United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 2007 No. 129

# House of Representatives

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

## DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
*September 4, 2007.*

I hereby appoint the Honorable JIM MCDERMOTT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

## PRAYER

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

''Lord, open my lips and my mouth shall declare Your praise.'' Breathe into the body of this 110th Congress of the United States a new spirit, fresh from the depths of Your own goodness, filled with justice for all. Recreate it vibrant and strong in righteousness.

Let all speak with kindness and the simplicity of truth, free from illusion and manipulation. May their words unite, not cause division, and convey the whisper of peace to all who would listen.

With their speech build bridges of understanding the essentials facing this Nation. Lord, may the power of Your Word placed in these human hearts resound around the world.

''Lord, open my lips and my mouth shall declare Your praise,'' both in this present moment of prayer and in every speech, both now and forever. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

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

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. CHABOT 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.

## A GRATEFUL NATION

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the President visited our troops in Anbar province, Iraq. Along with his message of continued resolve to stop enemies, he brought with him the thoughts and prayers of a grateful Nation.

We are blessed to have the new Greatest Generation who are sacrificing to protect American families by promoting freedom to millions around the world. Their dedication to duty should inspire us all. We must honor their hard work by ensuring that they have our support and the resources to complete the mission.

In the coming days, Congress will hear from General David Petraeus and Ambassador Ryan Crocker about conditions on the ground. I hope my colleagues will join me in welcoming their recommendations and listening with an open mind.

Just as our soldiers have the courage to stop our enemies, so should we have the strength to make the right decisions that will ensure the safety of our troops and stop additional terrorist attacks on America.

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

## PRAISING THE ASU MOUNTAINEERS' WIN OVER MICHIGAN

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute the Appalachian State University Mountaineer football team on their upset of fifth-ranked Michigan this weekend in their season opener. This win was one of the greatest upsets in college football history. Before last Saturday's win, no Division I-AA team had beaten a team ranked in the AP poll from 1989 to 2006.

The Mountaineers' win was no ordinary upset. It was a down-to-the-wire game for the history books. The game hinged on the heroic field goal blocked by Corey Lynch with 6 seconds left that secured ASU's 34–32 victory over one of the most storied college football programs in America.

With this upset, it looks like Coach Jerry Moore is poised to lead the Mountaineers to their third straight national championship.

By beating Michigan, ASU extends their winning streak to 15 games, the longest among Division I teams. But this victory is about more than winning streaks or statistics. This is about the achievements of a hardworking championship team from a small town in rural North Carolina proving that tenacity counts.

## SUPPORT THE CHARLIE NORWOOD CLEAR ACT OF 2007

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



Printed on recycled paper.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, during the district word period back in my State of Tennessee, I traveled, talked with many and listened to my constituents.

What they are wanting is people in Congress to solve problems. In their estimation, you are either part of the problem or part of the solution, and there is no in between. Yet they have not seen the liberal majority in this Congress tackle one of the most pressing problems of our time, that of illegal immigration, which is only getting worse every single minute.

That is why this week I am introducing the Charlie Norwood CLEAR Act of 2007. This legislation provides clear authority for local law enforcement to enforce immigration law, and actually requires the Feds to remove and deport criminal aliens detained by local law enforcement officials. What a novel concept, deportation.

It also sends a tough message to sanctuary cities by reducing Federal funds to those cities that provide sanctuary to violent criminal aliens.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Charlie Norwood CLEAR Act of 2007.

## DEALING WITH ISSUES FACING AMERICA IN A BIPARTISAN MANNER

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, welcome back to Washington. Most of us were home in our districts over the August district work period and heard from our constituents and heard from many others.

Clearly, as we get into the fall, there are a lot of very important issues that Congress is going to deal with. On the issue of what happens to Iraq, I would hope my colleagues would wait and listen to what General Petraeus and Admiral Crocker would have to say before we make up our minds and outline our strategy for where we are going to go.

Secondly, the issue of spending and taxes is clearly going to be coming up in October, and I would urge all of my colleagues to take a real serious look at just how much of the American taxpayer's wallet we are willing to get into and how much we really need to spend.

There are a host of other issues that we are going to deal with this fall, and I would have one more request of all of my colleagues: let's listen to what the American people had to say over the August recess. Let's find a way to reach our hands across the aisle and work in an honest way together to deal with what the American people expect of us, and that is to deal with the issues that face our country and to do it in a bipartisan way.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bills were signed:

by the Speaker on Sunday, August 5, 2007:

S. 1927, to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to provide additional procedures for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence information and for other purposes

by Speaker pro tempore Hoyer on Monday, August 6, 2007:

H.R. 1260, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6301 Highway 58 in Harrison, Tennessee, as the ''Claude Ramsey Post Office''

H.R. 1335, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 508 East Main Street in Seneca, South Carolina, as the ''S/Sgt Lewis G. Watkins Post Office Building''

H.R. 1384, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 118 Minner Avenue in Bakersfield, California, as the ''Buck Owens Post Office''

H.R. 1425, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4551 East 52nd Street in Odessa, Texas, as the ''Staff Sergeant Marvin 'Rex' Young Post Office Building''

H.R. 1434, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 896 Pittsburgh Street in Springdale, Pennsylvania, as the ''Rachel Carson Post Office Building''

H.R. 1617, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 561 Kingsland Avenue in University City, Missouri, as the ''Harriett F. Woods Post Office Building''

H.R. 1722, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 601 Banyan Trail in Boca Raton, Florida, as the ''Leonard W. Herman Post Office''

H.R. 2025, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11033 South State Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''Willye B. White Post Office Building''

H.R. 2077, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20805 State Route 125 in Blue Creek, Ohio, as the ''George B. Lewis Post Office Building''

H.R. 2078, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14536 State Route 136 in Cherry Fork, Ohio, as the ''Staff Sergeant Omer ''O.T.'' Hawkins Post Office''

H.R. 2127, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 408 West 6th Street in Chelsea, Oklahoma, as the ''Clem Rogers Mcspadden Post Office Building''

H.R. 2309, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3916 Milgen Road in Columbus, Georgia, as the ''Frank G. Lumpkin, Jr. Post Office Building''

H.R. 2563, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 309 East Linn Street in Marshalltown, Iowa, as the ''Major Scott Nisely Post Office''

H.R. 2570, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 301 Boardwalk Drive in Fort Collins, Colorado, as the ''Dr. Karl E. Carson Post Office Building''

H.R. 2688, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 South Getty Street in Uvalde, Texas, as the ''Dolph Briscoe, Jr. Post Office Building''

H.R. 3006, to improve the use of a grant of a parcel of land to the State of Idaho for use as an agricultural college, and for other purposes

H.R. 3311, to authorize additional funds for emergency repairs and reconstruction of the Interstate I–35 bridge located in Minneapolis, Minnesota, that collapsed on August 1, 2007, to waive the $100,000,000 limitation on emergency relief funds for those emergency repairs and reconstruction, and for other purposes

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, August 7, 2007.*

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 6, 2007, at 5:35 pm:

That the Senate passed S. 849.

That the Senate passed S. 163.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
*Clerk of the House.*

## COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE JOHN T. DOOLITTLE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Dan Blankenburg, Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of the Honorable JOHN T. DOOLITTLE, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, August 13, 2007.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

DAN BLANKENBURG,
*Deputy Chief of Staff.*

## COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE JOHN T. DOOLITTLE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Ron Rogers, Chief of Staff, Office of the Honorable JOHN T. DOOLITTLE, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, August 13, 2007.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

RON ROGERS,
*Chief of Staff.*

## COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE PHIL ENGLISH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Regina Smith, District Director, Office of the Honorable PHIL ENGLISH, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, August 13, 2007.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House that I have been served with a trial subpoena for testimony issued by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

REGINA SMITH,
*District Director for*
*Congressman Phil English (PA–03).*

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

## MINORITY SERVING INSTITUTION DIGITAL AND WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2007

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 694) to establish a digital and wireless network technology program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 694

*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 ''Minority Serving Institution Digital and Wireless Technology Opportunity Act of 2007''.

**SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**

Section 5 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3704) is amended by inserting the following after subsection (b):

''(c) MINORITY SERVING INSTITUTION DIGITAL AND WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a Minority Serving Institution Digital and Wireless Technology Opportunity Program to assist eligible institutions in acquiring, and augmenting their use of, digital and wireless networking technologies to improve the quality and delivery of educational services at eligible institutions.

''(2) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—An eligible institution may use a grant, cooperative agreement, or contract awarded under this subsection—

''(A) to acquire equipment, instrumentation, networking capability, hardware and software, digital network technology, wireless technology, and infrastructure to further the objective of the Program described in paragraph (1);

''(B) to develop and provide training, education, and professional development programs, including faculty development, to increase the use of, and usefulness of, digital and wireless networking technology;

''(C) to provide teacher education, including the provision of preservice teacher training and in-service professional development at eligible institutions, library and media specialist training, and preschool and teacher aid certification to individuals who seek to acquire or enhance technology skills in order to use digital and wireless networking technology in the classroom or instructional process, including instruction in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology subjects;

''(D) to obtain capacity-building technical assistance, including through remote technical support, technical assistance workshops, and distance learning services; and

''(E) to foster the use of digital and wireless networking technology to improve research and education, including scientific, mathematics, engineering, and technology instruction.

