my college, the University of North Texas, back in my district, on Tuesday night won the Sun Belt Conference.

Calvin Watson, a forward, scored 24 points and hit six of seven 3-point shots against Arkansas State University and was named the tournament's most outstanding player.

The University of North Texas was locked in a tight game but made all the key plays down the stretch to pull out an 83–75 win at the Cajundome to claim not only the Sun Belt title but an NCAA tournament bid as well.

The University of North Texas, my college men's basketball team, last went to the NCAA tournament when Reagan was President during the 1987–1988 season.

The Mean Green claimed its second NCAA bid by closing the game on an 11–5 run to set off a wild celebration. My team is under the leadership of head coach Johnny Jones. They were the No. 5 seed in the tournament and had to win all of their games to win the tournament title. They came up with standout performance throughout the tournament and in the finals.

I congratulate the fine men of the men's basketball team, their coaches and the staff of the University of North Texas on a great win.

□ 1015

FEMALE TROOPS IN IRAQ

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

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq has presented numerous hardships for our troops, their families, and by extension, our Nation. Over 3,000 American soldiers have been killed. Every day brings news of more explosions and more soldiers coming home with traumatic brain injuries and other maladies. However, this war has been a particular hardship for our Nation's courageous female troops.

In this, the first full week of National Women's History Month, I feel it is vital that we recognize the historic trials being faced by the women who are defending our country. As of 2005, there was a record 203,000 female troops on active duty in military, along with many thousands more National Guard and Reserve troops activated to work in Iraq.

Like their male counterparts, many of these female troops never expected to fight in a war and certainly not for such an extended period of time. Countless soldiers are mothers who joined the National Guard and Reserves to give back to their country. Now they find themselves half a world away from their homes and families, fighting a war on the sun-hardened battlefields of Iraq with no resolution or end in sight.

CONDITIONS AT WALTER REED

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the recent reports of substandard conditions at the outpatient facility at Walter Reed Medical Center are deeply disturbing. The brave men and women who put their lives on the line every day to protect our country do not deserve the shoddy conditions, nor do they deserve to be trapped in the bureaucratic morass that has engulfed Walter Reed.

It is necessary to put into place a seamless program for our veterans from the time they are injured through rehabilitation and home care and work support. I urge Secretary Nicholson of Veterans Affairs to do just that.

The proper treatment of our wounded members of the Armed Forces is not a partisan issue. It is a moral issue. And Congress needs to ensure that our injured brave men and women receive the best, most advanced, and most timely medical care possible. Anything less would be immoral and a dereliction of our duty.

VETERANS, MEMBERS OF MILITARY DESERVE THE FINEST MEDICAL CARE

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as a member of the U.S. Air Force Reserves a number of years ago, in support of our troops. It is unconscionable for the soldiers who defend our freedom to receive anything less than the finest medical care.

I visited the veterans hospital in Seattle again recently and talked at length to one soldier about the quality of care he has received. I was relieved to hear that from the time he was wounded in Iraq to his treatment at Bethesda and his time at Seattle's VA Hospital, the care that he received was excellent. Unfortunately, this is not the case in every hospital for every soldier.

I will soon be visiting Walter Reed to speak with soldiers there and make sure they are receiving the excellent care that they deserve. I am encouraged by the efforts to hold accountable those responsible for the appalling conditions at Walter Reed.

This issue transcends party lines and requires an immediate response by all parties. This is about young men and women who have sacrificed much for our country and for our freedom. We owe it to them to correct this injustice.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF ARMY SERGEANT PHILLIP MCNEILL

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the legacy of a brave young man who lost his life serving in Iraq. Sergeant Phillip McNeill, who grew up in Owingsville, Kentucky, was killed in Iraq on January 20, 2007. Sergeant McNeill was serving with the 3rd Battalion, 509th Parachute Infantry Regiment, based in Fort Richardson, Alaska, when his Humvee was struck by an IED, bringing his bright young life to a tragic end.

Sergeant McNeill came from a family steeped in American military tradition. His military service was inspired by the brave men in his family who had served before him. His family described his dedication to his mission, saying that he ''believed in the cause and that he was a soldier who wanted to be over there.'' This was Sergeant McNeill's second tour in Iraq.

As we celebrate the spirit of this great soldier, my thoughts and prayers are with Sergeant Phillip McNeill's family and friends. We are humbled by Sergeant McNeill's dedication, and we are forever indebted to him for making the ultimate sacrifice for our Nation and for our freedom.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 700, HEALTHY COMMUNITIES WATER SUPPLY ACT OF 2007

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 215 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 215

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 700) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are

waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 215 provides for the consideration of H.R. 700, the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act of 2007, under an open rule with a preprinting requirement. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except for clause 9 and 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read.

The rule provides that any amendment to the bill must be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to consideration of the bill. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, simply stated, maintaining an adequate water supply is critical to the health and livelihood of our agricultural industry, our economy, and our environment.

However, as critical as water is to sustaining our way of life, all too often we take it for granted. Water does not come in an infinite supply. It is, in fact, a very, very scarce resource, particularly in my region of the country.

There are significant water supply issues in my home district of California's Central Valley. The valley faces water shortages as various interests compete for this scarce resource.

The Central Valley is not unique. Water scarcity is occurring across the country and is becoming more widespread due to several factors. Population is on the rise. Pollution is a constant threat. Growth and development are expanding. And drought can strike us at any time.

Despite these pressing needs, we are severely lacking in programs that address the looming shortage. The Environmental Protection Agency, the Congressional Budget Office, and other organizations have estimated that $400 billion is needed for programs to maintain existing and build new water infrastructure. The EPA has also estimated that programs to address sewer overflows need in excess of $140 billion.

However, even meeting the needs of these programs has been challenging as this administration has constantly cut funding. Moreover, these programs deal exclusively with protecting our water quality and do not address scarcity or shortages.

While these programs are just as important, it doesn't make sense to have a one-track mind. Improving the quality of water is just one part of the equation. We also have to find innovative ways to reuse and recycle water that we have so it will be there to meet our needs as well as the needs of future generations. The rule and the bill we have before us today will begin to address this problem.

Mr. Speaker, the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act of 2007, H.R. 700, is quite simple. H.R. 700 extends a critical pilot program for alternative water source projects. Alternative water source projects allow local communities to develop innovative ways to reuse and recycle water, thereby saving money and expanding water use options for the entire country. This pilot program was initially created in 2002, but the program has expired.

The bill authorizes $125 million to help communities finance pilot projects to recycle or reuse water or to develop alternative water sources. It is not an excessive investment. Given the scarcity and challenges we face, this is just a start, but this funding is absolutely critical and is a step in the right direction. This will help spur technological development so that individuals, agriculture, and industry have access to the water they need. The bill is also fiscally responsible as it provides a 50 percent matching requirement.

Many should be recognized for their interest in ensuring that the future water supply will meet future water demands. I would like to commend my colleagues Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. KAGEN for introducing this important bill. I would also like to thank Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. MICA for their leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. This is a necessary bill. And this is a critically important investment for people today and for generations to come.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I also want to congratulate the gentleman from California on the managing of his first rule in his capacity on the Rules Committee.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, when most people think of the State of Washington, they imagine a cloudy day with a good chance of rain. However, much of the eastern part of Washington that I represent is very dry and very arid. In fact, my hometown of Pasco averages only 8 inches of rain a year, which is even less than the Central Valley, where my friend from California resides. This part of the State is also noted for its irrigated agriculture, which is the foundation of our rural communities.

Water is a valuable and limited resource that is critical for farmers and our agricultural economy. Two areas of my district in particular know the value and importance of water: the Yakima River Basin and the Odessa Subaquifer of the Columbia Basin. The Bureau of Reclamation is examining both areas for potential additional water storage, and I hope this Congress will continue past commitments to finding solutions that protect the farmers and the communities in these areas.

I also recognize the need to develop alternative sources of usable water for drinking and for agriculture purposes. By exploring innovative approaches such as membrane-filtering technologies and aquifer storage and retrieval, we can ensure that kitchen faucets and irrigation lines won't run dry in the future. Fresh water is a scarce and valuable resource and certainly one that we cannot afford to lose.

The underlying legislation continues a pilot program under the Clean Water Act that provides grants to encourage water reclamation and reuse. The bill would increase authorized funding for this program by $50 million without any fiscal-year limitation. However, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to point out that this program has never been funded. Therefore, the real question of whether this program warrants Federal funding will be left up to the Appropriations Committee and the subcommittee in charge of water spending to decide.

So I urge my colleagues to support this modified open rule, and I hope that we can continue this openness in future legislation, including the supplemental spending bill, the budget resolution, and the Water Quality Financing Act that is expected to be on the floor later this week.

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

□ 1030

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, maintaining an adequate water

supply is critical to the health and livelihood of our agricultural industry, our economy and our environment. Water is not an infinite supply, and water scarcity is occurring across the country and becoming more widespread. We have to find innovative ways to reuse and recycle the water that we have so it will be there to meet our needs, as well as the needs of future generations, and we have to provide the means to make that happen. This bill does just that.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE FUNDING RESOLUTION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 219 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 219

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 202) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Tenth Congress. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the resolution, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as amended, to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 219 provides for consideration of House Resolution 202, the 110th Congress committee funding resolution. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

The rule makes in order the committee funding substitute adopted by the Committee on House Administration. It also provides for a new Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming, the text of which is printed in the Rules report accompanying the rule. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the resolution and provides that the resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us would allow for the consideration of a bipartisan committee funding resolution. It was reported out of the House Administration Committee with the support of both Chairwoman MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Ranking Member EHLERS.

I want to take a moment to say how pleased I am with the way in which this bill embodies the spirit of fiscal responsibility that is so often advocated by this body.

The financial pressures on our government are immense. Recent years have left us with an unprecedented amount of foreign debt. At the same time, my fellow Democrats and I are struggling to ensure the safety of tens and hundreds of thousands of troops abroad, while refusing to shortchange vital domestic programs here at home.

The resolution reflects that reality. While not all committees have received the budget increases they hoped for, this funding resolution provides a bipartisan approach to ensuring that they can fulfill their duties and obligations without asking Congress to spend money we don't have. It includes only a 2.4 percent increase in funding from last year, one of the smallest increases in committee funding in the last 12 years.

As vital as it is to start bringing home some fiscal sanity back to Washington, there is another reason why the legislation is significant. As a result of actions taken by the Rules Committee yesterday, it now contains a provision that represents a profound departure from the approach that recent Republican Congresses have taken toward one of the most pivotal issues of our time, global warming.

Global warming is not merely an environmental issue. It is also a social issue and an economic one. It affects all nations and all peoples, and its consequences, if left unchecked, could produce truly dramatic changes to human society the world over.

For decades, evidence has mounted that our planet's temperature is rising, and that evidence has become so universally recognized that it is no longer in dispute. President Bush himself even used the phrase ''climate change'' in his State of the Union Address this year, the first time he has acknowledged it.

But the question raised today by some is a different one: Is global warming caused by human activity? Or is it merely a natural phenomenon akin to the last ice age, something that we have to adapt to but we cannot affect?

Efforts to break the link in the public imagination between human activity and climate change are still ongoing. Doubt is still being seeded in the public mind. Sometimes these efforts are blunt. Despite the President's recent admission, his administration has also been accused of rewriting sections of impartial Federal scientific reports that tie human activity to global warming.

Other times, the efforts are more subtle. We hear all the time Members of this body express their desire to, as they put it, ''get to the bottom'' of the problem of climate change so that we may come to understand its true cause.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I on the Democratic side of the aisle do not share this degree of doubt, nor do we seek to disseminate it. We have been convinced by numerous internationally recognized scientific studies, by years of careful analysis and by endless measurements taken around the world. We have been convinced, as have people the world over, by the overwhelming weight of available, impartial and scientific evidence. We have been convinced of a simple idea, that human beings are altering the planet's environment.

And, as such, we have committed ourselves to being the party of personal, environmental responsibility. We have pledged to confront this great challenge before it is beyond our grasp, beyond our ability to change even if we wanted to.

We have promised a strong path of action, and this bill represents the first steps along that path taken by this Congress in years, if not ever.

The resolution will create a fully funded select committee whose sole purpose will be to focus on global warming. The committee will have 15 members, nine from the majority and six from the minority. It will serve as a much-needed congressional forum for hearings, investigations and discussion, and will have the chance to make recommendations concerning climate change.

Simply put, people all the world over can breathe easier because the resolution will institutionalize the commitment of the House of Representatives to confronting global warming.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take a moment to address one of the criticisms of this rule that is likely to be voiced by the minority. We may be told that a hearing and markup process for the select committee did not take place before the rule was authored.

But a question like this one, the question of whether or not we should address global warming, has had an ongoing public hearing for a generation. Numerous arguments on both sides of the question have been made. And at the end of it all, the overwhelming consensus, both among the public and among internationally recognized climate scientists, is that global warming is real; it is human influenced; and it is our responsibility to control.

The creation of this select committee is a response to that international public hearing. Democrats have called for the need to fight climate change for years, and today we have the chance to turn that call into action, and we don't intend to waste it.

Mr. Speaker, we can't forget that, in 1997, the Republican-controlled Senate rejected the Kyoto Protocol, a pathbreaking international effort to control global warming. And we must not forget that, back in 2001, one of the administration's first acts of international significance was the dramatic rejection of that same set of principles.

It is time for this House to join the vast majority of the world community that recognizes the threat global warming poses and the role that our Nation plays in it. It is time for us to be leaders on this issue and to take responsibility for our actions.

I urge the passage of this rule and of the resolution.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my great appreciation to my very distinguished friend from Rochester, New York, the Chair of the Committee on Rules, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in strongest opposition to this rule and the underlying legislation, House Resolution 202, which provides for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the 110th Congress. While I consider the funding of the committees of the House a very, very important priority, I, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, oppose this rule since the resolution goes far beyond, far beyond the very important task in one respect, and, unfortunately, it falls extraordinarily short in another task.

Mr. Speaker, on March 1, the Committee on House Administration ordered reported House Resolution 202, a clean committee funding resolution. If passed by the full House, the resolution will provide approximately a 2.6 percent across-the-board increase in House committee budgets between the last session of the 109th Congress and the first session of the 110th Congress. While most committees can make do with that very modest increase, we have one committee that absolutely cannot. It is called the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 110th Congress, Ms. SLAUGHTER and I both stood here as we debated and then ended up supporting a very important part of the opening day rules package. On that day, we asked the Ethics Committee to take on substantial new responsibilities.

They are now responsible, Mr. Speaker, the Ethics Committee, based on what the passage of the opening days rules package imposed on them, they are now required to pre-approve all trips. They are required to issue guidance on rules that they were not involved in drafting at all. As I said, we imposed that on them. They are required to provide training for every employee of the House on the new ethics rules that we have just put into place and forced them to implement. And they are still in a position where they have to now provide timely advice to every single Member who makes a request for the application of this rule.

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, they have the responsibility of investigating allegations of wrongdoing whenever they do occur.

□ 1045

Now already, I understand, the Committee on Ethics, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, is falling behind. Appropriation season is well under way, and we have absolutely no guidance whatsoever about the new ethics standards for earmarks. We have new travel and gift rules, but those regulations created as many questions as they answered; and the Ethics Committee is already months behind in its correspondence with Members.

We are going to hear from a number of our colleagues who have been dealing with this very difficult situation. The chairman and the ranking member, the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Ethics appeared before the Committee on House Administration. In fact, Ms. SLAUGHTER and I were both there because our testimony followed them. Mr. HASTINGS and Mrs. TUBBS JONES, Republican and Democrat in a bipartisan way, they came to plead their case to provide an increase beyond that 2.6 percent so they can deal with this massive new mandate imposed upon them. It was a large request, but the members of the Ethics Committee need it because they want to do their job and they need the resources to do it.

What the House Administration Committee did, and we were there during that testimony, they expressed great sympathy with their plight. And at the end, they felt they could do a little more. That decision leaves every single Member of this House in jeopardy, and it is one that we cannot let stand.

That is why, as I said, Mr. HASTINGS, the former chairman of the Ethics Committee and Mrs. TUBBS JONES, the new chairman of the Ethics Committee, took the very unusual step of just yesterday appealing to us up in the Rules Committee to correct this problem.

Now my Rules Committee colleague, Mr. HASTINGS, has the dual responsibility of serving not only as the distinguished ranking member of the Ethics Committee, but also he serves on the Rules Committee, and he sat before us and asked that we simply allow the House to debate this issue. He didn't argue that we have to do it. I happen to believe we do have to do it, but he simply was making the request that the Rules Committee make in order a chance for this House to discuss this very important ethics issue, one with which we are all very familiar. He was joined in this request by the distinguished Chair of the committee. She wasn't there, but I know she has supported his request for us to have an opportunity to debate this issue, and I know she strongly supports the effort, as she did in her testimony before the Administration Committee asking for the additional resources so the Ethics Committee, Mr. Speaker, can in fact do their job.

This is particularly important given the other aspect of this rule. This rule self-executes an amendment establishing the new Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming, about which the distinguished Chair of the Rules Committee was just speaking.

Without impugning the necessity or desire to establish that select committee, my colleagues got to hear me explain at the Rules Committee yesterday exactly why this process was so outrageous and why this is the wrong way to go about establishing a select committee.

Mr. Speaker, never mind that the minority was never given the language creating this select committee until we literally walked into the room yesterday at 2 p.m., and never mind the fact the Democratic majority is denying us a motion to recommit with instructions which would have been made in order if the privileged resolution came to the floor, never mind that the Rules Committee never held a hearing or produced an original jurisdiction committee report on the establishment of this select committee, something I believe is totally unprecedented.

With all of the committees established in the history of this institution, I am convinced that never before has this process been used, and never mind that the House is completely side-stepping regular order by self-executing this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, never mind all of those horrible procedural outrages that have been imposed. I am not going to talk about those. The most troubling part of this whole episode is that this self-executing amendment grants the new select committee some $3.7 million over the course of this Congress. So if we can find an additional $3.7 million to fund this new select committee that will have no legislative power whatsoever, I don't understand why we can't fund a mere $1 million to fully fund the bipartisan request that was made before the Rules Committee to provide the necessary funding for our very hardworking colleagues, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. TUBBS JONES and their colleagues on the Ethics Committee.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of this debate on this rule, I will be asking Members to oppose the previous question so I may amend the rule to make in order the bipartisan Tubbs Jones-Hastings amendment so that the 430 Members that supported the new ethics rules may live up to the commitment that they made right here on opening day.

Mr. Speaker, if you think we needed new ethics standards, if you believe that the Ethics Committee should do its job, then you have a moral obligation to defeat the previous question and allow the House to work its will by at least considering the chance to make sure that Mrs. TUBBS JONES, the distinguished Chair of the Ethics Committee, and Mr. HASTINGS, the ranking member, have the resources they need to do what we, 430 Members, told them they had to do.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me take 30 seconds to say to my good friend, Mr. DREIER, that while he has made much of the fact that a bipartisan group went before the committee to beg for money, that it was turned down by a bipartisan pair, the Chair and the ranking member of that committee, perhaps he should take up his complaint with Mr. EHLERS who was the Republican ranking member on that committee.

Now I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, the issue here is global warming. There is a separate issue of Ethics Committee funding. It should be clear to all of us that we don't have to combine the two to let both defeat what is in the interest of this country to achieve. The crisis of global warming is real. It is urgent and it requires our immediate action. By embracing the challenge of global warming, we can open the door to innovative local approaches as we work towards solutions that are going to create jobs, improve the environment, and improve and strengthen our national security.

This is a very critical issue in my own State, as it is in every State. Even in a small State such as Vermont, we realize that we can and we must make a contribution towards a more sustainable local economy, a more environmentally friendly future. Meaningful Federal policy must be part of that.

I commend this House of Representatives' bipartisan action that in our first days we reversed those tax breaks that went to big oil companies and instead funded renewable energy. The leadership in this Congress has also set a priority on making a green capital initiative. We are going to work, I hope together with my friend from California, on greening this capital and putting our example forward as part of what can be achieved.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I would just like to say that I do look forward, Mr. Speaker, to working with my friend from Vermont on this very, very important issue. And we are at this moment, in fact, going through his legislative initiative. I hope to work closely with him on it.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I thank my friend from California. What that is about, we can take concrete steps. Last month my office introduced a bill that would allow us to be a carbon-neutral office by working with a couple of local initiatives in Vermont to offset the 54 tons of carbon pollution that turning on the lights in my office here in Washington and my office at home in Vermont and my travel back and forth around the State generates.

What we can accomplish by working together requires us to take concrete steps together. This committee, this special select committee, is something in my view that deserves bipartisan support because we have to focus the attention of this Congress on the big issue of global warming, but also on the concrete and specific steps that we can take that will reduce the damage that we do to the environment by our activities by creating jobs that will increase wealth and economic security for our country, and absolutely take steps towards reducing the stranglehold that foreign oil has on limiting our foreign policy options.

This is overdue and something that can be accomplished, and I commend the Speaker for her initiative in putting together this special panel that is going to help this Congress and this country make the overdue steps that are required.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend, the former chairman of the Committee on Standards, the gentleman from Pasco, Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend from San Dimas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Resolution 219. I am disappointed that a bipartisan amendment that I offered, along with the chairman of the Ethics Committee, Chairwoman TUBBS JONES of Ohio, to the Rules Committee was not made in order under this closed rule.

The amendment that we offered would simply set the funding levels for the Ethics Committee at the level that was requested by Chairwoman TUBBS JONES and by me, the amount that we jointly determined was necessary to effectively carry out the Ethics Committee's responsibilities.

Regrettably, the budget we requested was not provided by the House Administration Committee. Yesterday, the Rules Committee refused to allow the House to vote on whether the Ethics Committee will have the resources it needs to fully fund its responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, the Ethics Committee is responsible for two primary tasks: one, educating, informing and advising members and staff about their ethical responsibilities pursuant to the House rules; and, two, enforcing those rules firmly and fairly without regard to friendship, favor, or political party.

Two years ago in a bipartisan fashion, I requested a substantial increase in funding to better fulfill these responsibilities, and I was pleased that 2 years ago the House Administration Committee supported and approved the full funding that was requested. However, as the Speaker and Members know, the 110th Congress passed significant changes to the House rules that we are living under in this Congress. Those rules require, Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat, require that our committee take on additional responsibilities that we haven't had in the past in areas of gift, private travel, mandatory ethics training, and public disclosure.

Our budget request this year, $6.11 million, and it is the lowest of any standing committee in the House, would provide the additional staff to improve the quality of advice, authorize detailees from the Government Accountability Office to help process public disclosure office, increase ethics training for Members and staff throughout the country, and enhance the communication of the new ethics rules.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the need to live under a tight budget. Yet the budget requested by the Ethics Committee for this Congress is not arbitrary. It is the amount of funds needed to do the work that we are asked to do by a vote of the House. Limiting the Ethics Committee budget limits the Ethics Committee's ability to do its job. I do regret that this matter has reached the House floor, and I know that the chairwoman and I seek simply to have the resources we need to serve Members of this House and to uphold the integrity of this institution.

I am committed to working hand in hand with the chairwoman, and I know that she is sincerely dedicated to carrying out the committee's responsibilities. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I must ask my colleagues to join me in voting against the rule and against the previous question so that the amendment providing the Ethics Committee the necessary funding can be considered by the full House.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to enter into the RECORD a very important piece of information which has just come my way.

Printed in the New York Times this morning: ''Internal memorandums circulated in the Alaskan division of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service appear to require government biologists or other employees traveling in countries around the Arctic not to discuss climate change, polar bears or sea ice if they are not designated to do so.

''In December, the Bush administration, facing a deadline under a suit by environmental groups, proposed listing polar bears throughout their range as threatened under the Endangered Species Act because the warming climate is causing a summertime retreat of sea ice that the bears use for seal hunting.

''It remains unclear whether such a listing will be issued. Over the past

week, biologists and wildlife officials received a cover note and two sample memorandums to be used as a guide in preparing travel requests. Under the heading 'Foreign Travel—New Requirement—Please Review and Comply, Importance: High,' the cover note said.''

□ 1100

''''Please be advised that all foreign travel requests and any future travel requests involving or potentially involving climate change, sea ice and/or polar bears will also require a memorandum from the regional director to the director indicating who'll be the official spokesman on the trip and the one responding to questions on these issues, particularly polar bears.'

''The sample memorandums, described as to be used in written travel requests, indicate that the employees seeking permission to travel 'understands the administration's position on climate change, polar bears, and sea ice will not be speaking on or responding to these issues.'

''Electronic copies of the memorandums and cover note were forwarded to The New York Times by Deborah Williams, an environmental campaigner in Alaska and a former Interior Department official in the Clinton administration.

''''This sure sounds like a Soviet-style directive to me,' Ms. Williams said.

''Limits on government scientists' freedom to speak freely about climate change became a heated issue last year after news report showed that political appointees at NASA had canceled journalists' interview requests with climate scientists and discouraged news releases on global warming.''

Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a time for this Congress to take up global warming, and if there was ever a question that it was not the position of this administration to ignore it, I hope this puts it to rest.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say, we are all concerned about global warming. At this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my very distinguished friend from Miami (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that our colleagues that may be watching this debate realize what is being debated. That is, that at the beginning of this Congress, as we all know because we voted on it, the Congress, pursuant to the request of the new majority and the Rules of the House, significantly increased the responsibilities of the Ethics Committee.

And yesterday, the distinguished chairman of the Ethics Committee and the distinguished ranking member sought to have an amendment made in order in this legislation before us today, which is funding of the committees, to sufficiently fund the Ethics Committee, especially now that it has new significant additional responsibilities. That amendment was not made in order.

So what we are saying is, let's defeat the previous question so that the Ethics Committee, with all of its additional new responsibilities, can be funded because you can't have the newspaper article saying, oh, we're increasing all these requirements, ethics requirements, that are going to be supervised and executed by the Ethics Committee and then not fund the Ethics Committee sufficiently.

That is what our distinguished friends in the majority are doing. They get the headlines, but then they don't want to fund the Ethics Committee sufficiently so it can do its job correctly.

So what we are saying is, defeat the previous question and let's not support this rule because we need to fund the Ethics Committee sufficiently so it can do its job.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Dallas (Mr. SESSIONS), a hardworking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California giving me time.

I rise in opposition to this closed rule and to the unprecedented creation of a new panel with no legislative jurisdiction and no authority to take legislative action. Mr. Speaker, it is like being air-dropped into this usually noncontroversial resolution without any committee oversight or consideration being given.

The cost to the taxpayers for this lopsided new committee to study the serious issue of climate change but that is not given the power by the Democrat leadership of actually doing anything; yet it costs $4 million.

This resolution also represents an increase of 14.3 percent over last year's Congress, raising the funding levels for these committees and staff salaries from just over $250 million to just over $291 million, one Congress to the next.

But with all of this new spending, the Democrat majority cannot find a way to adequately fund one of the most vocally stated priorities, at least on the campaign trail, the Ethics Committee.

This lack of funding is hindering the committee's struggle to untangle the confusingly drafted new ethics package passed by the new Democrat majority and to provide the training mandated by House Rules.

So, today, the American people can see where the Democrats' true priorities lie, in crafting and creating an unfunded mandate and leaving a campaign promise unfilled, while spending millions of taxpayer dollars on a new panel that has no authority to do anything.

Mr. Speaker, I do encourage all my colleagues to hear the straight story, and I also encourage them to vote against this rule and to defeat it.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules how many speakers she has remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I have none. I am ready to close.

Mr. DREIER. Would the gentlewoman like to yield me some of the time because we have got loads of people here who want to talk?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Go ahead and use it any way you like.

Mr. DREIER. Well, I just wondered if you wanted to give us some of your time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am not giving you my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman reserves the balance of her time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, in light of that, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kiron, Iowa (Mr. KING) who came before the Rules Committee offering a very thoughtful amendment last night, our good friend.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am compelled to come to the floor and stand up and speak in opposition to this rule.

The rules package that came before the floor of the House, an unamendable rules package, was amended before it came to the 109th, to the 110th Congress, eliminating the requirement that the Rules Committee and other committee votes be published when there is a recorded vote.

Yesterday, before the Rules Committee, I brought an amendment that would require the Rules Committee to print recorded votes if they were to receive any of the funding that is authorized. I got about a third of the way through my presentation when I was interrupted by the chair, and the point was made that they have printed their votes to this date. The argument was made that since they have complied with my amendment, then there is no reason for my amendment, in fact, no latitude for me to continue my debate with regard to that and my presentation.

So I rise in opposition to this rule because, first of all, we need to have sunlight on everything we do, and a requirement to provide to the public access to recorded votes is something that ought to be in the rule. It ought not to be an option. If it is the practice of the Rules Committee, then this amendment codifies the practice of the Rules Committee, and it should not receive objection, especially the vociferous interruption objection.

I also object to the way I was treated before the Rules Committee. I will keep coming back regardless. I will not be intimidated, and I intend to raise the sunlight on everything we do in this Congress. I want to see all of our

work become available on the Internet, in a searchable, sortable, downloadable format. I want all the sunlight possible, so the bloggers can see, and I would love to see television cameras up before the Rules Committee as well, Mr. Speaker. I think that will help the decorum of the Rules Committee.

But I intend to come back. Like the Governor from California, I will be back.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Iowa quoting Governor Schwarzenneger. He can do it any time.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished former Governor of the State of Delaware, the gentleman from Wilmington (Mr. CASTLE), who is back.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding to me.

I rise today in opposition to the previous question for the committee funding resolution. The resolution at hand underfunds our Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, not compared to previous years but in light of problems that exist and the education that is needed.

At a time crucial to restoring America's faith in our ability to govern ourselves, the Rules Committee dismissed an amendment offered by Chairwoman STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES and Ranking Member DOC HASTINGS which would have allowed us to equip the Ethics Committee with the resources necessary for enacting meaningful reform.

Opposing this previous question will enable the House to consider the amendment to fully fund the Ethics Committee, which I believe will actually save us money in the long run, and I encourage my colleagues to allow us to debate and support this important amendment.

Mr. Speaker, some will say that the increase to the Ethics Committee is already substantial. To those Members, I would like to remind them that when making their request, the chairwoman and ranking member took into consideration the past problems and the recent changes to our rules, and determined the staffing and resources necessary to provide training, oversight and interpretation of those rules to this body.

We have rightfully tightened our travel rules, requiring preapproval; finally banned travel on corporate jets; and we have enacted specific restrictions on accepting food and drinks at briefings, and T-shirts or books from organizations or constituents. Some are allowed, and some are not.

Mr. Speaker, more than a memo is needed to convey these guidelines. Members and staff should already be receiving training on the Rules governing the 110th Congress. Instead, we are beginning the month of March, and it is unclear even when the training could be available.

On top of the new rules already adopted, there is more to be done, in my opinion. We need to have a permanent and professional committee staff, and we need to expand ethics training to lobbyists.

How can we expect the committee to exercise duties of even the most minimum oversight and investigations with a budget that does not meet the stated needs of the chairwoman and the ranking member of that committee?

As elected representatives, we come to Congress with the trust of those we represent. The poor decisions of a few have dishonored this great body and have challenged the faith Americans deserve to have in each of us. Enforcing high standards of ethics and civility may seem to be the responsibility of the majority party, but they are, in fact, essential within every one of us elected to hold the public trust.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to oppose this previous question to allow consideration of this amendment.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3½ minutes to a thoughtful former member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Moore, Oklahoma, (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against the rule and the underlying bill as it is currently written. Frankly, my concerns are not about the global warming issue. It is about the ethics issue.

As a former member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, I understand and appreciate the tremendously difficult job that we ask the staff and the members of that committee to face on a daily basis. It is common knowledge in this body that no one wants to serve on the Ethics Committee. It is a responsibility that no one seeks but, frankly, must be handled.

I think, frankly, everyone understands that there have been ethical lapses by some of our colleagues in the last few years. That committee has dealt with those lapses as best it could, handling a workload that is unpredictable, and it is by its very nature highly charged and occasionally and unfortunately partisan.

To do that job, the last Congress increased the funding for the committee by approximately 40 percent. Even that was probably not enough to handle the job which had been given to us by the House, but it is certainly not enough to deal with the new responsibilities that the majority has chosen to extend to that committee.

The majority party ran on a platform of ethics and made it a major issue in the last campaign, and frankly, it passed with strong, bipartisan support an ethics package as the very first act that calls, again, on Members to do more in the committee to supervise and do more.

Now the majority party is actually refusing to do what they promised; that is, they are refusing to fund the 41 percent increase in the underlying legislation that their own chairman of the Ethics Committee and the ranking member have jointly requested.

We have been able to find millions of dollars to fund the global warming effort, a select committee, a committee, frankly, that has no duties, no responsibilities, no legislative priorities, but it is an important committee, and I recognize the importance of looking at that extremely important issue. At the same time, we will not fund a committee that already has the smallest budget of any standing committee, whose responsibilities we have magnified, compounded and increased greatly.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle again made ethics a major issue in the last campaign, and frankly, they have threatened to make it a major issue in the next campaign. Fair enough. I think everybody should be scrutinized that is privileged to serve in this body, but if you are going to do that, you have to give the committee the financial resources to do the job that it is charged to do, and frankly, you have to provide the Members of this body with the services that they need to avoid inadvertently breaking the rules and becoming the target for political cheap shots, whether they are launched by one side or the other.

It is simply irresponsible to the Members of this body. I am not surprised that our friends on the other side of the aisle do not want to yield us some more time to talk about this simply because they are in an indefensible position.

Do the right thing: Vote against this hollow rule and give the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct the funding it needs to get its job done.

□ 1115

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman who chairs the Ethics Committee, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, thank you for the time.

Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I was actually in a Ways and Means hearing on waste, fraud and abuse in Medicare, and all of a sudden, someone called and said, they're using your name, they're using your name, they're using your name. So I turned on the television to see what was going on, and I was forced to come to the floor.

First of all, let me say that I feel like I am blessed to have the opportunity to chair the Ethics Committee of the U.S. Congress. I come from Cleveland, Ohio. My father carried bags for 40 years for United Airlines, and my mother was a factory worker. To have the opportunity to sit in this seat, the seat that my predecessor, the honorable Congressman Louis Stokes, held for so

many years is indeed an honor and an opportunity.

I am so pleased to have an opportunity to work with the committee of men and women who want to do the job of chairing and overseeing the Ethics Committee. I want you to know that DOC HASTINGS and I have worked together for the past 5 or 6 years on ethics, and we will continue to work diligently on behalf of the Members of Congress, the people of the United States, because it is through our responsibilities that we will be able to help people to understand how great the Members of the U.S. Congress are and how great we are at doing our job and taking our responsibilities seriously.

I come to the floor reluctantly. I did, in fact, sponsor an amendment with DOC HASTINGS and both of us, in fact, believe that the Ethics Committee could use additional dollars; but I am not going to be used. I am not going to allow the process of a bill with regard to other issues to hold up the dollars that are available to other committees. We understand we operate within a framework of having only so much money.

It was not the Rules Committee that had the responsibilities of granting additional dollars. It was the previous committee that previously said on a bipartisan basis, we are not going to give you any more money. So here comes the Rules Committee. We lost in the Rules Committee. I am a big girl, I lost that money, but it doesn't mean I am not going to do my job.

Let me finish. Then you can jump up, and, Mr. DREIER, I will, in fact, yield you some of my time. I guarantee you that there may be another mechanism or another vehicle for us to be able to provide the support to the Ethics Committee.

Understand, we are going to do our job. We are going to do our job, and I am not going to be used or my amendment to allow anyone to say we can't do our job. Guaranteed, I wouldn't have taken the job. NANCY PELOSI said I was tough and smart. I am both of those. Doc Hastings is tough, and he is smart. We will do our job.

I thank you for elevating the Ethics Committee to a level where people think that we ought to have another opportunity.

I am so happy to see the majority leader on the floor. We are both from Ohio. In fact, I am going to yield you some of my time. Come on, baby, let's talk. Let's interact.

Mr. BOEHNER. Would the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Absolutely.

Mr. BOEHNER. I appreciate the gentlelady yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentlelady from Ohio, knows I have deep respect for her and the other members of the Ethics Committee and Mr. HASTINGS. They do a good job on behalf of our Members, and it is thankful from the Members, but it is a very unwelcome job that you have; and we do appreciate your work.

With what the House did in early January, in terms of adopting a new ethics package, it is clear that the responsibility of the Ethics Committee has expanded significantly. Members supported that, and I think it is long overdue.

Now, we all know, and I am not going to talk about the amendment that was offered last night, but there is insufficient money in the budget for the Ethics Committee to do what we have charged them with doing.

Now, we do this with Federal agencies all the time and can look the other way. If we want Members to abide by the rules that we have adopted, we have to have an Ethics Committee that can provide services to those Members so they understand the rules, they understand the limits, what they can and can't do. The concern that we have is that because there is insufficient money for the Ethics Committee in this resolution that Members are going to be charged with living under new rules and not having the service component necessary from the Ethics Committee to carry out our job.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. BOEHNER, thank you very much, all of you. But let's find a forum to address this issue other than in this process. I guarantee you that our leadership can sit down and work this out. I'm not going to be used. I'm telling you, the Ethics Committee has to stand on its own. We are not going to be in this process. Let's find a way. There is a vehicle by which we can work on giving the Ethics Committee the money that they need without being caught up in this process.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Absolutely.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

First, let me say I have utmost respect for both Ohioans, Mr. BOEHNER and Mrs. JONES, as well as the ranking member of the Ethics Committee, Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. Speaker, on the opening day, we did, in fact, establish unprecedented ethics rules. Since that time, we have continued to hear complaints from Members about the lack of ability for the Committee on Standards to provide Members with information that is needed.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. DREIER, I take my time back. You can continue to make those comments if you want to, but I guarantee you that the Members who needed to get information by a certain date got their information. You are not going to use my committee on the floor to be a battling horse for anybody. I tell you, I will live within the dollars I get. I want more. Get them for me.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, we are trying to get the resources necessary.

With that, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to my very good friend, my California colleague who serves on the House Administration Committee, Mr. LUNGREN.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, at the time that the Ethics Committee came before our committee for their funding, I inquired as to what they needed, because I was concerned about the insufficiency of funds for that committee per the directions we had received from the leadership as to what we could actually give them.

So during that presentation before our committee, the distinguished chairwoman of the committee said these words regarding her request: ''These positions,'' that is the positions that will be funded by their additional money request, ''are needed to satisfy the mandates of the House Ethics Committee.'' She continued: ''Importantly, the figures presented today represent the collaborative efforts of my ranking member, Representative DOC HASTINGS, and I to advance,'' again, quoting her, ''the past needs of the committee and the current mandates of the House ethics rules.''

That's the nub of this whole debate. That is why we ask that this rule be voted down and that we will be allowed to have an amendment dealing specifically with funding for the Ethics Committee.

We have to understand, ''additional mandates,'' those are the words from the chairperson of the committee, current mandates of the House ethics rules. I am just asking Members on both sides of the aisle to think about this. We have said that we are going to be the most ethical Congress in history. We have adopted new rules that mandate new concerns with specificity as to conduct by Members and their staff.

One of the enforcing mechanisms is guidance to be given to us by that very Ethics Committee. Therefore, we have imposed additional obligations, additional work on that committee; and yet we are not giving them the additional resources.

Now, if I were a corporation having received the new mandate under Sarbanes-Oxley, and the first thing I told my employees and my shareholders is, I am not going to beef up our lawyers, I am not going to beef up our accountants to give us advice as to what we should do under the law, the shareholders would probably throw me out of my position because I would not be doing the job that is necessary.