''(3) APPLICATION AND REVIEW PROCEDURES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant, cooperative agreement, or contract under this subsection, an eligible institution shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. Such application, at a minimum, shall include a description of how the funds will be used, including a description of any digital and wireless networking technology to be acquired, and a description of how the institution will ensure that digital and wireless networking will be made accessible to, and employed by, students, faculty, and administrators. The Secretary, consistent with subparagraph (C) and in consultation with the advisory council established under subparagraph (B), shall establish procedures to review such applications. The Secretary shall publish the application requirements and review criteria in the Federal Register, along with a statement describing the availability of funds.

''(B) ADVISORY COUNCIL.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory council to advise the Secretary on the best approaches to encourage maximum participation by eligible institutions in the program established under paragraph (1), and on the procedures to review proposals submitted to the program. In selecting the members of the advisory council, the Secretary shall consult with representatives of appropriate organizations, including representatives of eligible institutions, to ensure that the membership of the advisory council includes representatives of minority businesses and eligible institution communities. The Secretary shall also consult with experts in digital and wireless networking technology to ensure that such expertise is represented on the advisory council.

''(C) REVIEW PANELS.—Each application submitted under this subsection by an eligible institution shall be reviewed by a panel of individuals selected by the Secretary to judge the quality and merit of the proposal, including the extent to which the eligible institution can effectively and successfully utilize the proposed grant, cooperative agreement, or contract to carry out the program described in paragraph (1). The Secretary shall ensure that the review panels include representatives of minority serving institutions and others who are knowledgeable about eligible institutions and technology issues. The Secretary shall ensure that no individual assigned under this subsection to review any application has a conflict of interest with regard to that application. The Secretary shall take into consideration the recommendations of the review panel in determining whether to award a grant, cooperative agreement, or contract to an eligible institution.

''(D) INFORMATION DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall convene an annual meeting of eligible institutions receiving grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts under this subsection to foster collaboration and capacity-building activities among eligible institutions.

''(E) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may not award a grant, cooperative agreement, or contract to an eligible institution under this subsection unless such institution agrees that, with respect to the costs incurred by the institution in carrying out the program for which the grant, cooperative agreement, or contract was awarded, such institution shall make available, directly, or through donations from public or private entities, non-Federal contributions in an amount equal to one-quarter of the grant, cooperative agreement, or contract awarded by the Secretary, or $500,000, whichever is the lesser amount. The Secretary shall waive the matching requirement for any institution or consortium with no endowment, or an endowment that has a current dollar value lower than $50,000,000.

''(F) AWARDS.—

''(i) LIMITATION.—An eligible institution that receives a grant, cooperative agreement, or contract under this subsection that exceeds $2,500,000 shall not be eligible to receive another grant, cooperative agreement, or contract.

''(ii) CONSORTIA.—Grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts may only be awarded to eligible institutions. Eligible institutions may seek funding under this subsection for consortia which may include other eligible institutions, a State or a State education agency, local education agencies, institutions of higher education, community-based organizations, national nonprofit organizations, or businesses, including minority businesses.

''(iii) PLANNING GRANTS.—The Secretary may provide funds to develop strategic plans

to implement such grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts.

''(iv) INSTITUTIONAL DIVERSITY.—In awarding grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts to eligible institutions, the Secretary shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that awards are made to all types of institutions eligible for assistance under this subsection.

''(v) NEED.—In awarding funds under this subsection, the Secretary shall give priority to the institution with the greatest demonstrated need for assistance.

''(G) ANNUAL REPORT AND EVALUATION.—

''(i) ANNUAL REPORT REQUIRED FROM RECIPIENTS.—Each institution that receives a grant, cooperative agreement, or contract awarded under this subsection shall provide an annual report to the Secretary on its use of the grant, cooperative agreement, or contract.

''(ii) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall enter into a contract with the National Academy of Public Administration to conduct periodic assessments of the program. The Assessments shall be conducted once every 3 years during the 10-year period following the enactment of this subsection. The assessments shall include an evaluation of the effectiveness of the program in improving the education and training of students, faculty and staff at eligible institutions that have been awarded grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts under the program; an evaluation of the effectiveness of the program in improving access to, and familiarity with, digital and wireless networking technology for students, faculty, and staff at all eligible institutions; an evaluation of the procedures established under paragraph (3)(A); and recommendations for improving the program, including recommendations concerning the continuing need for Federal support. In carrying out its assessments, the National Academy of Public Administration shall review the reports submitted to the Secretary under clause (i).

''(iii) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Upon completion of each independent assessment carried out under clause (ii), the Secretary shall transmit the assessment to Congress along with a summary of the Secretary's plans, if any, to implement the recommendations of the National Academy of Public Administration.

''(H) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(i) DIGITAL AND WIRELESS NETWORKING TECHNOLOGY.—The term 'digital and wireless networking technology' means computer and communications equipment and software that facilitates the transmission of information in a digital format.

''(ii) ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.—The term 'eligible institution' means an institution that is—

''(I) a historically Black college or university that is a part B institution, as defined in section 322(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061(2)), an institution described in section 326(e)(1)(A), (B), or (C) of that Act (20 U.S.C. 1063b(e)(1)(A), (B), or (C)), or a consortium of institutions described in this subparagraph;

''(II) a Hispanic-serving institution, as defined in section 502(a)(5) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101a(a)(5));

''(III) a tribally controlled college or university, as defined in section 316(b)(3) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b)(3));

''(IV) an Alaska Native-serving institution under section 317(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059d(b));

''(V) a Native Hawaiian-serving institution under section 317(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059d(b)); or

''(VI) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 365 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1067k)) with an enrollment of needy students (as defined in section 312(d) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1058(d)).

''(iii) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

''(iv) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term 'local educational agency' has the meaning given the term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

''(v) MINORITY BUSINESS.—The term 'minority business' includes HUBZone small business concerns (as defined in section 3(p) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)).

''(vi) MINORITY INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'minority individual' means an American Indian, Alaskan Native, Black (not of Hispanic origin), Hispanic (including persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban and Central or South American origin), or Pacific Islander individual.

''(vii) STATE.—The term 'State' has the meaning given the term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

''(viii) STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term 'State educational agency' has the meaning given the term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).''.

**SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to carry out section 5(c) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980—

(1) $250,000,000 for fiscal year 2008; and

(2) such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2012.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

□ 1415

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 694, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 694, the Minority Serving Institution Digital and Wireless Opportunity Act of 2007.

This bill creates a program to improve computer networks at minority-serving educational institutions. The program will award cost-shared grants to eligible campuses to buy networking equipment and train students and teachers in how to use it. The grants will be awarded by the Secretary of Commerce, and the program will be reviewed by the National Academy of Public Administration every 3 years.

In today's digital world, computer networks are a key part of the educational experience. But many campuses, especially minority-serving institutions, do not have the resources to build those networks on their own. That hurts the students and makes them less prepared to find jobs when they graduate. H.R. 694 will help fix that problem and enable many students to get the skills they need to compete in the digital economy. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on H.R. 694, the Minority Serving Institution Digital and Wireless Technology Opportunity Act of 2007, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The legislation has been an initiative of my colleague, Mr. FORBES, for several years and I congratulate him and Representative TOWNS and my colleague, Representative JOHNSON, on getting the legislation brought to the floor for a vote.

The bill requires the Secretary to establish a program to provide grants to increase the use of digital and wireless networking technology for institutions of higher education that primarily serve minorities.

Having been on the board of a minority institution in Texas for many years, I like the intent of the legislation and I want to say a few words about it. The grants may be used for training, education and professional development programs to increase the use of digital and wireless technology or to obtain capacity-building technical assistance and distance learning services.

Additionally, the grants may be used to foster the use of digital and wireless networking technology to improve research and education, including scientific mathematics, engineering and technology instruction.

H.R. 694 will help to provide grants to promote crucial development and educational programs for minority-serving institutions. It will help to ensure that minority students will not fall behind in education on critical digital and wireless networking technology. It will also help to ensure access to the technology and the training programs on the use of these technologies.

While I am a longtime supporter of grants to improve education and training on digital and wireless networking technology, and I commend my colleagues on this very important initiative, I would be a little bit remiss if I didn't raise some concerns about the process of bringing this bill up and the price tag associated with it.

The bill was referred to the Committee on Science and Technology in February of this year and received an additional referral to the Committee on Education and Labor in June of this year; yet neither of these committees has had a chance to really review the legislation and to hold hearings and to go through the markup process. I am a strong believer in proper order and the

important role that committees of jurisdiction play to make improvements to legislation.

In addition to my concerns about the process, I am concerned about the authorization levels in the bill and the fact that it does not contain any opportunities for grants for rural colleges and universities which experience similar equipment shortages and could benefit from the use of distance learning.