We on this floor in these committees have two shareholders. We have our peers, that is the other Members to whom we owe a responsibilities to give them that which they need to ensure that they follow those rules, and we have an obligation to our ultimate shareholders, the taxpayers of America, our constituents, who expect us to put our money where our mouth is to expect us to live up to our promises. May I just say, I thank the committee for the work they did.

I had to make a specific request of the committee about a particular trip I was going on to visit a friend that I have known for 40-some years, before our last break, and I received oral assurance from the committee that it was appropriate. But, technically, I was supposed to receive written assurance, and I received that a week after the visit.

Now, it turned out my wife slipped on the ice and we were not able to go on the visit, so I have to write a letter to the committee to make it clear I didn't do that, and that is why it will not be in my report at the end of the year. But the fact of the matter is, those technical violations that could occur because we don't give them enough in the way of personnel can come back to haunt us as individual Members, but, more importantly, to undercut, undercut the confidence the American people have in this place that we are ethical.

All I am saying is, we can save money in a number of different places; but we ought not to skimp on this particular issue, this particular committee.

Therefore, I would ask Members to vote down this rule so we can have this simple amendment brought forward.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules how many speakers she has remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York has 11 minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, obviously there has been a great deal of thought and talk, and it has been understandable about the issue of ethics and lobbying reform. Last year, Speaker HASTERT and I initiated a package that we passed through the House but, unfortunately, we were not able to come to an agreement in the Senate. On the opening day, 430 Members voted to put into place unprecedented ethics reform, unprecedented ethics reform.

Why? Because the American people know we should be held to the highest possible standards. Now, there is an expression that I think is a very important one, and that is ''put your money where your mouth is.'' Now the very distinguished Chair of the committee on ethics, my good friend Mrs. JONES, talked about the fact that she wants to address this as concerns come forward.

Mr. Speaker, this is the committee funding measure that we are bringing to the floor. We are doing some other things to it, self-executing establishment of a committee, but we are providing for that committee that will have no legislative authority whatsoever, $3.7 million. All we are asking, Mr. Speaker, is that we have a chance, a chance to debate the issue of funding for the Ethics Committee here on the floor.

That is why I am going to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question. Why? Because while this new committee that will have no legislative authority whatsoever will receive $3.7 million, we are simply asking for what is being denied, and that is a chance for $1 million to be provided so that our Members will not be facing the weekend situation that Mr. LUNGREN just described where he sent a letter to the Ethics Committee, asked for a response about going on a trip, and he didn't receive approval until a week after the trip was to take place.

Mrs. JONES and Mr. HASTINGS came before the House Administration Committee and made this request for additional funding; and Mr. HASTINGS, representing Mrs. JONES before the Rules Committee, asked that this amendment be made in order.

Mr. Speaker, any Member who votes for the previous question is denying this institution the opportunity to consider implementing the resources that are necessary to hold us to the highest possible ethical standards. Vote ''no'' on the previous question.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 219 OFFERED BY REP. DREIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, after conclusion of the time for debate on the resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider the amendment in section 3, if offered by Mr. Hastings of Washington or his designee. The amendment shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment or demand for division of the question.

Sec. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

In section 1(b), strike ''Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $4,994,181;'' and insert ''Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $6,119,301;''.

In section 2(b), strike ''Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $2,460,915;'' and insert ''Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $2,996,561;''.

In section 3(b), strike ''Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $2,533,266;'' and insert ''Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $3,122,740;''.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I just have one statement to say, that it is not the job of the Rules Committee to change the amounts of money given to various committees by House administration. Frankly, I am sorry Mr. LUNGREN missed his trip, and I do know the Ethics Committee is going to be very busy. We have been reading about it.

□ 1130

I want to say the same thing Mrs. TUBBS JONES said: our leadership is not going to let it go without the money that it requires.

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

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

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 195, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—228

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter

Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—195

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Bono
Camp (MI)
Davis, Jo Ann
Kanjorski
Larson (CT)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
Pence
Pitts
Radanovich

□ 1157

Messrs. PETRI, SULLIVAN, TIAHRT and BARTON of Texas changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1200

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule previously adopted, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 202) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Tenth Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 202

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Tenth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in such subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $12,398,755; Committee on Armed Services, $15,469,004; Committee on the Budget, $12,026,478; Committee on Education and Labor, $16,334,250; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $25,874,614; Committee on Financial Services, $16,575,710; Committee on Foreign Affairs, $17,953,805; Committee on Homeland Security, $16,511,877; Committee on House Administration, $10,214,461; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $10,409,000; Committee on the Judiciary, $16,657,587; Committee on Natural Resources, $15,581,951; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, $22,876,214; Committee on Rules, $6,781,540; Committee on Science and Technology, $13,209,820; Committee on Small Business, $6,257,410; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $6,119,301; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $19,724,511.24; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $6,933,319.44; and Committee on Ways and Means, $20,059,513.60.

SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2007, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2008.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $5,954,462; Committee on Armed Services, $6,883,959; Committee on the Budget, $6,013,239; Committee on Education and Labor, $8,025,500; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $11,013,668; Committee on Financial Services, $8,029,517; Committee on Foreign Affairs, $8,762,228; Committee on Homeland Security, $8,132,028; Committee on House Administration, $5,033,242; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $5,077,000; Committee on the Judiciary, $8,165,484; Committee on Natural Resources, $7,638,213; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, $10,790,667; Committee on Rules, $3,357,198; Committee on Science and Technology, $6,475,402; Committee on Small Business, $3,009,086; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $2,996,561; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $9,528,749.39; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $3,398,686; and Committee on Ways and Means, $9,785,128.60.

SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2008, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2009.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $6,444,293; Committee on Armed Services, $8,585,045; Committee on the Budget, $6,013,239; Committee on Education and Labor, $8,308,750; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $14,860,946; Committee on Financial Services, $8,546,193; Committee on Foreign Affairs, $9,191,577; Committee on Homeland Security, $8,379,849; Committee on House Administration, $5,181,219; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $5,332,000; Committee on the Judiciary, $8,492,103; Committee on Natural Resources, $7,943,738; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, $12,085,547; Committee on Rules, $3,424,342; Committee on Science and Technology, $6,734,418; Committee on Small Business, $3,248,324; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $3,122,740; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $10,195,761.85; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $3,534,633.44; and Committee on Ways and Means, $10,274,385.

SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 219, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the resolution, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 110–34, is adopted and the resolution, as amended, is considered read.

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

H. RES. 202

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Tenth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in such subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $11,995,306; Committee on Armed Services, $14,618,946; Committee on the Budget, $12,520,064; Committee on Education and Labor, $16,213,840; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $21,056,249; Committee on Financial Services, $16,189,138; Committee on

Foreign Affairs, $17,391,504; Committee on Homeland Security, $16,448,403; Committee on House Administration, $10,214,461; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $10,467,084; Committee on the Judiciary, $16,347,324; Committee on Natural Resources, $15,288,192; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, $21,602,950; Committee on Rules, $6,852,908; Committee on Science and Technology, $12,963,775; Committee on Small Business, $5,965,945; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $4,994,181; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $19,261,795; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $7,076,347; and Committee on Ways and Means, $19,040,609.

SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2007, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2008.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $5,910,765; Committee on Armed Services, $7,203,581; Committee on the Budget, $6,169,343; Committee on Education and Labor, $7,989,475; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $10,375,603; Committee on Financial Services, $7,977,303; Committee on Foreign Affairs, $8,569,776; Committee on Homeland Security, $8,105,057; Committee on House Administration, $5,033,242; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $5,157,724; Committee on the Judiciary, $8,055,250; Committee on Natural Resources, $7,533,355; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, $10,644,994; Committee on Rules, $3,376,815; Committee on Science and Technology, $6,387,984; Committee on Small Business, $2,939,758; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $2,460,915; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $9,491,374; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $3,486,916; and Committee on Ways and Means, $9,382,384.

SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2008, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2009.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $6,084,541; Committee on Armed Services, $7,415,366; Committee on the Budget, $6,350,721; Committee on Education and Labor, $8,224,365; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $10,680,646; Committee on Financial Services, $8,211,835; Committee on Foreign Affairs, $8,821,728; Committee on Homeland Security, $8,343,346; Committee on House Administration, $5,181,219; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $5,309,361; Committee on the Judiciary, $8,292,074; Committee on Natural Resources, $7,754,836; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, $10,957,956; Committee on Rules, $3,476,093; Committee on Science and Technology, $6,575,791; Committee on Small Business, $3,026,187; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, $2,533,266; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $9,770,421; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $3,589,431; and Committee on Ways and Means, $9,658,226.

SEC. 4. CREATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND GLOBAL WARMING.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming (hereinafter in this section referred to as the ''select committee'').

(b) COMPOSITION.—The select committee shall be composed of 15 members appointed by the Speaker, of whom 6 shall be appointed on the recommendation of the Minority Leader. The Speaker shall designate one member of the select committee as its chairman. A vacancy in the membership of the select committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(c) JURISDICTION.—The select committee shall not have legislative jurisdiction and shall have no authority to take legislative action on any bill or resolution. Its sole authority shall be to investigate, study, make findings, and develop recommendations on policies, strategies, technologies and other innovations, intended to reduce the dependence of the United States on foreign sources of energy and achieve substantial and permanent reductions in emissions and other activities that contribute to climate change and global warming.

(d) PROCEDURE.—(1) Except as specified in paragraph (2), the select committee shall have the authorities and responsibilities of, and shall be subject to the same limitations and restrictions as, a standing committee of the House, and shall be deemed a committee of the House for all purposes of law or rule.

(2)(A) Rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the select committee where not inconsistent with this resolution.

(B) Service on the select committee shall not count against the limitations in clause 5(b)(2) of rule X.

(e) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives not more than $3,725,467 for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of the select committee.

(2) LIMITATIONS.—Of the amount provided for in paragraph (1) for the select committee—

(A) not more than $1,666,667 shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on March 1, 2007, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2008; and

(B) not more than $2,058,800 shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2008, and ending immediately before midnight on January 1, 2009.

(f) REPORTING.—The select committee may report to the House from time to time the results of its investigations and studies, together with such detailed findings and recommendations as it may deem advisable. All such reports shall be submitted to the House by October 31, 2008.

(g) DISSOLUTION AND WINDUP OF AFFAIRS.—The select committee shall cease to exist on December 31, 2008.

(h) DISPOSITION OF RECORDS.—Upon dissolution of the select committee, its records shall become records of such standing committee or committees as the Speaker may designate.

SEC. 5. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 6. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank the ranking member, Mr. EHLERS, and all of the members on the Committee on House Administration for their assistance in meeting a very tight schedule. We have been able to perform what normally takes many months in a much shorter time period. Unfortunately, that necessitated some quick decisions, which we would all have preferred more time to make.

I would also like to thank the Chairs and the ranking members of the committees for meeting the deadline that I set forth. I know that there were concerns about foreshortening the process, but this resolution will provide for operating certainty.

The committee's recommendations are driven by the amount of funds available to be allocated to the committees. The continuing resolution, the CR, funding all government operations contained a very modest amount for committees, and it is the CR funds which my committee had to work with.

All committees which testified were treated in exactly the same way. At our hearing, the first question of each committee was, Is the minority satisfied with the allocation of funds for its operations? Almost without exception, Mr. Speaker, the minority expressed satisfaction. Even when there was initial disagreement, the chairman and ranking member found common ground before the House Administration markup.

This committee recognizes that each standing committee carefully assessed its anticipated workload and requested all of its sums it considered necessary to discharge its responsibilities. Unfortunately, when the 109th Congress adjourned, the fiscal 2007 appropriations process was unfinished. That led to the CR, which greatly limited this committee's options in the authorization process for the 110th Congress. And with severely limited resources, my committee was able to recommend across-the-board inflationary adjustments of 2.6 percent for 2007, and 2.94 percent for 2008. Without additional appropriations, no further adjustments were possible.

My committee's amendment in the nature of a substitute authorizes $280,234,490 for the entire 110th Congress, and that includes funding for the select committee just added by the rule.

The committee believes that the Chairs and ranking members will shepherd their resources carefully and despite the approximately $1 million shortfall will still be able to fulfill their responsibilities to the House. The lone panel to receive a supplemental amount was the Armed Services Committee, which bears an exceptionally heavy burden and must be considered a special case.

The war in Iraq has taken the lives of more than 3,000 American service personnel, wounded tens of thousands more, and consumed hundreds of billions of dollars over the last 4 years. The Armed Services Committee has an enormous responsibility going forward and must have the resources with which to oversee America's military policy in Iraq and around the world.

Given the gravity of Armed Services' task, House Administration recommended an additional increase of $500,000 for 2007. While appropriations for 2008 have yet to be enacted, the committee's amendment reflects the best assessment by the appropriators and by the House financial managers of the amount that will be available to support committees during the second session.

Committee workloads increase during the second session of any Congress, and I expect this pattern to continue as committees engage in the critical legislative and oversight work which the American people voted for last November.

As I indicated earlier, every effort was made to ensure that the fairness principle was applied during the funding process. The purpose is to ensure that the minority party can serve as the loyal opposition and contribute fully to the legislative and oversight initiatives of each committee.

The fairness principle takes the form of the one-third rule, which was advocated by both Republicans and Democrats when they served in the minority. The committee believes the principle has now become firmly established in the allocation of resources, committee by committee, and that irrespective of which party is in the majority, the one-third rule will be carried forward. Each committee must nonetheless implement the principle consistent with its own operating practices and procedures. As Chairs and ranking members change from Congress to Congress, the committee expects that the fairness principle will continue to address the needs of the minority.

There were many concerns expressed during this year's truncated funding process, not the least of which was the overall inadequacy of funds to meet the collective needs of the committees. From the beginning of the Congress, even before the adoption of the CR, committees were counseled to operate on a flatline spending basis in order to avoid a shortfall later in the Congress. Most committees followed that guideline and many kept their eventual funding requests within a few percentage points of the flatline spending rate of the preceding session, one committee even restraining its request to preclude an inflation adjustment for both personnel costs and operating expenses.

The committee appreciates the efforts of committees to keep their requests as low as feasible, given the backlog of the oversight responsibilities to be carried out and the legislative agenda set out by the House leadership. However, the committee recognizes the continuing needs of many committees to support and expand their agendas. As a result, both I and the ranking member, Mr. EHLERS, indicated that if additional funds became available for distribution, the committee would entertain future requests to supplement the authorized levels in this resolution.

In addition to the Chairs' and ranking members' concerns about the overall spending shortfall and the impact on staffing levels, there were additional concerns expressed about the ability of committees to attract and maintain senior legislative and oversight professionals because the current salary cap is not competitive with the private sector. A few committees indicated that some new employees were accepting committee positions at salaries below their previous private sector levels based upon a desire to perform public service, and we are very grateful to those staff persons who have done that and will do that. While this is laudable, and some individuals may be willing to make such sacrifices, it remains imperative that committee salary caps become competitive or congressional oversight will suffer.

Another theme carried forward from the 109th Congress committee funding process was crowding, insufficient office space to manage and maintain operations and adequately house the staff necessary to perform the legislative and oversight duties. While some committee have received additional work space, it is often in other buildings, and not even contiguous to other committee offices, making it very difficult to work. This broken-up space introduces operation inefficiencies, and we recognize that, Mr. Speaker. And while the committee does not assign or manage office space, it agreed to bring the committee's overall office space concerns to the attention of the House leadership in the hope that future building changes or innovations will take committee needs into consideration.

Again, I thank all of the members on the Committee on House Administration. I thank the ranking member, Mr. EHLERS, and all of those committee members, both sides of the aisle, who partook of this extremely long hearing that we got all of the committees and the ranking members in, and I applaud all of them for their tolerance.

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

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

I rise today in support of H. Res. 202, which provides approximately a 2.4 percent increase to committee budgets in the 110th Congress.

I believe I speak for both myself and my colleague, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, when I say we would have liked to have seen a larger increase to relieve some of the financial constraints that have been placed on committees. I totally agree with her concerns, which she expressed a moment ago, about the salaries of staff members, both in personal offices and in committees, and several Members on our side of the aisle have raised that same concern with me.

□ 1215

We, of course, as Members of the Congress, will not receive any increase in salary this year, but we expected that, and we have no problem dealing with that. However, it is different for our staffs. They have lush fields of opportunity outside of this institution, and we hope that all staff members will bear with us during this lean time during the next year or two and not be attracted to these lush fields, but remain with us, so that the institution can continue to function as well as it has.

The committee and ranking members alike face an increasing workload each year with limited resources and staff. Despite the funding limitations we have this year, it is my sincere hope that even a modest increase will be of use to committees in performing the important work that they do, and also my fond hope that through a normal appropriations process this year, there will be adequate funding to deal with the business of the Congress during the next fiscal year.

My goal during the course of providing funding levels for House committees in the 110th Congress has been twofold: first, to maintain what has in the last few years been a relatively smooth committee funding process. Many of our chairmen and ranking members have established standing precedents about the operating practices within their respective committees and have functioned for many years in accordance with those principles. Based on the productive hearing we held last week during which the chairs and ranking members testified on their budget requests, I believe we have continued that smooth process following the pattern of the last several Congresses.

Second, I wanted to ensure that an equitable division of funding continues. When the Republicans previously served in the minority, we were not provided with sufficient funds or staff. As an example, one of the major committees was given only 11 percent of the resources assigned to that committee, whereas the then majority, the Democrats, retained 89 percent for themselves. This is not appropriate or fair.

During the course of the past 12 years, the Committee on House Administration has reached an agreement on maintaining two-thirds of the funding for the majority and one-third for the minority, and I am very pleased that every committee chairman who came before the committee promised to honor and continue that commitment, that allocation, and we are delighted that the new majority's continuation of that split will serve as good guidance for the future as well. It is vital to the strength of the House of Representatives as an institution that the minority, no matter which party it is, continues to be given adequate resources, and that each chairman and ranking member be able to come to an arrangement that is satisfactory for both parties.

Adjustments to the two-thirds/one-third budget allocation have been made

in the past, for instance through the years of shared staff or a centrally managed budget for non-personnel expenditures. My goal is not to discourage these types of arrangements between the chairman and the ranking minority member. In fact, I admire the creativity and cooperation demonstrated by some of our chairmen and ranking members to establish a process that works for their particular committees. However, I do want to ensure that those in the minority continue to be given adequate resources and that each chairman and ranking member are able to come to an arrangement that is satisfactory for both parties.

I conclude by thanking our chairwoman, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for conducting this process in an open and transparent fashion. While we were only able to provide a small percentage increase for each committee when compared to last year's budget, we are pleased that we have accomplished the goals of a smooth process that maintains the two-thirds/one-third allocation.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), a junior member of our committee, but a very experienced junior member, one of the outstanding freshmen and a member of the steering committee.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the work that he has done.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reluctantly oppose this. As a member of the House Administration Committee, I sat through the hearings that we had, where the chairmen and the ranking members came before us and talked about what they needed in funding, and it was our accountability, our role to oversee that. We went through the committees.

But after this resolution was done and went to the Rules Committee, the Rules Committee created a new select committee, added $3.7 million, going beyond the jurisdiction of House Administration. Where is the accountability? Where is the approval process? Where is the role of this House and this committee to oversee that?

If the Rules Committee felt we had $3.7 million more to spend, I think there would be other places to spend it. For one, when we look at the ethics and the changes in this House and what this House wants to accomplish, I am a new Member, I sat on this floor the day we were sworn in, and I listened to our Speaker when she said she wanted a new House, when she talked about changing partisanship and making it partnership.

I do not see partnership with the Rules Committee overstepping the bounds of the House Administration Committee. I do not see partnership when we have put new rules on this floor, when the Ethics Committee needs to oversee them, when the Ethics Committee needs to be able to interpret them and bring them back to this floor so this floor understands it, is able to live by it and be the House that the people want it to be.

So I stand before you reluctantly, because I voted for the version that went before the House Administration Committee, but I will not vote for the version that came back from the Rules Committee. I believe it is overstepping its bounds. I believe the jurisdiction, the accountability, rests in the House Administration Committee, just like every other individual when they were the chair or ranking member and had to stand before us and had to justify the money they were going to spend.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for a brief comment.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his comments, and I certainly agree with him. It would have been much better had that special committee been processed through the Committee on House Administration, as all other committees are. I want to also let him know it is even worse than he said, because the total over the 2-year life of this special committee, the select committee that is being formed, is approximately, $3.7 million, which is a large amount of money for any committee to have.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 9 minutes to another gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN), who is also on our committee.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, at first I would like to congratulate both the chairwoman and the ranking member of this committee for the bipartisan way in which they have acted in bringing this bill to the floor, this funding resolution, which is part of the regular business of this House, making sure that we can do the people's business here in an organized fashion.

We listened to all of the presentations made by the various committee chairs and ranking members. I was very pleased to see the agreement on the one-third/two-thirds funding rule. As one who served here in a prior life, I can recall when it wasn't so. I can recall at one point in time on one of the committees that I won't mention where I believe the difference in staff ratio at the time I served was something like 7-to-1. I can recall when we got something like 11 percent of the total funding. That made it difficult.

We used to encourage our people by saying you have to be that much better than the others. We have to be seven times better. You have to work seven times harder. You can only say that for so long, and you can only do so much with limited resources.

So the rule that has been established over the last number of years that the minority receives one-third of the funding, approximately, is one that works well for both the majority and the minority. It is good for the minority to have sufficient resources so they not only can present their point of view, but also it keeps the majority on its toes. The direct result of that is better legislative product. So I am pleased that that came through.

However, I must once again register my objection to our inability to give appropriate funding to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. As the chairwoman of that committee said when she appeared before our committee, ''Ethics is neither a Democratic nor a Republican issue. It is an American issue.''

It is an issue that is essential to the proper functioning of this House, and it is something for which we have received black eyes of recent vintage and for which we deserve those black eyes because of the conduct of errant Members in this House. And to provide against that from happening again, to encourage that that does not happen again, we have adopted more stringent rules than we have had in this House, in recent memory at least.

In order to assure that Members are able to follow the details of the rules that have been established, the Ethics Committee, or the committee properly understood as the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, has been given additional responsibilities so that Members can rely on their advice in a timely fashion. They do great work. We have dedicated people there, but they will not be able to do the job we give them without additional resources.

This should not be a partisan issue. I for the life of me do not understand the decision made not to give this money. I would have thought the leadership could have put a spotlight on this, given additional money to the Ethics Committee and issued a press release about how they were ensuring that we were going to actually put our money where our mouth was and we were going to have the adequate resources in order to make real the promise that we have given the American people on ethics.

For the life of me, I don't understand why we couldn't find another $1 million for the Ethics Committee. I don't serve on the Ethics Committee, but I don't want to see a Member caught in technical violation of the rules we have adopted for lack of adequate information or available or timely information. I don't want to see a Member who has technically violated our rules because that Member couldn't get a timely response from the committee. Not because the committee doesn't wish to give them that, but because the committee essentially doesn't have the personnel to be able to do that.

We may very well tie ourselves up in knots. Now, the American people probably aren't concerned about whether

we tie ourselves up in knots, but they are concerned about whether our actions reflect the best standards of ethics that we can have. So it is a question of maintaining the confidence of the American people in this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I come here not to talk about a partisan issue and not to talk about an issue that just affects Members of Congress, but an institutional issue. If, in fact, we have created a bond with the American people, and part of that bond is a contract where we hold ourselves out to perform our duties at the highest level of ethical conduct, then in fact we should ensure that that is not difficult to do, but that is expected and easy to do because we have established the strictures in this House and we have established the resources to allow Members to perform within those ethical strictures.

That is why I would stand on this floor today and say that the request of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for $6.1 million, which would be an increase of $1.35 million, is absolutely necessary.

I had every intention of supporting the committee's work on this and being able to recommend this to my fellow Members. I cannot do this.

We have the argument about the other committee that came in with the funding that was put in by a self-executing aspect of the rule just adopted. But that is not what I am arguing about. I am arguing about the absolutely essential need for us to give sufficient resources for the Committee on Ethics to do its work.

As the chairwoman of the committee said in testimony to us directly, these positions that are requested by the Ethics Committee for which they sought the funding that was denied them, these positions are needed to satisfy the mandates of the House ethics rule. She did not say it would be nice to have them. These are additional. These are surplus, to make sure we can do our job. The words were carefully chosen: These positions are needed to satisfy the mandates of the House Ethics Committee.

□ 1230

We need to continue talking about this. We need to work as a committee. If we can do anything about this, I would implore the leadership to take another look at this because it doesn't hurt a Democrat or Republican; it doesn't hurt one individual Member or another. It hurts us all collectively if we fail to give ourselves the best opportunity to show the American people not only are we doing the American people's work, we are doing it based on merit. We are doing it based on a system that is fully ethical, and we don't take this as a burden. We take it as a necessary responsibility, and we understand that not only are we doing the people's business, but we are in a real sense on a stage which requires us to be teachers for many people.

Many young people look at this place and many young people have the opportunity to visit here, and many young people have the opportunity to see our workings here by way of C–SPAN, and I don't want them to be watching in the well of the House as we condemn a Member, as we expel a Member, or we reprimand a Member for inappropriate conduct, and have that Member stand here and say: if only you had given me the resources so I would have known what the rules really were.

I don't want that to be the excuse. I want us to say that we stand here as an ethical, collective body, and that we will put our money where our mouth is. I would just end by saying this: we would not allow a corporation to say they couldn't comply with Sarbanes-Oxley and the new responsibilities under ethics and reporting because they couldn't afford to hire the lawyers and the accountants to do it. We would say that was your obligation.

If we believe that is the obligation in the private sector, we ought to do the very same for ourselves as we stand here in the largest corporation in the world. As the members of the board of directors of the largest corporation in the world that spends more money in the world, we stand here saying we will be as serious about our responsibilities as we expect you to be about yours.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN that we need to take another look at perhaps supplemental funding, and we welcome that thought and we will pursue that, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN, because there is no Member of this House who doesn't want to make sure that the voices of the American people last year will not be taken seriously and will be heard and responded to.

I am so very happy, Mr. Speaker, that the chairwoman on the Committee on Standards and the Ethics Committee came to the floor during the rules deliberation, and she stated that while she would want additional funding, she will guarantee us that that committee will work effectively and efficiently to provide the type of service that is necessary to make sure that the Ethics Committee gives us what it wants us to have. And she said that the best standards of ethics will still be maintained irrespective of.

Now, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN did say we need an extra million dollars. If you look at this, there is a possibility that half a million per session each year would perhaps be the type of funding that we need. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, the supplemental expense resolution pursuant to House rule X for additional funding is where we will pursue that.

I thank the gentleman, but we are complying with, and the Ethics Committee chairwoman said that there will still be maintained, the highest level of standards, and they will do their work efficiently.

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time to conclude.

I wish to make a few comments about some of the points raised by the members of the committee on our side of the aisle.

First, I voted for this resolution as it came out of committee, without any dissent, because I thought we had done the best job we could, with both parties working together, to fairly distribute the limited funds that we had.

What is upsetting our side of the aisle and upsetting a number of individuals are two things: first, the select committee apportionment. I can assure you I am not opposed to forming the Energy Independence and Global Warming Select Committee. It is a major issue, a major topic, which probably has to be studied by a special task force, a select committee, simply because the issue is so complex and cuts across so many committees' jurisdictions that this is the only way to effectively conduct the study and come to an answer.

I do, however, strongly object to the process of adding this huge amount of money, $3.7 million, in the confines of the Rules Committee. That is something that I had hoped and expected would come to our Committee on House Administration so that the Chair of the committee and I could work on this issue with all of the parties involved and ascertain the needs of the select committee and determine the precise allocation needed.

What particularly angers me about this is that we did not fully fund the Ethics Committee at the level it should be funded. The reason was we simply didn't have the money. Now, suddenly, there is an extra $3.7 million. I would have much preferred to allocate part of that to the Ethics Committee and reduce the amount for the select committee. I am sure they would not have noticed the difference, whereas the Ethics Committee would notice a huge difference and would be able to do its work effectively.

With those caveats, I want to express my disappointments with the process, not within our committee, but the process outside our committee. I wish it would have gone through our committee, and we would have dealt with it properly.

My final comment is simply to say most Members of Congress do not realize what an incredible amount of work goes into this budget process. It took our committee a full day just to hear the testimony, but that was the easy part. The tough part is for the staff to assemble all of the numbers and get them in order, particularly when there is a transition from one party to the other. That adds complexity and difficulty to the task.

I want to thank Peter Sloan and George Hadijski from our side of the aisle, who did an excellent, an outstanding job on this issue. But even though normally one only praises the

people on their own side of the aisle, I want to take special note of some individuals who worked very, very hard on the majority side, simply because their job was monumental having to do it for the first time.

I particularly want to commend Charlie Howell, Janelle Hu and Matt Pinkus for their hard work. They worked closely with our team, and we were very happy to help them. But I can't emphasize enough what a horrendous task this is to put together all these budgets very quickly, and both sides did yeomen's work. I am very pleased.

I think they set a pattern for the committee because they worked so closely together on this, both parties equally shouldering the burden and not worrying about how many hours they were spending on whose job; and I think that is a good pattern for us to follow for the next 2 years.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the ranking member again in thanking him for his forbearance during that very strenuous hearing process.

I also join him in thanking the staff: Charlie Howell, who is just an extraordinarily effective person, and who worked very hard with me to make sure that all of the very thick material that was needed for this process of hearings was available. And also Matt Pinkus, Janelle Hu and Kristin McCowan, who all played an extraordinary part in making sure that the process went smoothly, although it was very long.

I would also like to thank the minority staff because together they worked very well with the staff to ensure that this process went as smoothly as it could. So I thank all of these folks and the ranking member and all of the members of the committee, the Chairs and the ranking members of all committees, for bearing with us in a tightly budgeted Congress.

I know that our resolution satisfies no one; however, I also know that when legislative and oversight agendas are set, they will be set with a keen eye to how to best use available funds. I want to assure all Chairs and ranking members that my committee will consider all requests for supplemental funding based upon whether or not additional funds are made available to the House. Right now, however, we must all live within our flatline budget constraints because, after all, there was no budget passed last year in the 109th Congress, and we are operating under a continuing resolution.

Indeed, the American people have spoken. They spoke last year, and the Congress must respond to their demands. We all serve as trustees for their voices and their dollars, and I know that each committee will use the funds entrusted to it wisely.

This committee recognizes that each standing committee carefully assessed its anticipated workload and requested only the sums it considered necessary to discharge its responsibilities. Nonetheless, with severely limited resources, the across-the-board inflationary adjustments share the pain equally.

This resolution has the lowest overall committee expenditure authorization level in the last three Congresses, even including the new select committee. At $280 million for the entire 110th Congress, it is an overall decrease of approximately 2 percent, Mr. Speaker. And that is a reversal for which this House should take credit.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly commend Speaker PELOSI for showing tremendous leadership on this issue and creating the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming. This committee will provide Congress the opportunity to conduct important and essential oversight that is long overdue.

I remain deeply concerned about global warming and have been appalled by the Bush Administration's failure to provide any leadership on one of the most important environmental, economic, and moral issues of our time. As the largest producer of greenhouse gasses in the world, the United States must enact national emissions controls to curb our country's contribution to global warming.

European Union leaders are meeting this week to consider plans to cut greenhouse gas emissions by 20 percent by the year 2020, a first step in a post-Kyoto global warming strategy that could lead to mandatory limits for cars and pollution allowances for airlines.

While these actions are critical, the United States needs to lead in this area as Speaker PELOSI is working to achieve. It is high time for the Bush administration to stop questioning the science behind global warming and act to protect future generations.

The Secretary General of the United Nations stated this week that "the danger posed by war to all of humanity—and to our planet—is at least matched by the climate crisis and global warming."

As a Representative of California, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Safe Climate Act, which was introduced last year and will be offered again this year. The goal of the Safe Climate Act is to reach 1990 emissions levels by 2020 and then to continue to cut emissions through 2050.

In order to achieve these cuts, the Environmental Protection Agency would be instructed to set national standards for vehicle emissions at the levels mandated by California state law, which has the strictest vehicle emissions laws in the country. By focusing on an increased use of renewable energy and allowing the nation's largest polluters to meet new federal standards by buying and selling emissions allowances, the Safe Climate Act sets out effective common-sense energy policies that will reduce the United States' dependence on foreign oil while actively addressing global warming.

Again, I praise Speaker PELOSI for drawing attention to this important issue and working toward a solution.

I strongly support the passage of the Committee Funding Resolution for the 110th Congress and the authorization for the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNERNEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 219, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. EHLERS. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on H. Res. 202.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 700.

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

There was no objection.

HEALTHY COMMUNITIES WATER SUPPLY ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 215 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 700.

□ 1244

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 700) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects, with Mr. McNULTY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1245

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

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 700, the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act of 2007. This important legislation would reauthorize appropriations of $125 million for the EPA's alternative water sources grant program.

Mr. Chairman, rapid population growth and development along with an increased awareness of the impact of massive water withdrawals and the threat of global climate change have forced many local communities to explore alternative sources of water.

H.R. 700 provides one alternative for meeting these future water needs by encouraging the testing and implementation of technology that reclaim and reuse water from municipal, industrial and agricultural needs.

I applaud the efforts of my colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Congressman MCNERNEY and Congresswoman TAUSCHER, for their efforts in moving this legislation forward and ensuring that communities are able to meet current and future water needs.

This committee approved similar legislation in the 109th Congress, and it is my hope this year Congress will finally approve legislation and forward it to the President for his signature.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 700, the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act of 2007. I want to thank the chairwoman and the ranking member, Mr. BAKER, for their hard work on this particular bill.

H.R. 700 extends the pilot program under the Clean Water Act for alternative water source projects.

Growth in population, increasing demands for water, and drought are resulting in water shortages in many areas around our Nation, both in the west and the east.

Many communities are finding that their water supply needs cannot be met by existing water supplies. As a result, many communities and their water resource development agencies are looking at alternative ways to alleviate their water shortages and enhance water supplies to meet their future water needs.

This is an important issue not only for my home State of Arkansas but for the many other parts of the country facing increasing demands for water.

Adequate water is needed to sustain our country's economic growth and viability. Some of the approaches they are looking at involve reclaiming, reusing or conserving water that has already been used.

H.R. 700 provides an authority to help communities meet some of their critical water supply needs through water reclamation, reuse, conservation and management.

H.R. 700 authorizes $125 billion for the EPA to make grants to water resource development agencies for these sorts of alternative water source projects. The program leverages non-Federal resources by requiring a non-Federal cash of 50 percent.

I urge all Members to support this important bill.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairmen Oberstar and Johnson and Ranking Members Mica and Baker for their leadership on clean water issues and for their work to bring the legislation we are considering today to the floor. In addition, I would like to thank my colleague and good friend, Mrs. TAUSCHER, for supporting this legislation with me. Mrs. TAUSCHER and I have adjoining districts in California, and we have similar water needs.

My bill, H.R. 700, the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act of 2007, is straightforward and helpful legislation that I hope both parties will support.

Everyone recognizes the need for clean water. It does not matter whether you live in a city or in the rural, it does not matter what your political persuasion is. We all need clean water. Therefore, it is vitally important to identify new water sources for use in agriculture, industry and for residential consumption.

In the past, the State Revolving Loan Funds and Clean Water Act construction grants were available for identifying new water sources. But communities now increasingly depend on those funds just to provide for the maintenance and upkeep of existing water infrastructure, rather than finding new and potentially less expensive water supplies.

H.R. 700 will provide $125 million so that local governments can innovate to collect, clean and distribute new sources of water. The Healthy Communities Water Supply Act will encourage municipalities, public and private water agencies and nonprofit organizations to find ways to provide new sources of water.

For the small investment of Federal funding provided in this bill, we can spur innovation in water resources and move towards solving the increasingly pressing need to ensure clean water for drinking, for family farms, for businesses and for households.

H.R. 700 encourages innovation by funding pilot projects and forward-thinking ideas that lead to practical solutions, which can be applied across the board. This legislation means jobs in local communities by spurring the kind of research that can create new businesses and make our towns and cities more livable at the same time.

The constant threat of drought in the Western States, along with the reality of global warming, emphasizes why the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act of 2007 is so important. We must begin to investigate alternative water sources now, so that we can make strides in ensuring that we have water that we need in the future.

I am hopeful that we can move quickly to pass H.R. 700 and to work with the other body so we can provide water relief for our communities.

Again, I urge all my colleagues to support the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Texas, for yielding the time and compliment her and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER), the ranking member of the subcommittee, for developing this legislation and preparing it and bringing it so early in the session to the House floor. I also appreciate the bipartisan cooperation with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), the ranking member of the full committee, and it is good to have the gentleman from Arkansas on the floor and managing the bill. I thank the gentleman for his ever thoughtful approach to legislation.

This alternative water sources initiative is not something that we developed in the course of this Congress. It started way back in 2000, in fact, earlier than that, as the committee held hearings over a period of several years to raise the visibility of issues of water supply and groundwater withdrawals and needs of communities well off into the future.

In fact, I should point out that a former colleague of ours, later Speaker, Jim Wright, in 1958 wrote a book entitled, ''The Coming Water Famine,'' where then new Congressman Wright gathered enormous amount of data about water usage by industry, by agriculture, by homeowners, and did a calculation that showed the rising use of water intersecting with a line of steady availability.

All the water there ever was, there ever will be, is available now. We will not create new water, and he showed that in the 1980s the lines would intersect, and that, at that point, the Nation and the Congress need to face up to the need to assure the continuity of availability of water supplies, that continued withdrawal of water from the Ogallala aquifer that covers west Texas and eastern Oklahoma, a huge area of the central portion of the United States, could not continue forever. That water would be withdrawn, and there would be no further water available, just simply was not replenishing as fast as surface needs were drawing upon it.

That was the background. That was the stimulus for the alternative water

sources program that our committee included in the Estuaries and Clean Water Act of 2000, which passed the House, the Senate and was signed into law.

The legislation was developed to address the concerns by communities all across the country over availability of water to meet their future requirements, especially in the more arid regions of the country, as we have already heard from the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) and Mrs. TAUSCHER, also from California, who was the initiator of this legislation in previous Congresses.

I have read a great deal about climate change that followed the enormous amount of scientific data pouring forth from the international geophysical year by the United Nations scientific panel, scientists in the U.S. who are reporting on global climate change, and the effect that it is having upon weather and the increasing volatility and variability of the amount, timing and distribution of moisture, not just rainfall but moisture that comes in the form of snow or freezing rain. There is consensus among the climatology scientific community that the timing, intensity and duration of floods, droughts and high-intensity storms are going to continue to plague us over the decades ahead.

Pressure for additional sources of drinking water, usable water for industry and agriculture will only grow and magnify across this country, putting greater pressure on reclamation, on reuse, on advanced wastewater treatment, and even on desalination, as many countries in the world are doing.

In the 1970s, there was an experiment by a Saudi prince who chartered a vessel to go to Antarctica and harness an iceberg, put a huge plastic wrap under that iceberg so it would not melt and had it towed by tug boats to a point off the shore of Saudi Arabia. Then they drilled a hole in the center of it and pumped the water out for several years to bring fresh water to Saudi Arabia. There are not going to be very many icebergs left to be towed as the polar caps melt faster than we can harness the icebergs.

Furthermore, that experiment proved enormously expensive. It also demonstrated that there is a considerable amount of loss of iceberg water capability as the 'berg is towed.

We have to do much better than just towing icebergs. We create with this legislation a modest start on a program to help communities provide for their current needs, for household requirements, industrial needs, for agricultural uses of water, well off into the future.