The bill authorizes $250 million for fiscal year 2008 and then such sums as may be necessary from 2009 to 2012. There is no CBO score, but I think we can look at the authorization levels and determine that this is a lot of money for a very limited group of institutions.

Despite these feelings and despite these problems, and because of my longtime support of these types of programs, I will be supporting the passage of the bill and will vote for it, but I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will address my concerns and the concerns others have as we move forward.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I ask the gentleman if he has any other speakers.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to conclude by thanking my colleague from Texas. This has truly been a bipartisan bill. I want to sing the praises of Congressman TOWNS from New York for his steadfast leadership on this and Mr. FORBES' leadership prior to that. I urge a ''yes'' vote for passage of this fine piece of legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the Minority Serving Institution Digital and Wireless Opportunity Act of 2007. This bill authorizes grants to Minority Serving Institutions for technology improvements and infrastructure. Given the large gap in technology between MSI campuses and other American universities, this legislation is critical to improving MSI's educational advancements.

It is important to note that MSI's educational contributions are significant. For example, in 2000 at least 40 percent of all African American students who received a baccalaureate degree in physics, chemistry, astronomy, environmental sciences, mathematics and biology graduated from a historically Black college and university. Given their contributions to our society, we must do all we can to make sure that MSIs receive the most modern technology to keep up with other universities.

Unfortunately, at the current time, there is a "digital divide" between MSIs and other schools in technology infrastructure and programming. Less than half of the students attending Minority Serving Institutions own computers. Sadly, the majority of historically Black colleges and universities do not provide high speed access to the Internet [according to a Feb. 2004 report by the Alliance for Equity in Higher Education]. We also see this trend in minority communities around the country. Over 60 percent of the U.S. population uses the Internet at home, while only 46 percent of African Americans and 37 percent of Hispanics have Internet access at home [according to a Feb. 2004 report by the Alliance for Equity in Higher Education].

The Minority Serving Institution Digital and Wireless Opportunity Act of 2007 will help eliminate the technological disparities at MSIs by establishing a grant program. These grants will help MSIs purchase equipment, make upgrades and improve their technology infrastructure as well as provide technology education services. In addition, these grants will promote the use of information communications technology to strengthen engineering, math and science research.

I would like to thank Mr. TOWNS and Mr. FORBES for their efforts to bring this bill before Congress and their commitment to rectify this disparity. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 694.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 694, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. 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 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

## GREEN CHEMISTRY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2007

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2850) to provide for the implementation of a Green Chemistry Research and Development Program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2850

*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 ''Green Chemistry Research and Development Act of 2007''.*

***SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.***

*In this Act—*

*(1) the term ''green chemistry'' means chemistry and chemical engineering to design chemical products and processes that reduce or eliminate the use or generation of hazardous substances while producing high quality products through safe and efficient manufacturing processes;*

*(2) the term ''Interagency Working Group'' means the interagency working group established under section 3(c); and*

*(3) the term ''Program'' means the Green Chemistry Research and Development Program described in section 3.*

***SEC. 3. GREEN CHEMISTRY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.***

*(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall establish a Green Chemistry Research and Development Program to promote and coordinate Federal green chemistry research, development, education, and technology transfer activities.*

*(b) PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.—The activities of the Program shall be designed to—*

*(1) provide sustained support for green chemistry research, development, education, and technology transfer through—*

*(A) merit-reviewed competitive grants to individual investigators and teams of investigators, including, to the extent practicable, young investigators, for research and development;*

*(B) grants to fund collaborative research and development partnerships among universities, industry, and nonprofit organizations;*

*(C) green chemistry research, development, and technology transfer conducted at Federal laboratories; and*

*(D) to the extent practicable, encouragement of consideration of green chemistry in—*

*(i) the conduct of Federal chemical science and engineering research and development; and*

*(ii) the solicitation and evaluation of all proposals for chemical science and engineering research and development;*

*(2) examine methods by which the Federal Government can create incentives for consideration and use of green chemistry processes and products;*

*(3) facilitate the adoption of green chemistry innovations;*

*(4) expand education and training of undergraduate and graduate students, and professional chemists and chemical engineers, including through partnerships with industry, in green chemistry science and engineering;*

*(5) collect and disseminate information on green chemistry research, development, and technology transfer, including information on—*

*(A) incentives and impediments to development and commercialization;*

*(B) accomplishments;*

*(C) best practices; and*

*(D) costs and benefits;*

*(6) provide venues for outreach and dissemination of green chemistry advances such as symposia, forums, conferences, and written materials in collaboration with, as appropriate, industry, academia, scientific and professional societies, and other relevant groups;*

*(7) support economic, legal, and other appropriate social science research to identify barriers to commercialization and methods to advance commercialization of green chemistry; and*

*(8) provide for public input and outreach to be integrated into the Program by the convening of public discussions, through mechanisms such as citizen panels, consensus conferences, and educational events, as appropriate.*

*(c) INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.—The President shall establish an Interagency Working Group, which shall include representatives from the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Department of Energy, the Environmental Protection Agency, and any other agency that the President may designate. The Director of the National Science Foundation and the Assistant Administrator for Research and Development of the Environmental Protection Agency shall serve as co-chairs of the Interagency Working Group. The Interagency Working Group shall oversee the planning, management, and coordination of the Program. The Interagency Working Group shall—*

*(1) establish goals and priorities for the Program, to the extent practicable in consultation with green chemistry researchers and potential end-users of green chemistry products and processes; and*

*(2) provide for interagency coordination, including budget coordination, of activities under the Program.*

*(d) AGENCY BUDGET REQUESTS.—Each Federal agency and department participating in the Program shall, as part of its annual request for appropriations to the Office of Management and Budget, submit a report to the Office of Management and Budget which identifies its activities that contribute directly to the Program and states the portion of its request for appropriations that is allocated to those activities. The*

*President shall include in his annual budget request to Congress a statement of the portion of each agency's or department's annual budget request allocated to its activities undertaken pursuant to the Program.*

*(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Interagency Working Group shall transmit a report to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate. This report shall include—*

*(1) a summary of federally funded green chemistry research, development, demonstration, education, and technology transfer activities, including the green chemistry budget for each of these activities; and*

*(2) an analysis of the progress made toward achieving the goals and priorities for the Program, and recommendations for future program activities.*

***SEC. 4. MANUFACTURING EXTENSION CENTER GREEN SUPPLIERS NETWORK GRANT PROGRAM.***

*Section 25(a) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k(a)) is amended—*

*(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (4);*

*(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting ''; and''; and*

*(3) by adding at the end the following:*

*''(6) the enabling of supply chain manufacturers to continuously improve products and processes, increase energy efficiency, increase recycling, identify cost-saving opportunities, and optimize resources and technologies with the aim of reducing or eliminating the use or generation of hazardous substances.''.*

***SEC. 5. UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION IN CHEMISTRY AND CHEMICAL ENGINEERING.***

*(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—(1) As part of the Program activities under section 3(b)(4), the Director of the National Science Foundation shall carry out a program to award grants to institutions of higher education to support efforts by such institutions to revise their undergraduate curriculum in chemistry and chemical engineering to incorporate green chemistry concepts and strategies.*

*(2) Grants shall be awarded under this section on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis and shall require cost sharing in cash from non-Federal sources, to match the Federal funding.*

*(b) SELECTION PROCESS.—(1) An institution of higher education seeking funding under this section shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. Minority Serving Institutions shall receive due consideration for such funding. The application shall include at a minimum—*

*(A) a description of the content and schedule for adoption of the proposed curricular revisions to the courses of study offered by the applicant in chemistry and chemical engineering; and*

*(B) a description of the source and amount of cost sharing to be provided.*

*(2) In evaluating the applications submitted under paragraph (1), the Director shall consider, at a minimum—*

*(A) the level of commitment demonstrated by the applicant in carrying out and sustaining lasting curriculum changes in accordance with subsection (a)(1); and*

*(B) the amount of cost sharing to be provided.*

*(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts authorized under section 8, from sums otherwise authorized to be appropriated by the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002, there are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for carrying out this section $7,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $7,500,000 for fiscal year 2009, and $8,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.*

***SEC. 6. STUDY ON COMMERCIALIZATION OF GREEN CHEMISTRY.***

*(a) STUDY.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council to conduct a study of the factors that constitute barriers to the successful commercial application of promising results from green chemistry research and development.*

*(b) CONTENTS.—The study shall—*

*(1) examine successful and unsuccessful attempts at commercialization of green chemistry in the United States and abroad; and*

*(2) recommend research areas and priorities and public policy options that would help to overcome identified barriers to commercialization.*

*(c) REPORT.—The Director shall submit a report to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the findings and recommendations of the study within 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.*

***SEC. 7. PARTNERSHIPS IN GREEN CHEMISTRY.***

*(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—(1) The agencies participating in the Program shall carry out a joint, coordinated program to award grants to institutions of higher education to establish partnerships with companies in the chemical industry to retrain chemists and chemical engineers in the use of green chemistry concepts and strategies.*

*(2) Grants shall be awarded under this section on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis and shall require cost sharing from non-Federal sources by members of the partnerships.*