□ 1300

This is but one important step in the long-term effort we must make to ensure the availability of water supplies and the viability of those water supplies off into the future in this time of highly uncertain climate conditions.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the committee chairman's comments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, what time do we have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Texas has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Arkansas has 28 minutes remaining.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, the primary author of the legislation, Mrs. TAUSCHER.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. I thank my friend, Chairman JOHNSON, for the opportunity to speak today in support of the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act.

Mr. Chairman, I can't tell you how pleased I am to have joined my good friend and neighbor, JERRY MCNERNEY, in introducing H.R. 700. As Californians, Mr. MCNERNEY and I know how precious every drop of water is to our communities, our economy, and our way of life.

Our legislation provides a real Federal commitment to exploring alternative water sources now so we can have the water supplies we will need in the future. This legislation will reauthorize a critical EPA program which was authorized in 2000 by the then Republican-controlled Congress.

Unfortunately, the Republican Congress' commitment to the program and water supply reliability ended with words, not deeds. The program was never funded, and the EPA never implemented it.

Fortunately, today is a very new day. This Congress has the opportunity to provide local communities with the means to invest in critical alternative water source projects.

By providing a modest $125 million authorization for this EPA program, we will help communities plan for their future; and investing in innovative projects such as water recycling, water reuse and aquifer storage will allow our local communities to use water more effectively and efficiently.

In my own district, these types of projects are already under way and will benefit from today's legislation. Projects like the Bay Area Regional Water Recycling Program and the Bay Area Regional Desalination Project are all advancing alternative water sources now and will be able to continue their work through access to these grants.

If we are effectively to plan for our Nation's future to use critical resources, there has to be Federal investment and innovation. The passage of H.R. 700 will clearly indicate that this Congress is ready to lead.

Today, some are trying to say that this program is duplicative, that these types of projects can already be funded through existing sources. First, let me say that we all understand that programs such as the Clean and Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Funds can be used for alternative water source projects.

However, in fiscal year 2007, the President's budget cut the Clean Water State Revolving Fund by 22 percent, and in the fiscal year 2006 he recommended that the fund be cut by $370 million.

So let me ask a simple question: Where will our communities find the resources to maintain and improve critical infrastructure and plan for the future if the Bush administration and the Republicans in Congress keep cutting the funds? It is disingenuous for anyone to claim that there are already resources available for these critical water projects while they are cutting the funds.

So it is time for us all to be responsible. It is time to make critical investments in water infrastructure which have been neglected for all too long, and it is time to ensure our communities can plan for their future water needs.

Mr. Chairman, I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting H.R. 700, the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act, which was passed by a voice vote in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I urge all of my colleagues to support this very important legislation.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, again, I rise to support this bill, very much so. I want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR, Chairman JOHNSON, Ranking Member MICA and Ranking Member BAKER and their staffs for their hard work and the efforts that they put into this.

Again, I would urge my colleagues to support passage of this bill.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for speakers. I want to express my appreciation to all of the staff of the committee. I ask for support of H.R. 700.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 700, Healthy Communities Water Supply Act of 2007, a reauthorization of a Pilot Program for Increasing Usable Water Supply. As you well know, this Pilot Program for increasing usable water supply was authorized for 2002 through 2004, but the previous majority never appropriated any funds and let the authorization expire.

I want to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues just how important it is to supplement existing water supplies by providing reliable high-quality sources of water, particularly in areas of the country that are under the threat of the desert. In California, especially in Orange County, the population is increasing; so is the need for water.

For over 15 years, the Orange County Water District has maintained a Groundwater Replenishment System designed to reuse advanced treated wastewater to recharge the County's groundwater aquifers and basin. This will help them meet the annual water needs of over 144,000 families that keep growing. Also, the county is barely 3 miles from the coast and has an added need to protect the Basin

from further degradation due to seawater intrusion. To this end, the OCWD under its Phase I project provides over 72 million gallons of water per day to replenish its aquifers as well as protect them from seawater intrusion by pumping water through injection wells. This phase will end in September, 2007.

In Phase II of the project, they will be able to process over 250 million gallons of wastewater per day and have enough to support the recharge effort and combat seawater intrusion. There are currently 30 such injection wells that can pump water up to 60–100 feet depth.

The beauty of this project is the collaboration the Water District has with the County's Sanitation District (OCSD) who provides the wastewater that would have been pumped out to the ocean thereby which would have deprived the Water District of the water that is now being reclaimed for the replenishment of groundwater aquifers. And the State Health Department provides the oversight, to make sure water quality is maintained.

With projects like this, communities such as Orange County will benefit tremendously. This OCGW project has attracted experts in public water management systems from other States and countries (Japan, Korea, and Taiwan) who come to Orange County to look at this tertiary system and learn from it. So, this is of national and even internatlonal significance. Also, projects like the OCGWR provides for the necessary investments to ensure water security for the future.

This bill will help improve water availability and quality by authorizing a total of $125 million to fund projects that increase usable water supply by encouraging innovation in water reclamation, reuse and conservation. The Orange County Water Reclamation Project is a perfect example of such a project and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 700.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I rise in strong support of H.R. 700, the "Healthy Communities Water Supply Act of 2007" which authorizes $125 million to enhance water supplies in shortage-plagued areas through the development of such alternative sources as waste water reuse and other water recycling projects. The funding will be used to help finance pilot projects to recycle water for drinking and agricultural use in states like Texas that have long faced chronic supply shortages amid continuing population booms. States would have to pay half the cost of the projects.

Mr. Chairman, the new majority in this House understands that ensuring clean water is a top priority for America's working families. A clean and healthy environment begins with clean water. H.R. 700 will help to make the Nation's water supply cleaner and healthier by utilizing alternative water sources such as waste water and recycled water. If we explore alternative water supplies now, we take a giant step toward ensuring that we will have adequate supplies in the future.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TIERNEY). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 700

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 "Healthy Communities Water Supply Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. PILOT PROGRAM FOR ALTERNATIVE WATER SOURCE PROJECTS.

Section 220(j) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1300(j)) is amended by striking "$75,000,000 for fiscal years 2002 through 2004" and inserting "$125,000,000".

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Amendments printed in the RECORD may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered read.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

Page 2, after line 5, insert the following:

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 220(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1300(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end "and the entity does not permit the use of its water for retail sale of water in containers of 5.7 gallons (20 liters) or less".

Page 2, line 6, before "Section" insert "(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—".

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 700, the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act, is designed to help communities with current or impending water shortages. I support the bill.

We know that such shortages can have many causes. For example, global warming is likely to cause or exacerbate water shortages in the U.S., especially in the Southwest. Under those conditions, alternative water sources will be more important than ever, but communities all over the United States are also fighting to protect their water supplies from overpumping by bottled water companies, who are making billions of dollars from this public resource. My amendment would remove from consideration for these Federal subsidies those areas where bottled water companies are contributing to the demise of the water supply.

According to the International Bottled Water Association, the volume of water privatized has increased between 8 and 12 percent every year since 2001. In 2006, bottled water companies enjoyed $11 billion in revenue from the United States alone. It is estimated that about 25 percent of the bottled water consumed in the United States comes from municipal water supplies.

The effects of the excessive influence of the bottled water industry can go beyond the regional confines of water source depletion and environmental destruction. It codifies a preference for corporate access to water over public access.

I represent the Cleveland area, that, like many cities nearby, relies on Lake Erie for drinking water. A few years ago, there were two instances in which a company received a permit to privatize Great Lakes water in bulk.

In both instances, the projects were abandoned because of the public outcry. In response, the Great Lakes States, with assistance from Canadian Premiers and other stakeholders, attempted to negotiate the conditions under which water could be withdrawn from the lake.

As the negotiations closed, bottled water companies managed to wedge their language into the final agreement. The language also allowed virtually unlimited withdrawals for bottled water companies, while attempting to protect against other privatization attempts.

Such unprecedented favoritism can actually represent a giant step backwards for the notion of water as a public trust. The loophole leaves the entire agreement open to commerce clause challenge or to a challenge in the World Trade Organization. If such a challenge were successful, there would be no limits to privatization of Great Lakes water. It would open the water of the Great Lakes to use by the growing and increasingly thirsty regions where they are having water shortages and where water shortages make it financially viable to pipe water across several States. We would not just be back to square one; we would take a giant step backwards.

This is a classic example, Mr. Chairman, in which greed of the bottled water companies is garnering profits at the expense of the public. I have not even talked about the overeffect of pumping, like the increased cost of finding a replacement source, the loss of connected streams, lakes and rivers, the land subsidence, the salt water intrusion near coasts that render the water undrinkable, and the loss of wildlife habitat.

Another example is emblematic of conflicts between communities and bottled water companies all over the United States. In two small towns in New Hampshire, Nottingham and Barrington, a company called USA Springs is attempting to drill wells that would pump 310,000 gallons a day in an area populated with homes that get their water from small private household wells. The community is worried about a loss of water supply, loss of water quality, and degradation of nearby wetlands.

A very conservative estimate said that USA Springs is looking at about $303 million per year in revenue from this site alone. With that kind of revenue potential, it can be expected they will spend big to make this project happen. This is exactly what they are doing. The result is that USA Springs

is now dangerously close to winning a battle that started in 2001.

The basic building blocks of life, like water, must be accessible by people before corporations, period. When access to the essentials is threatened by outside excessive private gain, I will stand firmly in defense of the public every time.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to explore this issue deeply as Chair of the Domestic Policy Oversight Subcommittee of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. I ask the chairman, my good friend from Minnesota, to work with me as Chair of Transportation and Infrastructure on the broader issue of water privatization and its effects on quality and access.

I yield to Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. OBERSTAR. The gentleman raises a very important issue, one that has been of deep concern. He raises two aspects of a question, one that raises deep concern among communities along the Great Lakes who do not want to see waters of the Great Lakes pumped west to quaff the thirst of arid western States.

Several years ago, there was a proposal for a coal slurry pipeline to bring coal in a slurry pipeline from the Powder River Basin to the western end of Lake Superior to ports of Duluth and Superior; and we vigorously opposed it, because that pipeline, if it pumps east, can also pump west and could suck water out of the Great Lakes in vast amounts.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) has expired.

(On request of Mr. OBERSTAR, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KUCINICH was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, subsequently, in a Water Resources Development Act, I succeeded with legislation to prohibit any withdrawals from the Great Lakes unless there is unanimous agreement among the eight Governors and the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario. That language is current law, but it is not strong enough. It really needs to be reinforced. Now that I am in a position to do that, we are going to reinforce it.

The second concern of the gentleman is private companies profiting from the public sector provision of water supplies, and I think we should find a way in which we can limit the profiteering while not interfering with private sector developments.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. OBERSTAR, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KUCINICH was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. For example, the little town of Buhl, population 900 in my district, has on its water tank the slogan, ''The Finest Water in America,'' and the city began bottling that water for sale. They are using their open resources to bottle this water in these little 8-ounce and 16-ounce bottles. I wouldn't want to prevent Buhl, which has fallen on hard times, from drawing on its resources. But they are using their own money to do that.

What the gentleman is concerned about is a public, federally funded process that might stimulate the private sector. I commend the gentleman for his concern, and we shall work together to address the situation.

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank the chairman for his comments and his dedication to the public good. I look forward to working with you on this to protect public water supplies and to protect the public's right to access.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT OF OFFSETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No authorization of appropriations made by this Act or other provision of this Act that results in costs to the Federal Government shall be effective except to the extent that this Act provides for offsetting decreases in spending of the Federal Government, such that the net effect of this Act does not either increase the Federal deficit or reduce the Federal surplus.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''deficit'' and ''surplus'' have the meanings given such terms in the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise with a very simple amendment, an amendment of responsibility.

As you and the House know, H.R. 700 grants $125 million for alternative water source projects. It is a program that Congress has never funded, may be a very appropriate program. For some in this Chamber, $125 million may not be very much money, but for folks in my district, and I suspect for folks around this Nation, $125 million is a lot of money.

□ 1315

And, again, while what this bill does may be very important, it is important that we also make a statement for financial responsibility. This amendment would apply the principle of pay-as-you-go, pay-as-you-go to any new spending that would be authorized in this legislation.

Very simple: If you are going to spend money for this project, you ought to make it a priority and identify an area where you desire to take that money from in order to pay for this project. It is a concept that has been embraced by many in this Chamber. In fact, many Members on the majority side embraced the pay-as-you-go project in their campaigns this past year. In fact, the New Direction for America, which was proposed by the majority party in the 109th Congress, says, ''Our new direction is committed to pay-as-you-go budgeting. No more deficit spending. We are committed to auditing the books and subjecting every facet of Federal spending to tough budget discipline and accountability, forcing the Congress to choose a new direction and the right priorities for all Americans.''

Mr. Chairman, I agree with that. It is a wise idea. We ought to follow that. We ought to follow that in this new Congress.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment. I would respectfully suggest that, unless adopted, then the new direction in which we are heading is one that will take us in a direction of greater red ink and not that of financial responsibility. So I offer this simple amendment, this PAYGO amendment to H.R. 700, and I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I appreciate the fashion of the gentleman from Georgia, and I respect his consistency. He offered the same amendment yesterday. We had quite a thorough and extensive discussion and a recorded vote, which ended 166–260.

Again, I appeal to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that we are dealing with an authorization. Tomorrow we will be dealing with a different bill that does result in a direct spending reduction as determined by the Congressional Budget Office and for which the committee created an offset and reduced the size of the bill.

This bill, H.R. 700, is not a direct spending bill, and has been so verified by the Congressional Budget Office and by the Office of Management and Budget. It is not subject to the so-called PAYGO rules. An appropriation subsequently could well be subject to PAYGO, but we have yet before us the congressional budget process. We have to vote on a budget, and then we consider the appropriations. If this legislation is enacted in time for the appropriation process, hopefully it could be considered and included, and then there is a question of whether it is subjected to the PAYGO rules.

But in its present form, this is an authorization. It is not a direct spending. It is not subject, as Congressional Budget Office has ruled, to the PAYGO rules. And we made that point yesterday. We make it again today. And I rise in opposition to the amendment, but not in opposition to the approach of the gentleman, who is a true fiscal conservative and wants to ensure that dollars are wisely spent and that we are not overspending.

I assure the gentleman, this legislation, modest as it is in its scope of dollars authorized, will be subjected to the

rigorous oversight of OMB, Congressional Budget Office, procedure and the appropriation process in its new course.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), almost to say the same thing we said yesterday: He has gotten the appropriations mixed up with the authorization.

This is an authorization committee, and actual funding of these programs through the appropriations process, which is where this will be more appropriate. A similar manner it was offered yesterday, as we said, to H.R. 569, the Water Quality Investment Act, and was defeated by 166–260.

This amendment would require that any authorization of appropriations be considered with corresponding offsets regardless of whether the program ever receives any funding. It is possible that it won't.

In the example of the Alternative Water Source pilot program under consideration today, a program that again has never been funded through the appropriations process, this amendment would require the identification of $125 million in offsets, regardless of whether appropriations are ever enacted for this program.

During the first few days of the legislative session, the new Democratic majority renewed the PAYGO rules to require the identification of offsets to any changes in direct spending by legislative initiatives.

This bill has no effect on direct spending. According to the Congressional Budget Office in its analysis of the bill, enacting the bill would not affect direct spending or revenues. Therefore, the offset requirements of PAYGO are never triggered.

I also remind my colleagues that the PAYGO provision was allowed to expire under Republican control of the House, with no attempt by the former Republican leadership to restore its protections to the Federal budgetary process. To now claim to be the champions of fiscal responsibility and attempt to hold Congress to stricter budgetary principles than instituted under their own leadership is a fairly hollow argument.

The gentleman's amendment would require offsets for any authorization of appropriations, regardless of its impact on Federal receipts. Were the gentleman's amendment adopted, my expectation is that every authorization of appropriations, whether it be for clean water, safer schools, better health care, or national defense, would require equal offsets. This is an inappropriate limitation on the ability of Congress to address the needs of the Nation.

Fiscal responsibility is a noble cause, but not at the cost of hindering Congress's ability to meet the needs of our constituents.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding. I will be very brief.

I rise to point a couple points of clarification. And I appreciate the gentlewoman from Texas and her comments, but she did say that this amendment would require finding $120 million of offsets somewhere else, regardless of whether there was any money that was ever authorized for this particular grant project. In fact, that is not the case.

On line 4 of the amendment, it says that, ''any other provision that results in costs to the Federal Government.'' So it would require that the Congress had determined that, yes, there should be money spent for these grant projects, and then the equal amount of offset money would need to be found.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOZMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I think what I did say is, it is not the authorization; it is the appropriations that I spoke about that would cause this to happen. It would trigger it. It is not the authorization. We are an authorizing committee.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I understand this is an authorizing piece of legislation; it is not requiring the money to be spent; and that we have the Appropriations Committees to do that.

But I would suggest to my colleagues that this is a matter of principle. It is a matter of principle, and it is a matter of making the statement now that we believe that, if we are going to spend money for this project and we believe that it is a priority, that we ought to find the money elsewhere in order to cover that so that we do not increase the deficit.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. SESSIONS:

Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''for fiscal years ending before October 1, 2008''.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 700 follows an authorization that the Republican Congress provided for in the year 2000, which authorized $75 million in grants for alternative water source projects.

We learned that the population growth was causing a number of communities to have to explore alternative supplies through reclamation, reuse and conservation. And so Congress created section 220 of the Clean Water Act. This amendment to the Clean Water Act required a 50 percent non-Federal cost share. And it expired in 2004.

Today's legislation doubles this authorization, but the troubling part to me is it allows this authorization to continue indefinitely. So if this legislation passes, there will be no sunset, no further oversight and no review of the effectiveness of these grants. My amendment would provide for the expiration of this authorization in fiscal year 2008.

I think it is fiscally responsible and allows Congress to reevaluate these grants, and not just leave them forever without oversight.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I understand that the gentleman Mr. OBERSTAR would wish to engage with me in a colloquy on this amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. The gentleman from Texas, a member of the Rules Committee, and I had a discussion about the principle involved in the gentleman's amendment in the course of our presentation at the Rules Committee for the rule covering this bill. As a result, the gentleman has offered an amendment that I think is entirely appropriate. But the point at which we are in the consideration of the legislation, and given the time it might take for the other body to act on it, would create a time frame problem through fiscal 2008. I would suggest that the language be changed to reflect two fiscal years from date of enactment, so that we have a precise time but that it is linked to date of enactment of the act, which then would be a very appropriate way to do it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time.

It is my understanding then that the chairman and I have engaged in an agreement; that I would withdraw my amendment, pending such that he would place within the legislation that agreement. And I would agree with that, and I would agree to withdraw my amendment. And I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for his thoughtful presentation and the questioning in the Rules Committee, and we will draft language in cooperation with the gentleman and include that as we move forward to conference with the Senate.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be withdrawn.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. CONAWAY:

Page 2, after line 5, insert the following:

(a) SELECTION OF PROJECTS.—Section 220(d)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1300(d)(2)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''or whether the project is located in an area which is served by a public water system serving 10,000 individuals or fewer''.

Page 2, at the beginning of line 6, insert the following:

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, for the past decade, within rural communities throughout the country, home water bills have increased faster than the rate of inflation, and it seems likely that this trend will continue. Currently, rural populations across America are being forced to comply with extremely costly regulations regarding standards that have been set forth by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. Chairman, I have rural constituents who are currently paying upwards of 770 percent more for water service than that of urban populations due to regulatory items and the inability to spread these costs over a wide basis.

As deregulations are implemented and aging infrastructures replaced, the affordability of water service in rural America will continue to be of great concern. Water systems, consumers, administrators and policy makers will need to focus on the ability of rural households to pay for public water service.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not a solution to the underlying problem; it is a recognition of the issue and a step in the right direction. My amendment would simply add to the considerations for these grants recognition of water systems serving 10,000 people or less.

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as water bills continue to rise larger, in the rural communities throughout the country home water bills have increased faster than the rate of inflation. Over 50,000 community water systems serve populations under 10,000. In North Carolina, 95 percent of our community water systems service populations of less than 10,000.

Currently, rural populations across America are being forced to comply with costly regulations. At this time, many rural areas have a greater percentage of the poverty and lower mean household income.

□ 1330

This is imposing a major burden on the rural families of America. In the same rural communities, some citizens are now paying 770 percent more for the water services than that of urban populations.

The Conaway-Shuler amendment does not call for more money or strike existing language. This is a fiscally responsible approach which points us in the right direction to take some of the strain off of the rural communities as they struggle to provide safety.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Both gentlemen offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman, to our bill that is well intentioned to respond to the needs of small communities, to assure that communities under a population of 10,000 are not left behind, as this program is administered. And I certainly am in consonance with that concern.

There are only maybe four communities in my congressional district that have population greater than 10,000. I think of Big Fork, population 950, and others of similar size who have needs for water resource as great proportionately as do the major metropolitan areas.

In fact, in a drought in 1988, Minneapolis was trying to encourage the Corps of Engineers to draw down the head waters of the Mississippi River to increase the flow to Minneapolis while at the same time not banning car washes, not banning sprinkling of lawns, not taking other water conservation measures and also drawing water from the Jordan Basin Reservoir underneath the Twin Cities, a 50-mile diameter basin that is water left over from the melting of the glacier 10,000 years ago, water that can never be replaced because it is an impermeable area.

And I said, oh, wait a minute. It just happened I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Investigation and Oversight; called the Corps of Engineers in and made sure they didn't draw any matter down from the head waters of the Mississippi River to serve the thirst of Minneapolis while at the same time St. Paul was incorporating water conservation measures.

Well, I cite that history to show that I am really sensitive to these needs. But we do not want to create in this legislation a preferential consideration. And when the gentleman says consider, when the language of the amendment the gentlemen are offering says consider, I take this to mean a factor to be considered, along with other relevant factors and not a set-aside and not a preference.

May I ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), and I yield to the gentleman, to be assured that he concurs in that interpretation.

Mr. CONAWAY. Yes, sir. This goes into the part of the bill that talks about additional consideration. The administrator has wide leeway in how they grant these grants, and I would simply like in the RECORD, in the law, that this is one of the things that administrator should take into consideration. This in no way binds or ties their hands to any particular size of community or use but allows good judgment by the administrator and in recognition that rural America is outnumbered on this floor. And having those words in this language will be particularly important to the constituents I serve who recognize that and understand that from time to time you guys have got us outnumbered. So it does not set up a preference, but it simply says, here is one other criteria to look at when you decide on these questions.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman. Let me ask the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. SHULER) whether he shares that viewpoint.

Mr. SHULER. I most certainly would. In rural America, they struggle so often. Although it is not binding, it doesn't cost any more; I would certainly like to see this in the amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, when I was elected to Congress, took office in 1975, we formed a Congressional Rural Caucus. There were 250 members. We had a voice on this floor, and a presence on this floor. Today there are less than 90 of us representing primarily rural areas, so we do have to be watchful for small towns, rural areas. And in the spirit of our discussion just concluded, I will accept the amendment of the gentlemen.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 256, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

AYES—176

Aderholt	Boustany	Chabot
Akin	Brady (TX)	Coble
Alexander	Brown (SC)	Cole (OK)
Bachmann	Brown-Waite, Ginny	Conaway
Baker	Buchanan	Crenshaw
Barrett (SC)	Burgess	Cubin
Bartlett (MD)	Burton (IN)	Culberson
Barton (TX)	Buyer	Davis (KY)
Bilbray	Calvert	Davis, David
Bilirakis	Campbell (CA)	Davis, Tom
Bishop (UT)	Cannon	Deal (GA)
Blackburn	Cantor	Dent
Blunt	Capito	Diaz-Balart, L.
Boehner	Carter	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bonner	Castle	Drake
Boozman		Dreier

Duncan
Emerson
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—256

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—6

Bono
Camp (MI)
Davis, Jo Ann
Hunter
Keller
Larson (CT)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1404

Messrs. KAGEN, GONZALEZ, RODRIGUEZ, DINGELL and TIAHRT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. SOUDER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mr. TIERNEY, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 700) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects, pursuant to House Resolution 215, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. In its current form, I am, yes, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Price of Georgia moves to recommit the bill H.R. 700 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report back the same forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS.

None of the funds authorized by this Act, including the amendments made by this Act, may be used—

(1) to lobby or retain a lobbyist for the purpose of influencing a Federal, State, or local governmental entity or officer; or

(2) to pay for expenses related to the membership of any individual or entity in an organization or association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer this motion to recommit. And I am more pleased to commend my Democratic colleagues for yesterday's recognition of the motion to recommit. They will recognize today's because it is exactly the same motion.

I think with that recognition came the realization and appreciation that motions to recommit are, indeed, substantive moves and they are substantive proposals of policy by this House of Representatives.

This motion to recommit is one about honesty; it is about honesty in the provision of the funds in the bill that is about to be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit would reinforce existing Federal law by making it clear that none of the funds authorized under this act may be used to lobby or retain a lobbyist to attempt to influence Federal, State or local governmental officials. It would also expand upon existing law by specifically prohibiting Federal funds from being used to pay for membership in any association or organization. And, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned yesterday, many of those dues rise to the sum of $48,000 to $50,000 or more. The funds should only be used for the purposes intended by Congress, namely, identifying alternative water source projects.

And while associations and organizations provide meaningful opportunities for collaboration and knowledge dissemination, it would not be appropriate to use hard-earned scarce Federal tax dollars for such a purpose. Such a diversion of these funds would not only limit the amount of funds available for the actual use and construction of alternative water source projects, it could indeed constitute an end run around the lobbying restrictions since many of these associations engage in lobbying activities.

In recent years, Mr. Speaker, growth in population and increasing environmental awareness is causing many communities to explore alternative water supplies through reclamation, reuse and conservation. And while the Clean Water Act construction grants prior to 1991 and State revolving loan funds since 1989 have been available for such activities, most expenditures to date have been for more traditional wastewater projects and not for enhancing water supplies through wastewater reuse and water recycling. For these compelling reasons, we need to ensure that all available resources provided through this reauthorization are used specifically for the purpose of building and improving alternative water source projects for municipal, industrial or agricultural uses in areas that are experiencing critical water supply needs.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to recognize what they recognized yesterday, and that is that motions to recommit are substantive policy motions. I urge the adoption of this motion to recommit.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, although I am not opposed to the motion, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, this amendment was offered yesterday by a different gentleman from the other side. I just want to read from the legislative language in the act.

Subsection F: Uses of Grants. ''Amounts from grants received under this section may be used for engineering, design, construction and final testing of alternative water source projects designed to meet critical water supply needs. Such amounts may not be used for planning, feasibility studies, for operation, maintenance, replacement, repair or rehabilitation.'' Although we do not specifically prohibit use of funds for lobbying, no such authorization is permitted. Nonetheless, the gentleman proposes to close a potential opportunity for money to be diverted, and, therefore, we are prepared, as yesterday, to accept the gentleman's motion.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 700, if ordered, and adoption of House Resolution 202.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 427, nays 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—427

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
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
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)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
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
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Bono
Camp (MI)
Davis, Jo Ann
Hunter
Larson (CT)
Scott (GA)

□ 1436

Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. RANGEL and Mr. NADLER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House on the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 700, back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS.

None of the funds authorized by this Act, including the amendments made by this Act, may be used—

(1) to lobby or retain a lobbyist for the purpose of influencing a Federal, State, or local governmental entity or officer; or

(2) to pay for expenses related to the membership of any individual or entity in an organization or association.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 368, nays 59, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—368

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
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)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—59

Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Feeney
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Hensarling
Herger
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Mack
Marchant
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Paul
Pence
Pitts
Price (GA)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Smith (NE)
Stearns
Tancredo
Thornberry
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—6

Bono
Camp (MI)
Davis, Jo Ann
Hunter
Larson (CT)
Tanner

□ 1445

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE FUNDING RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 202, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 269, nays 150, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—269

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Buyer
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney

Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—150

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tiahrt
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Bono
Boyd (FL)
Camp (MI)
Davis, Jo Ann
Hunter
Kennedy
Larson (CT)
Murphy, Tim
Rangel
Roskam
Sali
Terry
Van Hollen
Woolsey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1456

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 131, I was in a hearing during votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this statement for the RECORD and regret that I could not be present today, Thursday, March 8, 2007 to vote on rollcall vote Nos. 127, 128, 129, 130, and 131 due to a family medical matter.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall vote No. 127 on the previous question to H. Res. 219, on providing for the consideration of H. Res. 202;

"Nay" on rollcall vote No. 128 on the amendment to H. R. 700, to prohibit the bill's authorization levels or other provisions from taking effect if they would result in costs to the federal government;

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 129 on a motion to recommit H.R. 700 with instructions;

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 130 on the final passage of H.R. 700, the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act; and

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 131 on agreeing to H. Res. 202, a resolution providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the 110th Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110–17)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the Iran emergency declared on March 15, 1995, is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 2007.

The crisis between the United States and Iran constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of Iran that led to the declaration of a national emergency on March 15, 1995, has not been resolved. The actions and policies of the Government of Iran are contrary to the interests of the United States in the region and pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to Iran and maintain in force comprehensive sanctions against Iran to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 8, 2007*.

DEMOCRATS RETREAT FROM IRAQ

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, after waiting for months, the new Democrat majority has introduced their plan for Iraq today, and it can be summed up with one phrase, fully funded withdrawal.

Seeking to micromanage the war, the Democrats have come up with a plan that attaches strings to troop funding in order to seek American withdrawal from Iraq by 2008. This Democrat plan for a fully funded withdrawal could also be described as a well-equipped retreat. A fully funded withdrawal might well be added to that classic list of American oxymorons that includes plastic glass and jumbo shrimp.

Since their election pledge to ''fix the war,'' it has taken our friends on the other side of the aisle 4 months to come up with a strategy in Iraq. But even though their proposal does include funding for our soldiers in the field and our veterans here at home, their latest poll-tested approach for fighting the war in Iraq can best be described as cut and run.

For all the Democrats' furtive backroom efforts and tortured explanations, it is not nearly as complex as they describe. In fact, their strategy could be described by George Orwell: ''The quickest way to end the war is to lose it.''

We don't need a fully funded withdrawal. We need to fully fund victory for freedom in Iraq.

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.

□ 1500

YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn in the strongest possible terms President Bush's latest attempt to resurrect the fatally flawed Yucca Mountain Project in my home State of Nevada.

This past Tuesday, the White House ordered the Energy Department to seek reintroduction of the so-called Fix Yucca Bill.

In a nutshell, this special interest legislation guts key safety and environmental rules, makes it harder for Nevadans to challenge Yucca Mountain, gives the green light to a water grant in the middle of the Nevada desert where there is no water, and increases the amount of deadly nuclear

waste that can be buried outside of Las Vegas, a major metropolitan area in the western United States where 1.7 million people reside.

In calling for passage of this bill, the Bush administration has renewed its attack on Nevada, and their goal is simple: open Yucca Mountain at any cost.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal isn't about safety and it isn't about science. It is not about protecting our communities from shipments of nuclear waste. This legislation is all about using political muscle to ram through changes to the rules of the game in order to ensure that nuclear waste comes to Nevada.

The reason they need the bill is clear: Yucca Mountain is all but dead as a result of scientific uncertainties, of bloated budget, and total mismanagement. The proposed dump is decades behind schedule and has already cost upwards of $12 billion according to the figures published this January by the General Accounting Office.

Outgoing Nuclear Regulatory Commissioner Ed McGaffigan, not exactly a great friend of the State of Nevada, recently said that it will take until 2025 or beyond before Yucca Mountain is completed. But more importantly, he said it is time to ''stop digging'' at Yucca Mountain and look at alternatives because the system that created this abomination is so flawed that nuclear waste will never be stored in Nevada.

Clearly, this legislation, which was introduced last year and went absolutely nowhere, is a last ditch effort to try and bring Yucca Mountain back from the brink of total collapse. Make no mistake about it, Yucca Mountain's days are numbered. Working with my colleagues in the House and with my Nevada counterpart, majority leader HARRY REID, we will ensure that this dangerous and misguided bill never reaches the President's desk.

Despite claims to the contrary, Yucca Mountain has never been proven safe, and there will be no way to keep thousands of shipments of nuclear waste secure as it travels across our roads and railways.

Among the changes included in the White House bill is a provision that seeks to eliminate the current restriction on the amount of waste that can be stored inside Yucca Mountain. Right now, it is 77,000 tons. They want to double that. Lifting this cap would enable more nuclear waste to be dumped in Yucca Mountain, Nevada, and would increase the number of waste shipments that would have to travel along America's roads and railways.

I am also concerned that this bill is designed to try and pave the way for President Bush's plan to allow nuclear waste from other nations. It is bad enough they want to stick nuclear waste from across the country in Nevada; now they want to take other nations' nuclear waste, ship it to Nevada for burial at Yucca Mountain.

Right now there is a limit on the nuclear waste that can be stored at Yucca Mountain. If the President has his way, Nevada will become the world's nuclear garbage dump.

Another provision in the bill will make it easier for Congress to spend billions on dumping nuclear waste in Nevada, with little or no oversight to protect taxpayers. Billions of dollars have already been wasted on this hole in the middle of the Nevada desert, and the truth remains that Yucca Mountain is no closer to opening today than it was 20 years ago when Nevada was unfairly singled out as the only State to be considered as a location to bury nuclear waste. That is known affectionately in the State of Nevada as the Screw Nevada Bill.

Funding for this disaster waiting to happen does not deserve special treatment. Yucca Mountain should have to compete with our Nation's needs to fund homeland security, education, clean energy, health care, Social Security, and the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. There should be no special budget treatment for Yucca Mountain, and Congress should exercise its full oversight authority, something we haven't seen for a while, on runaway spending on this failed project.

This brings me to the fact that we have not seen an updated cost estimate for Yucca Mountain for years, despite the rising cost of fuel and construction projects and labor. I suspect that Yucca Mountain could ultimately cost hundreds of billions of dollars before we are through. Is this where you want to stick our taxpayers' dollars? I don't.

The answer to this Nation's nuclear waste problem is not Yucca Mountain. The answer is to keep waste on-site where it is now produced in so-called ''dry cask storage.''

I urge all of my colleagues to take a good look at this and make the right decision for our country and for our taxpayers.

This system is already in use in nuclear power plants, has the blessing of nuclear regulators and will keep waste safe for the next 100 years in hardened emplacements guarded by the same security precautions in place to keep nuclear power plants safe.

I say to my colleagues: Do not fall for false claims that Yucca Mountain can be "fixed" by sweeping aside important health and safety protections or through a water grab that turns Nevada's water law on its head. Or by lifting the cap on the amount of waste that can be stored at Yucca Mountain so that Nevada can become a global nuclear garbage dump.

Keep nuclear waste on-site, preserve the rules now in place to protect families and the environment, protect your right to scrutinize the billions being squandered on a hole in the Nevada desert and reject calls to support the reintroduction of the so-called "Fix Yucca" legislative package.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SALI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SALI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NO MORE ''BLANK CHECKS'' ON TRADE: FAST TRACK HAS HURT MAINE'S WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to renewing trade promotion authority, also known as fast track.

Fast track in its current form is nothing more than a blank check for the administration to negotiate harmful trade agreements without congressional input.

I voted against the Trade Act of 2002, which granted fast track authority to the President. Those of us who opposed such a large grant of authority are not surprised that, given a blank check, the Bush administration has made regional and bilateral deals to suit narrow corporate interests and cut Members of Congress out of the process.

We need to examine what has happened to hardworking people in my home State of Maine since Congress signed that blank check. Between January of 2001 and December of last year, Maine lost more than 20,000 manufacturing jobs. In the same period of time, Maine also lost 8,000 information sector jobs, in what surely is just the beginning of trouble for our service sectors. Only one month ago, Moosehead Manufacturing, a furniture-making firm in the towns of Monson and Dover-Foxcroft, Maine, employing 120 people, closed its doors as a result of competition from China, Mexico, and Brazil. Moosehead Manufacturing tried for years to adjust to the pressure of foreign competition by changing its products and the structure of its workforce, unfortunately, to no avail. Fast track authority allowed the administration to continue to make trade deals without adjusting their tactics in the least, even as jobs flowed out of my State.

It isn't clear how lost manufacturing jobs will be replaced in Maine. What is clear is that these jobs were casualties not of the inevitable forces of globalization, but the abuse of a process that is closed to the majority of Americans.

That is why I voted against fast track, and why I am here to urge my colleagues to vote against renewal in anything like the form of the current law.

Mainers who lose their jobs because of global competition often have to accept lower wages when they find another job. This week, The Washington

Post reported that nearly half of workers laid off between 2003 and 2005 who were successful at finding new employment took a pay cut at their new jobs. Nearly 30 percent reported earnings losses of 20 percent or more.

The same is true for Maine manufacturing sector workers. According to a 2002 survey done by the Maine AFL–CIO, laid-off manufacturing workers who found new employment lost on average 16 percent of their wages. One out of three laid-off workers lost pension benefits.

Congress is under pressure to renew fast track. The administration claims that it cannot negotiate bilateral or multilateral agreements without it.

The administration has had long enough to demonstrate what it will and won't do with fast track authority. Our constituents deserve to be heard when trade deals are negotiated, not ignored. Rather than write another blank check, Members of Congress should take an active part in trade negotiations. We must insert accountability into any future grants of authority to the executive branch. We must strive to create agreements that meet the test of what serves the public good, rather than what serves narrow special interests.

I strongly believe that the choice between agreements that open new trade opportunities and agreements that protect workers is a false one. We can and must achieve both objectives. We can address health care, education, job training, and technological investments to make our firms more competitive. We can do more to retrain and cushion the blow for workers who lose their jobs as a result of foreign competition, and we can rewrite the model for trade agreements so that the interests of hardworking Americans are a priority.

I urge my colleagues to oppose renewal of fast track in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SAN FRANCISCO VS. TEENMANIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor today to praise the more than 20,000 teens that will reunite in San Francisco this weekend to worship. Their movement called Battlecry has a home base in my district just outside Lindale, Texas.

Their message is a hopeful one: they reject the negative messages often portrayed in pop culture and, instead, they embrace a godly path. They strive to live a life of Christian values and reject premarital sex, drugs, alcohol, and destructive behavior.

One thing is very clear: there is nothing in Battlecry's message that is hateful. It is a message of love. However, last year, when these teens gathered in San Francisco, they were met by protests, and the board of supervisors passed a resolution condemning these young people of Battlecry and their message.

As we know, there are some in the San Francisco government who are not happy with these voices carrying a Christian message. These teens are congregating at AT&T Park where the Giants play, and they are going to worship and promote a positive path for young people. The entertainment commission in San Francisco issued a restrictive loud speaker permit to them to prevent their use before 10 a.m., and yet these delightful youth are taking the lemon-sour treatment and are going to turn it into lemonade by using the time in a positive, peaceful manner to reach out in prayer and grace to those in San Francisco and the surrounding area. These Christian young people uniting in Teenmania and Battlecry are filled with love and the teachings of Jesus and are fueled by their faith in God, along with hope for their generation.

They offer an alternative to the mysogynistic world. They offer alternatives to drugs, alcohol, sexually transmitted diseases.

Mr. Speaker, San Francisco apparently has some who are such religious bigots that they loathe and want to thwart these loving young people because of the grace and kindness these people bring in the name of the Lord. Time magazine has called Battlecry's event the "Lollapalooza for the Lord," and I humbly submit this kind of event is a good thing to have.

Of course, we know the discrimination against wholesome, nurturing groups like the Boy Scouts of America in San Francisco by some intolerant fanatics. But this is an alternative to the kind of head-banging music that sometimes promotes drugs, alcohol, careless sexual activity, and at times even anarchy.

On the other hand, the young Christians believe that embracing God's love and grace can make the drugs, alcohol, and any hallucinogen completely unnecessary.