*(3) In order to be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an institution of higher education shall enter into a partnership with two or more companies in the chemical industry. Such partnerships may also include other institutions of higher education and professional associations.*

*(4) Grants awarded under this section shall be used for activities to provide retraining for chemists or chemical engineers in green chemistry, including—*

*(A) the development of curricular materials and the designing of undergraduate and graduate level courses; and*

*(B) publicizing the availability of professional development courses of study in green chemistry and recruiting graduate scientists and engineers to pursue such courses.*

*Grants may provide stipends for individuals enrolled in courses developed by the partnership.*

*(b) SELECTION PROCESS.—(1) An institution of higher education seeking funding under this section shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as shall be specified by the Interagency Working Group and published in a proposal solicitation for the Program. The application shall include at a minimum—*

*(A) a description of the partnership and the role each member will play in implementing the proposal;*

*(B) a description of the courses of study that will be provided;*

*(C) a description of the number and size of stipends, if offered;*

*(D) a description of the source and amount of cost sharing to be provided; and*

*(E) a description of the manner in which the partnership will be continued after assistance under this section ends.*

*(2) The evaluation of the applications submitted under paragraph (1) shall be carried out in accordance with procedures developed by the Interagency Working Group and shall consider, at a minimum—*

*(A) the ability of the partnership to carry out effectively the proposed activities;*

*(B) the degree to which such activities are likely to prepare chemists and chemical engineers sufficiently to be competent to apply green chemistry concepts and strategies in their work; and*

*(C) the amount of cost sharing to be provided.*

***SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.***

*(a) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for carrying out this Act—*

*(1) $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;*

*(2) $21,000,000 for fiscal year 2009; and*

*(3) $22,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.*

*(b) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Institute of Standards and Technology for carrying out this Act—*

*(1) $8,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;*

*(2) $9,000,000 for fiscal year 2009; and*

*(3) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.*

*(c) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for carrying out this Act—*

*(1) $13,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;*

*(2) $14,000,000 for fiscal year 2009; and*

*(3) $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.*

*(d) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency for carrying out this Act—*

*(1) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;*

*(2) $11,000,000 for fiscal year 2009; and*

*(3) $12,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.*

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2850, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2850, the Green Chemistry Research and Development Act.

Chemical manufacturing produces great wonders for the world, but at the same time it can result in harm to health and the environment due to the use of hazardous materials and the generation of hazardous by-products. Green chemistry seeks to mitigate such harmful outcomes.

In short, the goal of green chemistry is to minimize or to eliminate this harm by using safer materials and manufacturing processes. Besides protecting human health and the environment, green chemistry can offer economic advantages and improvements to worker safety, public safety, and our national security.

The bill before us today, H.R. 2850, the Green Chemistry Research and Development Act, establishes an interagency program to enhance green chemistry R&D at NSF, EPA, DOE and NIST.

This legislation will provide grants to individual researchers, spur university/industry partnerships, fund research at Federal laboratories, and train students in green chemistry science.

H.R. 2850 is the third iteration of a bill that Congressman GINGREY has introduced addressing this issue in three

separate Congresses. I want to applaud the gentleman from Georgia for his steadfast leadership on this, and I fully support the legislation.

Under Chairman Boehlert's leadership in the 108th and 109th Congresses, Democratic amendments were agreed to, and these amendments now make up sections of H.R. 2850. This bill is the product of good, bipartisan cooperation and has the support of our chairman, Mr. GORDON, from Tennessee.

H.R. 2850 is a good first step, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, leaving most of the time for Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just say that the Green Chemistry Research and Development Act of 2007 offered today by my good friend from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, will provide for research and development of chemical products and processes so as to reduce the use of creation of hazardous substances. Advances in these areas have the potential of reducing the creation of substances that are harmful to our environment.

In particular, H.R. 2850 includes a competitive merit-based grant program to universities to incorporate green chemistry concepts into the curriculum for chemistry and chemical engineering. This will ensure that future generations will consider the importance of green chemistry ideas.

The legislation strives to build a base from which the creation of hazardous substances may be reduced. I look forward to Dr. GINGREY's comments on this bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield 6 minutes to Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, as a proud sponsor of this legislation, I rise to support H.R. 2850, the Green Chemistry Research and Development Act of 2007.

I want to thank my colleague on the Science Committee, Dr. BAIRD. I thank him for his kind comments. And certainly I want to thank our chairman, BART GORDON, the ranking member, Mr. HALL of Texas, and all of the members of the Science Committee and staff. Both majority and minority have worked hard to bring this important bipartisan legislation through committee and to the House floor today.

This legislation has passed the House in the 108th and 109th Congresses, and I hope that the third Congress will truly be the charm and we will see H.R. 2850 quickly passed by both Chambers and signed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, chemists can design chemicals to be safe, just as they can design them to have other properties like color and texture. As chemists design products and the processes by which those products are manufactured, they can and should factor in the possible creation of any hazardous by-products.

This technique of considering not only the process by which chemicals are produced, but also the environment in which they are created, is the basic definition of green chemistry. It is the method of designing chemical products and processes that at the very least reduce, and at the very best eliminate, the use or generation of hazardous substances.

Mr. Speaker, the basic idea is this: Preventing pollution and hazardous waste from the start of a design process is far preferable to cleaning up pollution and waste at a later date. Additionally, the innovation created by this enhanced research will subsequently spur economic growth as developing new products and processes is an integral component of many industries, from fabrics to fuel cells, as an example.

Green chemistry doesn't just help protect our environment, it also protects our workers. The conditions under which chemicals are created and used can present many risks to those who work on their production. But if companies utilize green chemistry, the materials they use will be as benign as possible, vastly improving employee conditions.

Unfortunately, despite all of the promise of green chemistry, the Federal Government invests very little in this area. H.R. 2850 works to remedy this by promoting greater Federal investment in, and coordination of, this important research area. It does so by establishing a program that coordinates Federal green chemistry research and development activities within the National Science Foundation, the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, and the Department of Energy.

Make no mistake, greater Federal attention will encourage universities and academic institutions around this country to train future workers in this exciting technology. H.R. 2850 will achieve this by supporting research and development grants to partnerships between universities, industry and nonprofit organizations. It will also promote education through curriculum development and fellowships that will collect and disseminate information about green chemistry.

In past years, many industries, from chemical companies and pharmaceutical corporations, to carpet manufacturers and biotechnology businesses, have all endorsed H.R. 2850, showing a broad range of support for the merits of this legislation.

This bill is nearly identical to the version passed in the 109th Congress. The companies and corporations that have voiced their strong support for this bill realize that the advancement of green chemistry is positive for not only their businesses, but also our country's environment, our economy and our Nation's citizens.

The American Chemical Society, a nonprofit organization chartered by Congress, stated in support of H.R. 2850, ''Green chemistry means continuously improving process safety and resource efficiency leading to reduced cost, waste and environmental impact. It is the ultimate proof that environmental and economic benefit in chemistry can be optimized simultaneously.''

Mr. Speaker, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and green chemistry promises a ton of pollution prevention. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would just reiterate my commendation to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, and Mr. HALL for his leadership, and urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Technology and Innovation Subcommittee and a cosponsor of the bill, I rise in support of H.R. 2850, the Green Chemistry Research and Development Act of 2007. I want to commend Dr. GINGREY for his work on this bill.

Partnerships with universities, non-profits, industry and the Federal Government are important for the chemical industry's success. The transfer of technology from federally funded research to industry helps promote innovation, which helps the United States remain competitive in a global economy.

Federal support of green chemistry can produce many benefits. First, companies will be able to produce more products less harmful to humans and the environment. Second, businesses will benefit from the facilitation of green chemistry research by the Federal Government and the subsequent transfer of technology to the private sector.

This bill presents opportunities to reduce impact on the environment while assisting our domestic industry to find new products through innovation.

Recently, Columbia Forest Products, a company in my district, received an award for an innovation in green chemistry. The company produces interior plywood products. In collaboration with Oregon State University, Columbia Forest Products has created a soy-based product to use for its production of plywood, instead of traditional urea-formaldehyde resin.

H.R. 2850 will help create more opportunities for universities and companies to partner in green chemistry innovation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2850, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1430

## SBA TRADE PROGRAMS ACT OF 2007

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2992) to amend the Small Business Act to improve trade programs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2992

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

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

*(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''SBA Trade Programs Act of 2007''.*

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

*Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.*

*TITLE I—SMALL BUSINESS TRADE POLICY*

*Sec. 101. Develop and implement small business trade policies.*

*Sec. 102. Establish an annual small business trade strategy.*

*Sec. 103. Track small business exports and trade resource utilization.*

*TITLE II—TRADE COMPLIANCE PROGRAMS*

*Sec. 201. Trade Remedy and Dispute Assistance Initiative.*

*Sec. 202. Patent Assistance and Intellectual Property Protections Initiative.*

*TITLE III—TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL BUSINESSES*

*Sec. 301. Trade Adjustment Assistance Financing Initiative.*

*Sec. 302. Technical resources for trade adjustment assistance.*

*TITLE IV—EXPORT ASSISTANCE*

*Sec. 401. Increase Small Business Administration participation at Export Assistance Centers.*

*Sec. 402. Increase access to capital for small and medium-sized exporters.*

*Sec. 403. Clerical amendment.*

*TITLE V—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS*

*Sec. 501. Authorization of appropriations.*

### *TITLE I—SMALL BUSINESS TRADE POLICY*

***SEC. 101. TRADE POLICY FOR SMALL BUSINESS.***

*Section 22 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 649) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(h) ROLE IN TRADE POLICY.—*

*''(1) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The director of the Office shall present recommendations regarding small business exporters to trade negotiators.*

*''(2) DEVELOPMENT OF TRADE POLICIES.—The director of the Office shall assist in the development of trade policies that increase opportunities for small businesses in domestic and foreign markets, including the removal of trade barriers.*

*''(3) IMPLEMENTATION OF TRADE POLICIES.—The director of the Office shall assist in the implementation of trade policies through relationships developed with Federal trade policymakers, particularly the United States Trade Representative, and transnational organizations, such as the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.*

*''(4) SMALL EXPORTER PROMOTION PROGRAMS.—The director of the Office shall establish programs that will boost the export opportunities of entrepreneurs and encourage transnational organizations, such as the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, small exporter organizations, and ministries of foreign governments to support and publicize these programs.*

*''(5) STRATEGIC ALLIANCES.—*

*''(A) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—The director of the Office shall notify the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate of pending strategic alliances.*

*''(B) FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES.—The director of the Office shall ensure that planned and documented follow-up activities for strategic alliances increase trade opportunities for small businesses.*

*''(C) STRATEGIC ALLIANCE DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'strategic alliance' means a working relationship, entered into between the Small Business Administration and foreign national ministries representing small business concerns, for the purpose of strengthening trade between United States small businesses and foreign small businesses by establishing overseas networks and buyers.''.*

***SEC. 102. ESTABLISH AN ANNUAL SMALL BUSINESS TRADE STRATEGY.***

*Section 22 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 649), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(i) ANNUAL SMALL BUSINESS TRADE STRATEGY.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—The director of the Office shall develop and maintain a small business trade strategy that is contributed as part of the National Export Strategy developed by the Department of Commerce that includes at least the following components:*

*''(A) Strategies to increase small business export opportunities. The strategies shall include a specific strategy to increase small business export opportunities to the Asia Pacific Region.*

*''(B) Recommendations to increase the competitiveness of domestic small business industries in the global economy.*

*''(C) Recommendations to protect small businesses from unfair trade practices, including intellectual property violations.*

*''(D) Strategies to expand small business representation in United States trade policy formation and implementation.*

*''(E) Coordination efforts with the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee of the Department of Commerce, as well as with Federal agencies that also provide trade financing to small businesses, such as the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Export-Import Bank.*

*''(2) REPORT.—At the beginning of each fiscal year, the director shall submit to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate a report on the small business trade strategy required by paragraph (1). The report shall cover, at a minimum, each of the components required by paragraph (1) and shall include specific policies and objectives and timelines to implement those policies and objectives.''.*

***SEC. 103. TRACK SMALL BUSINESS EXPORTS AND TRADE RESOURCE UTILIZATION.***

*Section 22 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 649), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(j) TRACKING SYSTEM.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—The director of the Office shall develop a system to track small business exports and the use by small businesses of Federal trade promotion resources. The director shall ensure that the system is consistent through each Federal agency member of the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee.*

*''(2) DESIGN EMPHASIS.—The director shall give particular attention, in designing the system, to the tracking of data on the trade of services by small exporters, in consultation with the Department of Commerce.*

*''(3) IMPLEMENTATION.—The director shall work in consultation with members of the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee to ensure that the system is implemented and that the results of the system are reported annually in the National Export Strategy conducted by the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee.''.*

### *TITLE II—TRADE COMPLIANCE PROGRAMS*

***SEC. 201. TRADE REMEDY AND DISPUTE ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE.***

*Section 22 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 649), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(k) TRADE REMEDY AND DISPUTE ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE.—The director of the Office shall design, and the district offices of the Administration shall implement, a program that provides technical assistance, counseling services, and reference materials to assist small businesses navigate the trade dispute and remedy processes. The program shall include—*

*''(1) information on available resources, procedures, and requirements for trade remedy investigations;*

*''(2) an approach for district office staff to provide one-on-one assistance to small businesses involved in these activities; and*

*''(3) an identification of legal resources and other tools to ensure small businesses can navigate the trade dispute and remedy processes affordably.''.*

***SEC. 202. PATENT ASSISTANCE AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROTECTIONS INITIATIVE.***

*Section 22 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 649), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(l) PATENT ASSISTANCE AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROTECTIONS INITIATIVE.—In consultation with the United States Patent and Trademark Office and the United States Copyright Office, the Office shall design counseling services, including identifying legal resources for small businesses to secure intellectual property protection in foreign countries. To implement the program, the Office shall collaborate with district office staff to provide on-on-one assistance to small businesses involved in these activities.''.*

### *TITLE III—TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL BUSINESSES*

***SEC. 301. TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FINANCING INITIATIVE.***

*Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended—*

*(1) in paragraph (2)(D) by inserting after ''paragraph (14)(A),'' the following: ''or to participate in a loan made under paragraph (16),''; and*

*(2) in paragraph (16)—*

*(A) in subparagraph (D) by striking clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting the following:*

*''(i) is impacted by—*

*''(I) increased competition with foreign firms in the relevant market; or*

*''(II) unfair trade practices, particularly intellectual property violations; and*

*''(ii) is injured by such impacts.''; and*

*(B) by adding at the end the following:*

*''(E) OUTREACH AND MARKETING.—The Administration shall increase outreach and marketing of international trade loans to district offices and private lenders.''.*

***SEC. 302. TECHNICAL RESOURCES FOR TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.***

*Section 22 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 649), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(m) TECHNICAL RESOURCES FOR TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—The director of the Office shall establish a comprehensive set of services to assist small business readjustment, including access to training, technology, marketing assistance, and research and information on domestic and global markets.*

*''(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Administrator shall, by regulation, establish such requirements as may be necessary to carry out paragraph (1).*

*''(3) OUTREACH.—The Office shall work with the district offices and the outreach business assistance centers of the Administration, including Small Business Development Centers, Women's Business Centers, and SCORE, to offer the set of services established under paragraph (1) to small businesses in their local communities.''.*

***TITLE IV—EXPORT ASSISTANCE***

***SEC. 401. INCREASE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION PARTICIPATION AT EXPORT ASSISTANCE CENTERS.***

*Section 22 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 649), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(n) TRADE FINANCE POSITIONS.—*

*''(1) ADDITIONAL TRADE FINANCE SPECIALISTS.—*

*''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Office, over the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection, shall increase the number of trade finance specialists at Export Assistance Centers by at least 6 and thereafter shall maintain the number of such trade finance specialists at or above that number. Candidates for the positions are required to have sufficient qualifications and experiences.*

*''(B) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out subparagraph (A) such sums as may be necessary.*

*''(2) FILLING VACANT POSITIONS.—The Office, over the 3-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection, shall fill all trade finance positions that have been vacant since 2003. Candidates for the positions are required to have sufficient qualifications and experiences.*

*''(3) FILLING GAPS IN HIGH-EXPORT-VOLUME AREAS.—The director of the Office shall—*

*''(A) not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, carry out a national study to compare the rate of exports from each State and major metropolitan region to the availability of Administration staff participating in Export Assistance Centers in such State or region;*

*''(B) not later than 2 years after such date of enactment, design a formula to eliminate gaps between supply of, and demand for, such staff in areas with high export volumes; and*

*''(C) request the additional staff that are required to eliminate such gaps and place them in those areas.''.*

***SEC. 402. INCREASE ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED EXPORTERS.***

*Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended—*

*(1) in paragraph (2)(D) by amending the heading to read as follows: ''PARTICIPATION UNDER EXPORT WORKING CAPITAL AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE PROGRAMS''; and*

*(2) in paragraph (3)—*

*(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''subparagraph (B)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (B) and (C)'';*

*(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as (C) and (D), respectively;*

*(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:*

*''(B) if the total amount outstanding and committed (by participation or otherwise) solely for the purposes provided in paragraphs (14)(A) and (16) to the borrower from the business loan and investment fund established by this Act would exceed $2,250,000 (or if the gross loan amount would exceed $3,000,000), except as provided in subparagraph (C);''; and*

*(D) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated) by striking ''$1,750,000, of which not more than $1,250,000'' and inserting ''$2,250,000, of which not more than $1,600,000''.*

***SEC. 403. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.***

*Section 22(c)(5) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 649) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon.*

***TITLE V—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS***

***SEC. 501. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.***

*There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

International trade is a key part of our economic future, and competition in the global marketplace will only increase in the years to come. Consequently, our country is facing many decisions concerning how we will engage in transnational commerce. To utilize resources effectively and secure our industry's leadership, it is critical that the Nation's trade strategy incorporates a key source of innovation in world markets, small businesses.

I want to thank Representative HALL for introducing this legislation. He has been a strong supporter of trade policies that will benefit all Americans.

Small businesses that generate and develop new products have shown that they can lead the way in building entire industries. They represent virtually all of the country's exporting firms, improving our trade balance and introducing U.S. products to consumers across the world. With all of their success, these firms still face barriers to maintaining domestic and international markets. As a result, although the entrepreneurs are nearly 100 percent of export firms, they generate less than one-third of revenues from these activities.

Given their contributions, it is critical that entrepreneurs are considered in the Nation's trade strategy and that obstacles to their competitiveness are removed. By enhancing the Small Business Administration's focus to reflect the international-oriented demands of small businesses, H.R. 2992 will ensure that entrepreneurs are able to effectively incorporate trade into their business strategy.

The SBA Trade Programs Act of 2007 will provide small firms with a comprehensive set of tools to thrive in a marketplace without borders. It will assist them to overcome trade barriers by enhancing their access to export financing, counseling and technical assistance programs. The SBA's mandate is also expanded to ensure entrepreneurs participate on a level playing field as they face global competition.

To make certain that small businesses have access to newly opened world markets, H.R. 2992 requires the agencies to incorporate entrepreneurs' interests into trade policies and plans. The bill increases trade finance resources and the size of international trade loans which will facilitate small exporters' overseas transactions. These improvements will help to ensure that the Nation's trade promotion strategy supports, and benefits from, U.S. small businesses.

Small firms play a crucial role in promoting the global competitiveness of our country's industries. Including them in the development of the U.S. trade policy will support the growth of the Nation's economy, as well as to reduce the trade deficit. Effective trade strategies, enforcement assistance, and export promotion resources will ensure small businesses contribute to maintaining the Nation's global leadership. Doing so will guarantee that benefits of free trade are more widely distributed to not only businesses but also more of our Nation's communities.

I strongly urge support of this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2992, the SBA Trade Programs Act of 2007. The committee worked in a cooperative and bipartisan basis to bring these changes in the SBA's operation of its programs to enhance small business participation in the global economy. H.R. 2992 represents the Small Business Committee's continued commitment to promotion of international trade by America's small businesses.

The Small Business Administration has a number of general entrepreneurial assistance programs that provide technical advice to small business owners. However, international trade is an area that is fraught with regulatory issues requiring specialized knowledge that may not be available from the SBA's entrepreneurial partners.

It is not surprising to find that the SBA created other programs to meet the needs of small business exporters that rely on personnel with specialized knowledge about the international trade regulatory regime. These programs, as well as the SBA efforts to coordinate with other agencies such as the Department of Commerce, have resulted in remarkable gains in exports.

There are about a quarter of a million small businesses that export. Revenue increased from $102.8 billion to $203 billion in 2004. There's no doubt that small businesses are playing a vital role in reducing America's trade deficit. Continuation of this success and even greater impetus on small business exporting will benefit the American economy.

H.R. 2992 requires the Small Business Administration to expand its trade

outreach initiatives and improve coordination of its trade promotion activities with those of other Federal agencies such as United States Trade Representative, the Department of Commerce, and the Export-Import Bank.

The bill will increase the capacity of America's small businesses to export. This will reduce our trade deficit and increase our national and economic security.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to one of the bill's original cosponsors, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK), who is also the vice-Chair of the Small Business Committee, as much time as he may consume.

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

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman and ranking member. I very much appreciate your support on this bill, and I rise to speak highly on it and thank, in particular, my colleague Mr. John Hall who is also an original cosponsor.

I believe this bill has a lot to do with enhancing global competitiveness of American small businesses. In fact, in May I held an economic summit in my district in partnership with the U.S. Export Assistance Center in Philadelphia. The day's program aimed to provide business owners with information about the resources and services provided by the local, State and Federal governments. The panel that day particularly focused on how to help local small businesses export their products to foreign markets, as well as on how firms interested in expanding their businesses overseas could obtain trade financing.

I was extremely encouraged by the number of small business owners interested in expanding their business into overseas markets during this summit. However, this should come as no surprise since small businesses make up 97 percent of all exporters and have contributed greatly to the growth of exports overseas.

There is promise in the economic impact of trade among small businesses. For example, with assistance from the Philadelphia Export Assistance Center, Nielsen-Kellerman, a small business in my district that designs and manufactures waterproof electronics for use in the rowing industry, worked with trade specialists to expand globally and since 2001 has signed nine dealer agreements in Germany and has successfully sold products in Southeast Asia, Europe, Central America and the Middle East. The firm continues to utilize the Export Assistance Center for business counseling and guidance to further expand their business overseas.

However, I also saw during my district's economic summit that small exporters also face numerous challenges, such as higher transaction costs, than do big business. They assume greater risk than larger exporters, and they experience burdensome customs requirements which limit their access to foreign markets, impeding small firms from maximizing their full potential to expand their enterprises.

This legislation not only addresses the need for a focus on assisting in overseas trading by calling for an annual trade strategy to increase exports but also, Mr. Speaker, enhancing the level of export assistance by increasing access to capital and establishing programs for trade adjustment assistance to help small firms adjust to ever-changing global economic conditions and demands.

I believe the SBA Trade Act is comprehensive legislation that is critical to the economic security of our Nation and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. CHABOT. I will continue to reserve, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) as much time as she may consume.

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2992, the SBA Trade Programs Act.

I want to thank Congressman HALL for introducing this important bill and for his continued efforts to ensure our trade policies work for American businesses and workers.

I also want to applaud the distinguished chairwoman, Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ, for her leadership on this issue and dedication to helping our small businesses.

This bill could not be more relevant because small businesses in Ohio and across the Nation are struggling to compete because of sometimes misguided U.S. trade policies and unfair and often illegal foreign trade practices.

Small businesses and their workers are the backbone of communities in Ohio and across this Nation. Just listen to the statistics:

Small businesses comprise 97 percent of all export enterprises but only generate 30 percent of domestic export revenues, and that number is shrinking. This is happening because our trade policies often benefit large corporate interests and leave small businesses behind.

The trends also show that it is becoming more and more difficult for American small businesses to compete against the unfair trade practices of foreign nations, often propped up by governmental subsidies, weak intellectual property laws, and currency manipulation.

H.R. 2992 will help small businesses become more competitive in the international trade market. This bill will provide a comprehensive set of resources to help small businesses by increasing export assistance, strengthening small business trade policies, and providing adjustment assistance.

These are very important steps we can take at the Small Business Administration to help our local firms stay competitive; and while this will help small business compete both domestically and globally, there is clearly much more that needs to be done, including an overhaul of U.S. trade policy to ensure that the needs of American businesses and workers and communities are being met.

Unfortunately, our current trade policies put American businesses and workers often at a disadvantage and reward companies who move overseas or outsource jobs, and for communities like mine, Mr. Speaker, in northeast Ohio where the creation and retention of jobs is the number one issue, supporting our local industries and small businesses will be critical to our ability to revitalize our economy and succeed in the future.

Today, we move in the right direction by passing the SBA Trade Programs Act; and, once again, I applaud Congressman HALL and Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ for their leadership on this important issue and for the hard work that they are doing.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers.

Mr. CHABOT. I would urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2992, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I just would like to say that Representative HALL's legislation, the SBA Trade Programs Act of 2007, promotes the competitiveness of small businesses in the global economy, assists them in adjusting to economic dislocations, and makes certain their needs are represented in U.S. trade policies.

Due to the increasing global pressures upon small businesses, this modernization initiative has been widely supported. The legislation has been endorsed by the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, the National Black Chamber of Commerce, the Small Business Exporter Association, the National Small Business Association, and the Precision Metalforming Association.

□ 1445

I would like to conclude by thanking the staff that worked on this legislation, from the Small Business Committee, Nicole Witenstein, Michael Day, and Adam Minehardt; and from Mr. SESTAK's staff, Clarence Tong.

In conclusion, I would like to thank Congressman HALL and the cosponsors for this timely bill. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for the SBA Trade Programs Act of 2007.

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ for doing such a wonderful job ushering this bill through her committee and onto the House floor today. America's small business community could not ask for a better ally and friend

in this body than the chairwoman of the Small Business Committee.

I am pleased today that H.R. 2992, the SBA Trade Programs Act of 2007, is being considered on the House Floor. As in many parts of the country, the small businesses in New York's Hudson Valley are the engine that drives our economy, and their success is vital to the prosperity of our communities. In our increasingly shrinking world, being successful throughout the global economy has taken on a vitally important role. As a result, it is crucial that all businesses, including small businesses, have a level playing field in international trade.

Unfortunately, by their very nature small businesses do not have the same opportunities to take part in international trade that their larger competitors do. They are smaller and less able to take advantage of the economy of scale. Many simply do not have the capital or the logistical capability to devote to the cause. Most of the small businesses in my district are located only a few miles from New York City, the world's greatest international hub, and yet they often do not have the capacity to take advantage of that location. Today, with this bill, we hope to change that.

The SBA Trade Programs Act we have considered directs the Small Business Administration's Office of International Trade to take a number of steps specifically designed to help small businesses have a greater opportunity to take part in international trade. It instructs the OIT to capitalize on its relationship with the US Trade Representative and international organizations to develop and implement trade policies to support small businesses. This will enable small businesses to take advantage of the system we have created for bigger companies and has proven so helpful to American businesses.

It orders the OIT to establish an annual trade strategy for small businesses, which includes specific ideas on ways to increase competitiveness, better protect small businesses from unfair trade practices, increase small business' exports, and expand the representation of small businesses in creating and defining trade policy.

It provides small businesses with technical assistance in trade remedy investigations and dispute cases, two places where small businesses have long been at a disadvantage as they often do not have the financial capacity or manpower to deal with multiple jurisdictional issues.

The bill calls on the OIT to design comprehensive services to assist small businesses adjust to global climate conditions and increase loans and loan guarantees to small business exporters. By increasing loan availability small businesses will have greater access to the capital required for successful international business opportunities. And the assistive services will better enable small businesses to adapt to the differing tastes and desires of foreign markets.

This bill will provide assistance for businesses that require legal resources to help secure intellectual property protection. It will also expand eligibility requirements for international trade loans to include intellectual property violations as well as other trade practices with negative financial repercussions. These provisions are especially relevant because intellectual property remains one of our country's most important exports. Yet the extent and scope of their protection varies significantly from country to country. Any company looking to protect their intellectual property must be aware of the protections offered, and not offered; in each jurisdiction in which they have a presence. This bill will provide the appropriate resources so that America's small businesses can protect, and if need be, defend their intellectual property rights.

Mr. Speaker. This is an important bill. It is a bill that will provide a significant benefit to America's small businesses and open doors to them have been shut for far too long. I urge every member of the House to support it. Once again, I thank Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ and the rest of the small business committee for such great work in bringing this bill to the floor.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2992, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MICROLOAN AMENDMENTS AND MODERNIZATION ACT

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3020) to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Microloan program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3020

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

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

*(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Microloan Amendments and Modernization Act''.*

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

*Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.*

*TITLE I—MICROLOAN*

*Sec. 101. Transmission of credit reporting information.*
*Sec. 102. Flexible credit.*
*Sec. 103. Intermediary eligibility requirements.*
*Sec. 104. Average loan size.*
*Sec. 105. Technical assistance.*
*Sec. 106. Entrepreneurs with disabilities.*

*TITLE II—PRIME*

*Sec. 201. Short title.*
*Sec. 202. PRIME.*
*Sec. 203. Conforming repeal.*

***TITLE I—MICROLOAN***

***SEC. 101. TRANSMISSION OF CREDIT REPORTING INFORMATION.***

*Section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(14) CREDIT REPORTING INFORMATION.—The Administrator shall establish a process, for use by a lender making a loan to a borrower under this subsection, under which the lender provides to the major credit reporting agencies the information about the borrower that is relevant to credit reporting, such as the payment activity of the borrower on the loan.''.*

***SEC. 102. FLEXIBLE CREDIT.***

*Section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)) is amended, in each of paragraphs (1)(B)(i) and (11)(B), by striking ''short-term,''.*

***SEC. 103. INTERMEDIARY ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.***

*Section 7(m)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(2)) is amended—*

*(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''paragraph (10)'' and inserting ''paragraph (11)''; and*

*(2) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:*

*''(B) has—*

*''(i) at least—*

*''(I) 1 year of experience making microloans to startup, newly established, or growing small business concerns; or*

*''(II) 1 full-time employee who has not less than 3 years experience making microloans to startup, newly established, or growing small business concerns; and*

*''(ii) at least 1 year of experience providing, as an integral part of its microloan program, intensive marketing, management, and technical assistance to its borrowers.''.*

***SEC. 104. AVERAGE LOAN SIZE.***

*Section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)) is amended by striking ''$7,500'' and inserting ''$10,000'' in each of the following places: paragraph (3)(F)(iii), paragraph (6)(C)(i), and paragraph (6)(C)(ii).*

***SEC. 105. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.***

*Section 7(m)(4)(E) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(4)(E)) is amended as follows:*

*(1) PRE-LOAN.—Clause (i) is amended by striking ''25 percent'' and inserting ''35 percent''.*

*(2) THIRD PARTY CONTRACTS.—Clause (ii) is amended by striking ''25 percent'' and inserting ''35 percent''.*

***SEC. 106. ENTREPRENEURS WITH DISABILITIES.***

*Section 7(m)(1)(A)(i) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(1)(A)(i)) is amended by inserting ''disabled,'' before ''and minority entrepreneurs''.*

***TITLE II—PRIME***

***SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.***

*This title may be cited as the ''Program for Investment in Microentrepreneurs Act'' or the ''PRIME Act''.*

***SEC. 202. PRIME.***

*The Small Business Act is amended—*

*(1) by redesignating section 37 as 99; and*

*(2) by inserting after section 36 the following:*

***''SEC. 37. PRIME PROGRAM.***

*''(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:*

*''(1) CAPACITY BUILDING SERVICES.—The term 'capacity building services' means services provided to an organization that is, or that is in the process of becoming, a microenterprise development organization or program, for the purpose of enhancing its ability to provide training and services to disadvantaged entrepreneurs.*

*''(2) DISADVANTAGED ENTREPRENEUR.—The term 'disadvantaged entrepreneur' means a microentrepreneur that is—*

*''(A) a very low-income person;*

*''(B) a low-income person; or*

*''(C) an entrepreneur that lacks adequate access to capital or other resources essential for business success, or is economically disadvantaged, as determined by the Administrator.*

*''(3) COLLABORATIVE.—The term 'collaborative' means 2 or more nonprofit entities that agree to act jointly as a qualified organization under this section.*

*''(4) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian tribe' means any Indian tribe, band, pueblo, nation, or other organized group or community, including any Alaska Native village or regional or village corporation, as defined in or established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, which is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the*

*United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.*

*''(5) INTERMEDIARY.—The term 'intermediary' means a private, nonprofit entity that seeks to serve microenterprise development organizations and programs as authorized under subsection (d).*

*''(6) LOW-INCOME PERSON.—The term 'low-income person' means a person having an income, adjusted for family size, of not more than—*

*''(A) for metropolitan areas, 80 percent of the area median income; and*

*''(B) for nonmetropolitan areas, the greater of—*

*''(i) 80 percent of the area median income; or*

*''(ii) 80 percent of the statewide nonmetropolitan area median income.*

*''(7) MICROENTREPRENEUR.—The term 'microentrepreneur' means the owner or developer of a microenterprise.*

*''(8) MICROENTERPRISE.—The term 'microenterprise' means a sole proprietorship, partnership, or corporation that—*

*''(A) has fewer than 5 employees; and*

*''(B) generally lacks access to conventional loans, equity, or other banking services.*

*''(9) MICROENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION OR PROGRAM.—The term 'microenterprise development organization or program' means a nonprofit entity, or a program administered by such an entity, including community development corporations or other nonprofit development organizations and social service organizations, that provides services to disadvantaged entrepreneurs.*

*''(10) POVERTY LINE.—The term 'poverty line' means the official poverty line defined by the Office of Management and Budget based on the most recent data available from the Bureau of the Census. The Administrator shall revise annually (or at any shorter interval the Administrator determines to be feasible and desirable) the poverty line. The required revision shall be accomplished by multiplying the official poverty line by the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers during the annual or other interval immediately preceding the time at which the revision is made.*

*''(11) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The term 'training and technical assistance' means services and support provided to disadvantaged entrepreneurs, such as assistance for the purpose of enhancing business planning, marketing, management, financial management skills, and assistance for the purpose of accessing financial services.*

*''(12) VERY LOW-INCOME PERSON.—The term 'very low-income person' means having an income, adjusted for family size, of not more than 150 percent of the poverty line.*

*''(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Administrator shall establish a microenterprise technical assistance and capacity building grant program to provide assistance from the Administration in the form of grants to qualified organizations in accordance with this section.*

*''(c) USES OF ASSISTANCE.—A qualified organization shall use grants made under this section—*

*''(1) to provide training and technical assistance to disadvantaged entrepreneurs;*

*''(2) to provide training and capacity building services to microenterprise development organizations and programs and groups of such organizations to assist such organizations and programs in developing microenterprise training and services;*

*''(3) to aid in researching and developing the best practices in the field of microenterprise and technical assistance programs for disadvantaged entrepreneurs; and*

*''(4) for such other activities as the Administrator determines are consistent with the purposes of this section.*

*''(d) QUALIFIED ORGANIZATIONS.—For purposes of eligibility for assistance under this section, a qualified organization shall be—*

*''(1) a nonprofit microenterprise development organization or program (or a group or collaborative thereof) that has a demonstrated record of delivering microenterprise services to disadvantaged entrepreneurs;*

*''(2) an intermediary;*

*''(3) a microenterprise development organization or program that is accountable to a local community, working in conjunction with a State or local government or Indian tribe; or*

*''(4) an Indian tribe acting on its own, if the Indian tribe can certify that no private organization or program referred to in this paragraph exists within its jurisdiction.*

*''(e) ALLOCATION OF ASSISTANCE; SUBGRANTS.—*

*''(1) ALLOCATION OF ASSISTANCE.—*

*''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall allocate assistance from the Administration under this section to ensure that—*

*''(i) activities described in subsection (c)(1) are funded using not less than 75 percent of amounts made available for such assistance; and*

*''(ii) activities described in subsection (c)(2) are funded using not less than 15 percent of amounts made available for such assistance.*

*''(B) LIMIT ON INDIVIDUAL ASSISTANCE.—No single person may receive more than 10 percent of the total funds appropriated under this section in a single fiscal year.*

*''(2) TARGETED ASSISTANCE.—The Administrator shall ensure that not less than 50 percent of the grants made under this section are used to benefit very low-income persons, including those residing on Indian reservations.*

*''(3) SUBGRANTS AUTHORIZED.—*

*''(A) IN GENERAL.—A qualified organization receiving assistance under this section may provide grants using that assistance to qualified small and emerging microenterprise organizations and programs, subject to such rules and regulations as the Administrator determines to be appropriate.*

*''(B) LIMIT ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than 7.5 percent of assistance received by a qualified organization under this section may be used for administrative expenses in connection with the making of subgrants under subparagraph (A).*

*''(4) DIVERSITY.—In making grants under this section, the Administrator shall ensure that grant recipients include both large and small microenterprise organizations, serving urban, rural, and Indian tribal communities serving diverse populations.*

*''(5) PROHIBITION ON PREFERENTIAL CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN SBA PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.—In making grants under this section, the Administrator shall ensure that any application made by a qualified organization that is a participant in the program established under section 7(m) does not receive preferential consideration over applications from other qualified organizations that are not participants in such program.*

*''(f) MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—Financial assistance under this section shall be matched with funds from sources other than the Federal Government on the basis of not less than 50 percent of each dollar provided by the Administration.*

*''(2) SOURCES OF MATCHING FUNDS.—Fees, grants, gifts, funds from loan sources, and in-kind resources of a grant recipient from public or private sources may be used to comply with the matching requirement in paragraph (1).*

*''(3) EXCEPTION.—*

*''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an applicant for assistance under this section with severe constraints on available sources of matching funds, the Administrator may reduce or eliminate the matching requirement in paragraph (1).*

*''(B) LIMITATION.—Not more than 10 percent of the total funds made available from the Administration in any fiscal year to carry out this section may be excepted from the matching requirement in paragraph (1), as authorized by subparagraph (A).*

*''(g) APPLICATIONS FOR ASSISTANCE.—An application for assistance under this section shall be submitted in such form and in accordance with such procedures as the Administrator shall establish.*

*''(h) RECORDKEEPING.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—A qualified organization receiving assistance from the Administration under this section shall keep such records, for such periods as may be prescribed by the Administrator and necessary to disclose the manner in which any assistance under this section is used and to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of this section.*

*''(2) USER PROFILE INFORMATION.—The Administrator shall require each qualified organization receiving assistance from the Administration under this section to compile such data, as is determined to be appropriate by the Administrator, on the gender, race, ethnicity, national origin, or other pertinent information concerning individuals that utilize the services of the assisted organization to ensure that targeted populations and low-income residents of investment areas are adequately served.*

*''(3) ACCESS TO RECORDS.—The Administrator shall have access on demand, for the purpose of determining compliance with this section, to any records of a qualified organization that receives assistance from the Administration under this section.*

*''(4) REVIEW.—Not less than annually, the Administrator shall review the progress of each assisted organization in carrying out its strategic plan, meeting its performance goals, and satisfying the terms and conditions of its assistance agreement.*

*''(5) REPORTING.—*

*''(A) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Administrator shall require each qualified organization receiving assistance from the Administration under this section to submit an annual report to the Administrator on its activities, its financial condition, and its success in meeting performance goals, in satisfying the terms and conditions of its assistance agreement, and in complying with other requirements of this section, in such form and manner as the Administrator shall specify.*

*''(B) AVAILABILITY OF REPORTS.—The Administrator, after deleting or redacting any material as appropriate to protect privacy or proprietary interests, shall make such reports submitted under subparagraph (A) available for public inspection.*

*''(i) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Administrator shall, by regulation, establish such requirements as may be necessary to carry out this section.''.*

***SEC. 203. CONFORMING REPEAL.***

*Subtitle C (15 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) of title I of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 is repealed.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Small businesses create three out of four new jobs and account for almost half of our country's income. But that is only part of the story. The opportunities through business ownership are

limited only by our own imagination and ability. Each year, 700,000 men, women and children follow the dream of entrepreneurship.

The vast majority of our businesses are very small. Over 50 percent of all businesses are home based. Most get started without a single employee. But with hard work, that changes. Ultimately, half the people who work in this country now work for small businesses.

Small businesses are flexible and more likely to adapt to changes in the economy. They have to be nimble to survive. So if there is one thing we have learned, it is that helping these small businesses start up and grow provides a significant benefit for our local and national economy.

One of the best methods devised to encourage start-up small businesses is the small microcredit loan. The SBA Microloan Program makes funds available to nonprofit community-based lenders. In turn, these lenders make small loans to eligible borrowers who are often individual fledgling entrepreneurs that live in the same community where they work.

The Microloan Amendments and Modernization Act introduced by my colleague, the ranking member on our committee, Mr. CHABOT, improves an already strong program. It will increase the number of lenders and borrowers that will be able to get involved in creating new businesses and help put people in their communities to work. It also encourages credit reporting so that the excellent repayment history of its participants is recorded to their benefit.

Finally, the bill takes steps to strengthen the PRIME program, a key initiative that provides counseling to low-income entrepreneurs.

Since its inception in 1992, the Microloan Program has been reaching many that otherwise would not be served by the private sector or even the SBA's traditional loan programs. The type of people that use the Microloan Program are borrowers that may be unable to get a loan from traditional sources due to no credit rating or a lack of business experience.

By filling this void, microloans have become an important source of assistance for groups who traditionally have had more difficulty accessing capital. These loans fulfill the goal of widely distributing resources, as roughly one third are made in rural areas. It is for these reasons that the program complements the successes of President Clinton's New Market Initiative. Microloans are a low-cost effective way to move people off welfare and turn them into business owners and even employers. There have been only two defaults to the government since the program's inception, and tens of thousands of jobs retained and created. This is a great bargain for the taxpayers.

With that, I urge the House to vote for the Microloan Program and this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3020, the Microloan Amendments and Modernization Act.

The chairwoman and I have worked together on a cooperative basis to bring this technical but important piece of legislation to the floor. H.R. 3020 represents the first substantive change in the Microloan Program in more than 6 years.

According to Dr. Mohammad Yunus, the 2006 Nobel Laureate in Peace and founder of the Grameen Bank, ''microcredit views each person as a potential entrepreneur and turn on the tiny economic engines of a rejected portion of society.''

Unlike Bangladesh or other countries that have emulated the Grameen Bank, microcredit in the United States is not aimed at a rejected portion of society, but rather at those individuals who do not have access to commercial financial institutions and the typical resources to manage those funds. Despite the different target audiences, microlending in the United States represents a variation of the concept developed by Dr. Yunus.

The Small Business Administration created a pilot program based on the success of the Grameen Bank, and Congress created a permanent authority for the program back in 1992. SBA does not provide microcredit directly to entrepreneurs; instead, the SBA provides below market-rate loans to nonprofit intermediaries. These institutions then make loans to entrepreneurs.

As with other SBA financing programs, the SBA does not provide all the funds for financing. Intermediaries must contribute 15 percent of the value of loans in non-Federal funds. But the key to the success of microlending is not the loans; rather, it is the education and counseling that the intermediaries provide to their borrowers.

With this knowledge, these entrepreneurs are able to manage their financial resources and ensure repayment of loans. This success is demonstrated by the very low number of defaults by borrowers and cost-effective means by which it produces nearly 10,000 jobs a year in areas, including parts of my district in Cincinnati, that need economic revitalization.

Despite its success, the Microloan Program needs to be revised in light of changes to the economy during the past 6 years and, in some cases, to update matters that have not been altered since the program's inception more than 15 years ago.

Microlenders exist, mainly because normal commercial lending institutions did not provide access to credit for those who are highly credit risky. One way to improve that is to have borrowers' histories passed along to credit bureaus. I think having the SBA work with the intermediaries to accomplish the delivery of credit histories will benefit borrowers.

H.R. 3020 also enables the intermediaries to determine the length of credit that will be made available to the borrowers. Given the expertise of the intermediaries, it makes abundant sense for the determinations on the length of loans to rest with the intermediaries and borrowers.

I want to emphasize that this change has no impact on the loan obligations of the intermediaries to the SBA. The change involves no risk to the Federal Treasury.

H.R. 3020 also raises the level of the average loan size in an intermediary's portfolio from $7,500 to $10,000. This level has not been changed since 1992, and an adjustment is appropriate to take account of inflation in the intervening