So I salute these wonderful young people from Battlecry and Teenmania and encourage them to continue promoting positive Christian-type values and the love of the Lord to any and all, including the bigots against them. And for the religiously intolerant who get angry just thinking about Christian young people spreading the love and teachings of Christ, the message needs to go out, far and wide, very clear: Jesus loves you, too.

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.)

CORPORAL CLOY RICHARDS—"WHY I FIGHT FOR PEACE"

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, all too often the painful stories of those who have served in Iraq go unheard by Representatives in Washington; however, their experiences are a window into the truth about the real effect of this war on real people, both in service and after they come home from service.

One of these stories belongs to Corporal Cloy Richards, who bravely served with the United States Marine Corps for two tours in Iraq and may soon be called back again even though he has been diagnosed with PTS.

Cloy Richards has a poem; it is a courage poem. It is entitled: "Why I Fight for Peace." This poem is exactly the message we need to hear.

□ 1515

The message that shows us in our continuing debate on funding the occupation of Iraq, just how this affects our servicemembers.

As I said, the poem is called, "Why I Fight for Peace," by Corporal Cloy Richards, United States Marine Corps. And I am going to read it, Mr. Speaker.

"Because I can't forget no matter how hard I try. They told us we are taking out advancing Iraqi forces, but when we went to check out the bodies, they were nothing but women and children desperately fleeing their homes because they wanted to get out of the city before we attacked in the morning.

"Because my little brother, who is my job to protect, decided to join the California National Guard to get some money for college, and they promised he wouldn't go to Iraq. Instead, 3 months after enlisting, he was sent to Iraq for 1 year.

"Since he has been home for the last 6 months, he refuses to talk to anyone; he lives by himself. The only person he associates with is a friend of his, the one other man out of his squad of 13 men who made it home alive.

"He called me a few weeks ago for the first time, and he told me he's having nightmares. I asked what they were about, and he said, they're about picking up the pieces of his fellow soldiers after a car bomb hit them.

"Because every single one of the Marines I served with, the really brave warriors, even when some friends and people they looked up to got killed and lost an arm or a leg, they wouldn't cry; they just kept fighting. They completed their mission.

"Every one of them I have spoken to since we got home has broken down

crying in front of me, saying all they can do since they got back is bounce from job to job, drink and do drugs and contemplate suicide to end the pain.

''Because I'm tired of drinking, bouncing from job to job and contemplating suicide to end the pain.

''Because every time I see a child, I think of the thousands I have slaughtered. Because every time I see a young soldier, I think of the thousands Bush has slaughtered. Because every time I look in the mirror, I see a casualty of war.

''Because I have a lot of lives I have to make up for, the lives I have taken. And because it's right. That's why I fight. Because of soldiers with wounds you can't see.''

As I said, Cloy Richards served two tours in Iraq. He is currently in the IRR and facing a possible involuntary recall for a third tour.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, I urge the President to remember that our commitment to our soldiers does not stop on the battlefield. It must continue when our troops return home.

Corporal Richards deserves our full support. He has bravely fulfilled his duty to fight for our country.

Now it is time for the Congress to fulfill its duty, and we must do that by heeding his call for peace. This is a call we cannot afford to ignore.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). The Chair will remind members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to try to bring about some common sense to a Federal agency known to many as the Federal Emergency Management Agency and known to others as FEMA.

Many of you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that after that horrible hurricane that devastated the Gulf Coast, Hurricane Katrina, back in August of 2005, FEMA went out and purchased tens of thousands of brand new mobile homes that were destined for storm victims after Hurricane Katrina.

They came to Hope, Arkansas. We have got the old World War II proving grounds there, an old airport there with a lot of inactive runways and tarmacs, and they thought it was a good place to have as a so-called FEMA staging area, a place for them to bring mobile homes in transit on their way to storm victims on the gulf coast.

Starting about October of 2005, they started arriving, and they continued to arrive, but none ever left. And this quickly became not a FEMA staging area but, rather, a FEMA storage area.

This is an aerial photo that was taken this past Saturday, and these white dots, I mean, it is hard to understand and comprehend, but as you look at this aerial photo, what you are looking at is 8,420 brand new, fully furnished, never used, mobile homes that were destined for Hurricane Katrina victims that found themselves homeless.

FEMA purchased them, and then they said, we won't put a mobile home in a flood plain. And of course, everybody who lost their home as a result of Hurricane Katrina lived in a flood plain. So they have remained stored at the airport in Hope, Arkansas, on this cow pasture, if you will, since about October of 2005; 8,420 brand new, fully furnished mobile homes.

There is also approximately 16,000 camper trailers at the Hope airport. The camper trailers did work. They were used by storm victims, and they are now bringing them back to Hope. And if they need more than $1,500 worth of repair, they are auctioning them off. If they can repair them for less than $1,500, they are going to repair them there at the Hope airport and store them for future disasters. That is being a good steward of your tax money. That mission, that program makes a lot of sense.

My problem with FEMA is this: There are 8,420 brand new, fully furnished, never used mobile homes sitting there, as you can see from this aerial photo, at the Hope airport in Hope, Arkansas. Now, let's fast forward.

Well, one other point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is, about 8 months ago, to try to get FEMA off high center and to move these homes to the people, I said they are going to start sinking into the cow pasture, thinking that would get FEMA off high center and they would move them to the storm victims.

Instead, FEMA showed up at Hope with $7 million worth of gravel to put under them. I mean, this is so crazy, you can't make this stuff up.

And then, fast forward, tragically to February 24, 12 days ago, where a tornado ripped through another part of my district, not Hope, Arkansas, but Dumas, Arkansas in DeSha County.

This is one of 150 homes that have been either totally destroyed or heavily damaged. If there is any doubt about the amount of damage done, this is the Fred's Dollar Store and the grocery store in town and an 18-wheeler.

The bottom line is this: I immediately went to Dumas to be with the people there. I told them help was on the way. The Governor declared it a State disaster. The Governor called out 150 members of the National Guard; 150 homes heavily damaged or destroyed, 650 people out of work because their workplace has been heavily damaged or destroyed. No power for 6 days.

And I asked FEMA to help; 12 days later, the President still has not declared Dumas and DeSha County a Federal disaster area.

And what does the FEMA spokesman, John Philbin, say? March 7, 2007, Stephens Washington Bureau, in a story by Aaron Sadler, FEMA spokesman, John Philbin, says, ''The damages or need for Federal assistance are not readily apparent.'' If that is not damage that is readily apparent, I don't know what it is.

I implore the President to declare Dumas and DeSha County a Federal disaster area. And I beg FEMA to begin to move some of these mobile homes to the people of Dumas who are without housing this evening.

WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Oversight and Reform Committee, we recently traveled to Walter Reed Army Hospital, where, as a panel, we heard graphic testimony from numbers of witnesses. Witnesses included Staff Sergeant Shannon, who testified, wearing an eye patch, suffering from a traumatic brain injury, about the kind of treatment he had received at Walter Reed Army hospital.

The testimony was striking. He told us, Mr. Speaker, that after a few days of inpatient treatment, he was transferred into a limbo of outpatient treatment in which he couldn't find his way around the grounds and didn't have help for that; in which the assistance he needed wasn't there. And he is still in that limbo.

We heard graphic testimony from Mrs. McLoed, whose husband had suffered a traumatic brain injury and who also hasn't received treatment as an outpatient at Walter Reed of the kind that we would expect.

And we heard from Specialist Duncan, also testified with an eye patch on, that he had been living in intolerable living conditions in what is now the infamous building 18 at Walter Reed Army Hospital.

The testimony was gut wrenching. Nobody who was in the room could have not been affected at hearing how our soldiers, our brave troops who had been injured in combat and come home, to be sent to intolerable living conditions, with mold, peeling wallpaper, cockroaches and rats in their living quarters, and no way to work through a system that was a Byzantine bureaucracy, seemingly designed to deny care, instead of provide care for those who both need it and deserve it most.

It was with a heavy heart that I heard the testimony of the generals who were in charge of this system. The Surgeon General, General Kiley, who said that it wasn't his job to inspect the barracks at building 18; he had people to do that.

And the gentleman next to him, General Weitman, whose command recently was relieved, the person he essentially pointed to, the man who had been there for 6 months. But General Kiley had been there from 2002 to 2004. He was the fellow in charge of the whole operation.

General Weitman had been preceded by General Farmer. These conditions were known. And, in fact, General Kiley had been told on numerous occasions of the graphic problems with the system he was overseeing, and nothing had happened.

It is now time to fix these problems, Mr. Speaker. It is time for this Congress to hold the system accountable. It is time for the Armed Forces medical system to step up with the kind of accountability and oversight and fix that our soldiers deserve.

I look forward to participating in the fix of that system as a member of the House Oversight and Reform Committee. I look forward to hearing from the generals how they are going to fix things for our soldiers. Our soldiers need it. They deserve it.

And especially at a time when the President proposes to send more troops to Iraq, I ask the question, how can he do it at a time when the medical system of the Armed Services is incapable of handling the inevitable casualties that will result?

There is a disconnect, Mr. Speaker, and it is time that we change that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PENCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCDERMOTT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HOLT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. TAYLOR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1530

HONORING THE FALLEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, 3,188 servicemen and -women have died serving in Iraq, and 371 have given their lives fighting in Afghanistan.

We owe these brave individuals and their families a debt of gratitude that can never fully be repaid. It is our responsibility to honor the ultimate sacrifice that our men and women in uniform have made while serving their country.

We often invoke their sacrifices in general, but seldom take the time to thank them individually.

Last year I led a bipartisan group of Members of Congress in recognizing the individual members of our Armed Forces that have made the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq and Afghanistan by reading the names and rank of each servicemember who had fallen in the line of duty so that they never will be forgotten and they will always be remembered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

So far we have read just over 2,400 names on the floor of the people's House. Tonight and on future nights we will continue to complete this tribute with the names of our most recent fallen fellow Americans.

If I can, in the words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt: ''Each of these heroes stands in the unbroken line of patriots who have dared to die that freedom might live and grow and increase in its blessings.''

God bless and keep each of the brave Americans whose memory we honor tonight:

Private First Class George Anthony Lutz, II; Private Jonathan R. Pfender; Staff Sergeant Ayman A. Taha; Sergeant Marcelino Ronald Corniel; Staff Sergeant Christopher J. Vanderhorn; Sergeant First Class Jason Lee Bishop; Major William F. Hecker III; Captain Christopher P. Petty; Sergeant Stephen J. White; Sergeant Johnny J. Peralez Jr.; Sergeant Jason Lopez-Reyes; Specialist Ryan D. Walker; Lance Corporal Ryan S. McCurdy; Lance Corporal Jason T. Little; First Lieutenant Jaime L. Campbell; Captain Clayton Lee Adamkavicius; Specialist Eric D. King; Private First Class Jacob H. Allcott; Private Michael E. Bouthot; Private First Class Jason D. Hasenauer; Corporal Stephen R. Bixler; Staff Sergeant Kevin P. Jessen; Private First Class Ricky Salas Jr.; Gunnery Sergeant Justin R. Martone; Gunnery Sergeant John D. Fry; Private First Class Amy A. Duerksen; Lance Corporal Kristen K. Marino; Staff Sergeant Joseph R. Ray; Specialist Joshua Lee Hill; Lance Corporal Nicholas R. Anderson; Staff Sergeant Brian A. Lewis; Sergeant Corey A. Dan; Corporal Nyle Yates III; Specialist Carlos M. Gonzalez; Sergeant Amanda N. Pinson; Specialist Antoine J. McKinzie; Staff Sergeant Christopher L. Robinson; Staff Sergeant Robert Hernandez; Captain Timothy J. Moshier; Sergeant First Class John Thomas Stone; Chief Warrant Officer John W. Engeman; Master Sergeant Robert H. West; Chief Warrant Officer Jamie D. Weeks; Major Matthew W. Worrel; Lance Corporal Jose S. Marin-Dominguez Jr.; Lance Corporal William J. Leusink; Private First Class Steven Freund; Lance Corporal Robert G. Posivio III; Specialist Michael L. Hermanson; Captain Douglas A. DiCenzo; Specialist Robert E. Blair.

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join in reading the names of our American heroes:

Private First Class George R. Roehl Jr.; Lance Corporal Robert L. Moscillo; Private First Class Matthew L. Bertolino; Specialist Anthony Chad Owens; Specialist Walter B. Howard II; Private First Class Scott A. Messer; First Lieutenant Simon T. Cox Jr.; Sergeant First Class Lance S. Cornett; Specialist Jesse M. Zamora; Sergeant Jeremiah Boehmer; Staff Sergeant Christopher R. Morningstar; Specialist William S. Hayes III; Specialist Sergio A. Mercedes Saez; Specialist Jacob E. Melson; Major Stuart M. Anderson; Major Michael R. Martinez; First Lieuentant Joseph D. DeMoors; Sergeant Nathan R. Field; Chief Warrant Officer Rex C. Kenyon; Specialist Clinton R. Upchurch; Staff Sergeatt Metodio A. Bandonill; Sergeant First Class Richard J. Herrema; Lance Corporal Michael L. Ford; First Sergeant Bobby Mendez; Sergeant Matthew A. Webber; Captain Shane Mahaffee; Private First Class Grant Allen Dampier; Staff Sergeant Marion Flint Jr.; Staff Sergeant Santiago M. Halsel; Petty Officer Third Class Lee Hamilton Deal; First Lieutenant Robert Seidel III; Sergeant Lonnie Calvin Allen Jr.; Private First Class Nicholas Cournoyer; Lieutenant Colonel Daniel E. Holland.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES).

Corporal Carlos Arrelano; Private Robbie M. Mariano; Lance Corporal Raul Mercado; Major Douglas A. LaBouff; Lance Corporal Brandon Christopher Dewey; Lance Corporal Hugo R. Lopez; Sergeant David L. Herrera; Private First Class Caesar S. Viglienzone; Specialist Roberto L. Martinez Salazar; Private First Class Javier Chavez Jr.; Lance Corporal Michael S. Probst; Specialist Clay P. Farr; Corporal Adam O. Zanutto; Lance Corporal Bunny Long; Private First Class Angelo A. Zawaydeh; Sergeant Dale G. Brehm; Staff Sergeant Ricardo Barraza; Hospitalman Geovani Padilla Aleman; Lance Corporal Felipe D. Sandoval-Flores; Captain Brian S. Letendre; Sergeant Joseph E. Proctor; Staff Sergeant Gavin B. Reinke; Specialist Bryan L. Quinton; Sergeant Elisha R. Parker; Private First Class Caleb A. Lufkin; Lance Corporal Adam Lucas; Corporal Richard A. Bennett; Captain Nathanael J. Doring; Corporal J. Adan Garcia; Captain James A. Funkhouser.

Those are the names of individuals from the State of California.

I would now like to yield to my colleague from Tennessee, Congressman COHEN, to call the names of those from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Private First Class Brian J. Schoff; Corporal Rusty L. Washam; Staff Sergeant Brock A. Beery; Corporal David A. Bass; Corporal Robbie Glen Light; Specialist Ty J. Johnson; Lance Corporal Juana Navarro-Arellano; Corporal Joseph A. Blanco; Lance Corporal Marcus S. Glimpse; Corporal Salem Bachar; Sergeant Kyle A. Colnot; Lance Corporal Aaron William Simons; Private First Class Raymond L. Henry; Private First Class Benjamin T. Zieske; Corporal Orville Gerena; Private First Class Jacob D. ''Jake'' Spann; Corporal Brandon S. Schuck; Specialist Patrick W. Herried; Specialist Allen D. Kokesh Jr.; Lance Corporal Steven L. Phillips; Sergeant Nathan J. Vacho; First Sergeant Carlos N. Saenz; Specialist Teodoro Torres; Private First Class Alva L. Gaylord; Chief Warrant Officer Eric W. Totten; Corporal Jeremy M. Loveless; Corporal Bobby R. West; Specialist Brock L. Bucklin; Corporal Alexander J. Kolasa; Sergeant Benjamin E. Mejia; Private First Class Brett L. Tribble.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Tennessee.

I will now read the names of those from Florida:

Sergeant Adam Leigh Cann; Chief Warrant Officer 2; Kyle E. Jackson; Sergeant Dennis J. Flanagan; Staff Sergeant Marco A. Silva; Private First Class Sean D. Tharp; Sergeant Michael D. Rowe; Lance Corporal Patrick J. Gallagher; Private Jody W. Missildine; Private First Class Roland E. Calderon-Ascencio; Corporal Pablo V. Mayorga; Sergeant Lea R. Mills; Lance Corporal Jason K. Burnett; Lieutenant Colonel Joseph J. Fenty; Corporal Matthieu Marcellus; Corporal Ross A. Smith; Petty Officer Third Class Nicholas Wilson; Specialist Felipe J. Garcia Villareal; Corporal Justin J. Watts; Private First Class Kasper Allen Dudkiewicz; Specialist Dustin L. Kendall; Staff Sergeant Christopher T. Howick; Sergeant Bryan A. Brewster; Sergeant John C. Griffith; Sergeant Jeffery S. Wiekamp; Specialist Justin L. O'Donohoe; Corporal Ryan J. Cummings; Staff Sergeant Darren Harmon; Major Michael D. Stover; Petty Officer Second Class Jamie Jaenke.

I would like to now yield to my colleague from New Hampshire, Congressman HODES.

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Specialist Justin Rollins from New Hampshire.

From Georgia: Petty Officer First Class Michael Anthony Jordan; Civilian Darren D. Braswell; Staff Sergeant Rickey Scott; Lance Corporal Joshua A. Scott; Sergeant First Class Amos C. Edwards Jr.; Lance Corporal Kun Y. Kim; Specialist David S. Collins; Lance Corporal Samuel W. Large Jr.; Staff Sergeant Clinton T. Newman; Sergeant Chad A. Gonsalves; Sergeant Alberto D. Montrond; Lance Corporal Matthew Ron Barnes; Captain Anthony R. Garcia; First Lieutenant Brandon R. Dronet; Sergeant Donnie Leo F. Levens; Lance Corporal Nicholas J. Sovie; Senior Airman Alecia S. Good; Staff Sergeant Luis M. Melendez Sanchez; Sergeant Charles E. Matheny IV; Corporal Matthew D. Conley; Private Brian M. Moquin Jr.; Staff Sergeant Dale James Kelly Jr.; Lance Corporal Leon Deraps; Corporal Cory L. Palmer; Staff Sergeant Emmanuel L. Legaspi; Petty Officer First Class Gary Rovinski; Specialist Issac S. Lawson; Corporal Derek A. Stanley; Sergeant Travis A. Van Zoest; Specialist Curtis R. Mehrer; Sergeant Daniel Gionet.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

Now Congressman COHEN will read the names of those from Pennsylvania.

□ 1545

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Congressman EMANUEL.

Lieutenant Colonel Michael E. McLaughlin; Corporal Albert Pasquale Gettings; Sergeant First Class Randy D. McCaulley; Specialist Fredrick A. Carlson; Lance Corporal Jacob Walter Beisel; Staff Sergeant Eric A. McIntosh; Specialist Mark W. Melcher; Private Travis C. Zimmerman; Corporal Brandon M. Hardy; Staff Sergeant David Michael Veverka; Private First Class Stephen P. Snowberger III; Lance Corporal Adam C. Conboy; Captain Brian D. Willard; Sergeant Jonathan E. McColley; Sergeant James F. Fordyce; Petty Officer Third Class John T. Fralish; Sergeant Radhames Camilomatos; Lance Corporal Kyle W. Brown; Corporal Brett L. Lundstrom; Sergeant Michael Joseph McMullen; Staff Sergeant Mark A. Wall; Sergeant Jose Gomez; Staff Sergeant Bryant A. Herlem; Sergeant Steve M. Sakoda; Private First Class Christopher M. Eckhardt; Specialist Luis D. Santos; Sergeant First Class Daniel Crabtree; Sergeant First Class Clarence D. McSwain; Sergeant Jose M. Velez; Lance Corporal Brent Zoucha; Private First Class Ben Slaven; Seaman Zachary M. Alday; Lance Corporal Salvador Guerrero; and Corporal Bernard P. Corpus.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Tennessee. I will now read the names of those from Illinois, my State:

Sergeant Shawn Christopher Dostie; Lance Corporal Jonathan Kyle Price; Private First Class Sean T. Cardelli; Lance Corporal Philip John Martini; Sergeant Edward G. Davis III; Specialist Ron Gebur; Chief Warrant Officer Christopher B. Donaldson; Staff Sergeant Edwin H. Dazachacon; Lance Corporal Adam J. VanAlstine; Private First Class Benjamin C. Schuster; Lance Corporal John Joshua Thornton; Specialist Joshua U. Humble; Staff Sergeant Christopher J. Schornak; Specialist Joshua M. Pearce; Staff Sergeant Dwayne Peter R. Lewis; Master Sergeant Emigdio E. Elizarraras; Private First Class Tina M. Priest; Specialist Christopher S. Merchant; Sergeant Joshua V. Youmans; Lance Corporal Matthew A. Snyder; Lance Corporal David J. Grames Sanchez; Second Lieutenant Michael L. Licalzi; Corporal Steve Vahaviolos; Specialist Brandon L. Teeters; Lance Corporal Richard Z. James; Lieutenant Colonel Charles E. Munier; Sergeant Russell M. Durgin; Sergeant Roger P. Peña Jr.; Corporal Michael A. Estrella; Specialist Jeremiah S. Santos; Captain

Patrick Damon; First Lieutenant Forrest P. Ewens; and Sergeant Ian T. Sanchez.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now recognize my colleague from North Carolina, Congressman HEATH SHULER.

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Specialist Kenneth D. Hess; Sergeant Kevin D. Akins; Specialist Prince K. Teewia; Specialist Robert T. Johnson; Lance Corporal David S. Parr; Specialist David N. Timmons, Jr.; Sergeant Anton J. Hiett; Sergeant Jessie Davila; Air Force Civilian Daniel J. Kuhlmeier; Staff Sergeant Jay T. Collado; Second Lieutenant Almar L. Fitzgerald; Sergeant Rickey E. Jones; Staff Sergeant Gregson G. Gourley; Private First Class Christopher L. Marion; Private First Class Allan A. Morr; Staff Sergeant Curtis T. Howard II; Sergeant Gordon F. Misner II; Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth; Private Joshua Francis Powers; Sergeant Dimitri Muscat; Staff Sergeant Gregory A. Wagner; Specialist Aaron P. Latimer; Sergeant Alessandro Carbonaro; Private First Class Eric D. Clark; Specialist Armer N. Burkart; First Lieutenant Ryan T. Sanders; Sergeant Carlos E. Pernell; Corporal Andy D. Anderson; Staff Sergeant Richard A. Blakley; Sergeant Mark T. Smykowski; First Lieutenant Scott M. Love; Private First Class Davod N. Crombie; and Second Lieutenant John Shaw Vaughan.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from North Carolina.

I would like to once again recognize my colleague from New Hampshire to read the names from the State of Minnesota.

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois. From Minnesota: Corporal Andrew J. Kemple; Sergeant First Class Randall L. Lamberson; Specialist James W. ''Will'' Gardner; Private First Class James F. Costello III; Specialist Scott M. Bandhold; Specialist Andrew K. Waits; Lance Corporal Stephen Joseph Perez; Lance Corporal Darin T. Settle; Lance Corporal Derrick J. Cothran; Private First Class Ryan G. Winslow; Lance Corporal Justin D. Sims; Master Sergeant Clinton W. Cubert; Captain Ian P. Weikel; Private First Class Robert J. Settle; Private First Class Patrick A. Tinnell; Corporal Christopher D. Leon; Sergeant Jason J. Buzzard; Lance Corporal Nicholas J. Whyte; Sergeant Sirlou C. Cuaresma; Sergeant First Class Jared C. Monti; Staff Sergeant Patrick L. Lybert; Private First Class Brian J. Bradbury; Staff Sergeant Heathe N. Craig; Corporal Riley E. Baker; Private First Class Paul A. Beyer; Staff Sergeant Mario J. Bievre; Corporal Ryan J. Buckley; Private First Class Devon J. Gibbons; Specialist Channing G. Singletary; Sergeant Justin Dean Norton; Sergeant Benjamin J. Laymon; Staff Sergeant Virrueta A. Sanchez; Master Sergeant Thomas D. Maholic; and Staff Sergeant Joseph F. Fuerst III.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, before I turn to my colleague from Tennessee, I would like to thank those who are joining us today from the Armed Services as we read these names. I would like to thank them for their presence and for being here.

I yield to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I also pay tribute to the officers who are here.

Sergeant Matthew J. Fenton; Technical Sergeant Walter M. Moss, Jr.; Private First Class Joseph J. Duenas; Sergeant Israel Devora Garcia; Captain Timothy J. Moshier; Chief Warrant Officer Michael L. Hartwick; Corporal Scott J. Procopio; Corporal Brian R. St. Germain; Staff Sergeant Abraham G. Twitchell; Corporal Andres Aguilar, Jr.; Lance Corporal Eric A. Palmisano; Petty Officer Third Class Marcques J. Nettles; Private First Class Jeremy W. Ehle; Specialist Dustin J. Harris; Specialist Daniel L. Sesker; Private First Class Chase A. Edwards; Lance Corporal Bryan N. Taylor; Corporal Richard P. Waller; Sergeant First Class Gregory S. Rogers; Private First Class Joseph I. Love-Fowler; Lance Corporal Hatak Yuka Keyu M. Yearby; First Sergeant Tobias C. Meister; Private First Class Adam R. Shepard; Chief Warrant Officer Chester W. Troxel; Specialist Michael I. Edwards; Specialist David J. Babineau; Specialist Brent W. Koch; Private First Class Thomas Lowell Tucker; Private Kristian Menchaca; Specialist Robert L. Jones; Sergeant Reyes Ramirez; Private First Class Christopher N. White; Lance Corporal Brandon J. Webb; and Staff Sergeant Benjamin D. Williams.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to now recognize my colleague from Minnesota, Congressman KEITH ELLISON.

Mr. ELLISON. Thank you, Congressman EMANUEL. The following brave soldiers are from North Carolina: Lance Corporal Jeriad P. Jacobs; Chief Warrant Officer Mitchell K. Carver, Jr.; Corporal Felipe C. Barbosa; Staff Sergeant Darrell P. Clay; Specialist Shawn R. Creighton; Staff Sergeant Jason C. Ramseyer; Specialist Clifton J. Yazzie; Specialist Matthew C. Frantz; Technical Sergeant Jason L. Norton; Staff Sergeant Brian McElroy; Sergeant Matthew D. Hunter; Private Lewis T. D. Calapini; Staff Sergeant Lance M. Chase; Private First Class Peter D. Wagler; Sergeant Sean H. Miles; Staff Sergeant Jerry M. ''Michael'' Durbin, Jr.; Sergeant Joshua Allen Johnson; Lance Corporal Billy D. Brixey, Jr.; First Lieutenant Garrison C. Avery; Specialist Marlon A. Bustamante; Private Travis C. Zimmerman; Corporal Eric R. Lueken; Corporal Jason B. Daniel; Corporal Shawn Thomas Lasswell, Jr.; Sergeant Robert W. Ehney; Corporal William B. Fulks; Staff Sergeant Christian Longsworth; Lance Corporal Benito A. Ramirez; and Sergeant David Christoff, Jr.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I now recognize my colleague from New Hampshire to read the names from California.

Before he does that, for those who have just joined us, last year we started reading the names of each of our fellow citizens who gave their lives in both Iraq and Afghanistan. We read up to 2,400 names. We have another 1,000 to go, which today we are reading those names into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in recognition of their service so they always stay with us in our memory.

My colleague from New Hampshire, Congressman HODES.

Mr. HODES. Thank you, Congressman EMANUEL. I am honored to read the names of soldiers from California, who are all American heroes.

Corporal Carlos Arrelano; Private Robbie M. Mariano; Lance Corporal Raul Mercado; Major Douglas A. LaBouff; Lance Corporal Brandon Christopher Dewey; Lance Corporal Hugo R. Lopez; Sergeant David L. Herrera; Private First Class Caesar S. Viglienzone; Specialist Roberto L. Martinez Salazar; Private First Class Javier Chavez, Jr.; Lance Corporal Michael S. Probst; Specialist Clay P. Farr; Corporal Adam O. Zanutto; Lance Corporal Bunny Long; Private First Class Angelo A. Zawaydeh; Sergeant Dale G. Brehm; Staff Sergeant Ricardo Barraza; Hospitalman Geovani Padilla Aleman; Lance Corporal Felipe D. Sandoval-Flores; Captain Brian S. Letendre; Sergeant Joseph E. Proctor; Staff Sergeant Gavin B. Reinke; and Specialist Bryan L. Quinton.

□ 1600

Sergeant Elisha R. Parker; Private First Class Caleb A. Lufkin; Lance Corporal Adam Lucas; Corporal Richard A. Bennett; Captain Nathanael J. Doring; Corporal J. Adan Garcia; Captain James A. Funkhouser.

Mr. EMANUEL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the distinguished Members who participated in this tribute and this honor, both those from last year and those who participated tonight.

I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of my colleagues to thank the brave men and women who continue to serve our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan and throughout the world and serve with distinction and honor. Our thoughts and prayers are with them and their families at this time until they come together.

As I said this afternoon, in the words of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, ''Each of these heroes stands in the unbroken line of patriots who dare to die that freedom might live and grow and increase in its blessings.''

A number of our colleagues have stumbled over the names; I hope those families understand that. Although we struggle with the names, we honor their service.

I continue to place the names and pictures of those who have given their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan outside

my office in the Longworth Building. These faces and these names and their rank serve as a stark reminder to me and those who pass by my office that there are young men and women who have given their lives for our country, and we need to stop and remember their sacrifices and the sacrifices of their family, to thank them and honor them. May we always remember them, their names and their faces. God bless them, and God bless America.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1718

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OBEY) at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 720, WATER QUALITY FINANCING ACT OF 2007

Ms. CASTOR, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–36) on the resolution (H. Res. 229) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 720) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KANJORSKI (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today until 12:30 p.m. on account of personal business.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today until noon.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. BERKLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TAYLOR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KUHL of New York) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, March 13.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, March 15.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HODES, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 9, 2007, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

766. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, ''To amend the authority for the National Arboretum to authorize construction of a Chinese Garden within the National Arboretum, and for other purposes''; to the Committee on Agriculture.

767. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's 2007 farm bill proposals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

768. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Departmenf of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Notification Requirements for Critical Safety Items (DFARS Case 2004-D008) (RIN: 0750-AF12) received February 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

769. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Berry Amendment Restrictions — Clothing Materials and Components Covered (DFARS Case 2006-D031) (RIN: 0750-AF54) received February 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

770. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Emergency Acquisitions (DFARS Case 2006-D036) (RIN: 0750-AF56) received February 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

771. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement Admiral John B. Nathman, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

772. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the annual report mandated by the Military Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

773. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received February 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

774. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administra tion, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Statutory Exemption for Cross-Trading of Securities (RIN: 1210-AB17) received February 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

775. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's ''Major'' final rule — Control of Hazardous Air Pollutants from Mobile Sources [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0036; FRL-8278-4] (RIN: 2060-AK70) received February 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

776. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency with respect to Iran, as declared by Executive Order 12957 on March 14, 1995, is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 2007, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 110–17); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

777. A letter from the Office Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Export and Import of Nuclear Material; Exports to Libya Restricted (RIN: 3150-AI02) received February 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

778. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Gasparilla Marine Parade, Hillsborough Bay, Tampa, FL. [CGD07-06-001] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

779. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Regulations; Port of New York [CGD01-06-027] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

780. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; 63rd Street Bridge, Indian Creek, Miami, Miami-Dade County, FL [CGD07-06-041] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

781. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Lewes and Rehoboth

Canal, Lewes, DE and Rehoboth, DE; Mispillion River, Milford, DE [CGD05-06-089] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

782. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Stickney Point (SR 72) Bridge, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 68.6, Sarasota, FL [CGD07-05-158] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

783. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Mississippi River, Dubuque, IA [CGD08-06-037] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

784. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Anna Maria, FL [CGD07-05-097] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

785. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries and the C & D Canal, Maryland, Virginia, and Washington DC. [CGD05-07-011] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

786. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Wantagh Parkway 3 Bridge Over the Sloop Channel, Town of Hempstead, NY [CGD01-06-132] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

787. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Regulations, New Tacoma Narrows Bridge Construction Project, Construction Barge ''MARMACK 12'' [CGD13-07-003] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

788. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Regulations, New Tacoma Narrows Bridge Construction Project, Bridge Deck Lifting Beams [CGD13-07-004] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

789. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Regulations, New Tacoma Narrows Bridge Construction Project, Construction Vessels and Equipment Under and in Immediate Vicinity of West Span [CGD13-07-002] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

790. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; M/V Roy A. Jodrey, St. Lawrence River, Wellesley Island, NY [CGD09-06-174] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

791. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Saugus River, Lynn and Saugus, MA [CGD01-06-014] received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

792. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757-200 Series Airplanes Modified by Supplemental Type Certificate (STC) SA 979NE [Docket No. FAA-2006-25175; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-099-AD; Amendment 39-14670; AD 2006-13-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

793. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopters Textron Canada Model 222, 222B, 222U, 230, and 430 Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2006-25098; Directorate Identifier 2006-SW-12-AD; Amendment 39-14667; AD 2006-13-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 545. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to clarify that territories and Indian tribes are eligible to receive grants for confronting the use of methamphetamine (Rept. 110–35, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Ms. CASTOR: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 229. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 720) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–36). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 740. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent caller ID spoofing, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–37). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 85. A bill to provide for the establishment of centers to encourage demonstration and commercial application of advanced energy methods and technologies; with an amendment (Rept. 110–38). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 363. A bill to authorize appropriations for basic research and research infrastructure in science and engineering, and for support of graduate fellowships, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 110–39). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 1068. A bill to amend the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (Rept. 110–40). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 1126. A bill to reauthorize the Steel and Aluminum Energy Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act of 1988 (Rept. 110–41). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 545. Referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than April 20, 2007.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 1397. A bill to provide for immigration relief in the case of certain immigrants who are innocent victims of immigration fraud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BUYER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HAYES, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MELANCON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SPACE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 1398. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 to provide that manure shall not be considered to be a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. ROSS (for himself and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 1399. A bill to restore Second Amendment rights in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1400. A bill to enhance United States diplomatic efforts with respect to Iran by

imposing additional economic sanctions against Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, 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. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DICKS, Ms. HARMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 1401. A bill to improve the security of railroads, public transportation, and over-the-road buses in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. KELLER, Mr. MACK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MICA, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. BOYD of Florida, and Mr. STEARNS):

H.R. 1402. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 320 South Lecanto Highway in Lecanto, Florida, as the ''Sergeant Dennis J. Flanagan Lecanto Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 1403. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 2 percent tax reduction for members of the Armed Forces who serve in a combat zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 1404. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income a portion of the compensation received for active service and for inactive-duty training as a member of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 1405. A bill to establish a wildlife global animal information network for surveillance internationally to combat the growing threat of emerging diseases that involve wild animals, such as bird flu, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, and Agriculture, 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. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 1406. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase, and make permanent certain improvements to, the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. POE, and Mr. PICKERING):

H.R. 1407. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand incentives for education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. MARSHALL):

H.R. 1408. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of establishing the Chattahoochee Trace National Heritage Corridor in Alabama and Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FOSSELLA (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER):

H.R. 1409. A bill to establish a demonstration incentive program within the Department of Education to promote installation of fire alarm detection systems, or other fire prevention technologies, in qualified student housing, dormitories, and other university buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JEFFERSON (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 1410. A bill to provide emergency child care in the Gulf Coast Region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JEFFERSON (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 1411. A bill to provide for the construction and rehabilitation of child care facilities in areas of the Gulf Coast affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JEFFERSON (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 1412. A bill to establish a temporary program under which emergency loans are made to small businesses that are nonprofit child care businesses; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 1413. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to address vulnerabilities in aviation security by carrying out a pilot program to screen airport workers with access to secure and sterile areas of airports; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 1414. A bill to establish a grant program for individuals still suffering health effects as a result of the September 11, 2001, attacks in New York City and at the Pentagon; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 1415. A bill to provide for the effective prosecution of terrorists and guarantee due process rights; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Foreign Affairs, 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. NADLER (for himself, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 1416. A bill to restore habeas corpus for those detained by the United States and to repeal the prohibition on treaty obligations establishing grounds for certain claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1417. A bill to prohibit the closure of Walter Reed Army Medical Center notwithstanding the 2005 recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 1418. A bill to provide for the expansion and improvement of traumatic brain injury programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WELLER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 1419. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KIRK, Ms. LEE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCNULTY, and Ms. SCHWARTZ):

H.R. 1420. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to facilitating the development of microbicides for preventing transmission of HIV/AIDS and other diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. TERRY (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. BONO, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H.R. 1421. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase tax benefits for parents with children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KIND, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 1422. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax credit to individuals who enter into agreements to protect the habitats of endangered and threatened

species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VISCLOSKY (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

H.R. 1423. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease a portion of a visitor center to be constructed outside the boundary of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore in Porter County, Indiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. STEARNS):

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. JONES of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that an appropriate month should be recognized as Bebe Moore Campbell National Minority Mental Health Awareness Month to enhance public awareness of mental illness, especially within minority communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a world day of remembrance for road crash victims; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. POE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H. Res. 228. A resolution recognizing the 186th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating Greek and American democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H. Res. 230. A resolution recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the Treaty of Rome signed on March 25, 1957, which was a key step in creating the European Union, and reaffirming the close and mutually beneficial relationship between the United States and Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 20: Ms. NORTON and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 65: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H.R. 74: Mr. WALSH of New York.

H.R. 89: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 129: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 171: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 198: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 241: Mr. GINGREY.

H.R. 303: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 321: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 423: Mr. KAGEN.

H.R. 463: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 473: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 493: Ms. BEAN and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 511: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 524: Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ROSS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 562: Mr. JINDAL.

H.R. 573: Mr. DONNELLY.

H.R. 589: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 631: Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. AKIN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. MACK.

H.R. 634: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 687: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 690: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 692: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 708: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 718: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. KIND, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HARE, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. GRAVES, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 731: Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 734: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 757: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 769: Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H.R. 770: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 780: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 784: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.

H.R. 787: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 790: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 837: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 840: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 869: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 887: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 891: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 901: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. RUSH, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 910: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 920: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 932: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 936: Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 947: Ms. SOLIS and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 948: Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 958: Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 971: Mr. WAMP, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 980: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HILL, and Mr. RENZI.

H.R. 988: Mr. HERGER, Mr. FARR, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 997: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H.R. 1023: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 1061: Mr. FARR and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1071: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 1087: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1093: Mr. KELLER and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1108: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1115: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1118: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 1120: Mr. SALI, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 1132: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1187: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1188: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1190: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1197: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1225: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1232: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BONNER, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1246: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 1304: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 1314: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. WAMP, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 1321: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1330: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 1338: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WU, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1347: Mr. ALLEN and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 1363: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1366: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H.R. 1371: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. HILL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KIND, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 1390: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 1391: Ms. LEE.

H. J. Res. 9: Ms. FOXX.

H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KIND, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. BEAN, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. COHEN.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H. Con. Res. 71: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H. Con. Res. 73: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 101: Mr. BACA and Ms. SUTTON.

H. Res. 102: Mr. RENZI, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 118: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. WATT.

H. Res. 136: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H. Res. 141: Ms. BEAN.

H. Res. 197: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H. Res. 209: Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 221: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 222: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. ESHOO.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

5. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Idaho Association of Counties, relative to a petition supporting the reauthorization and funding of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources.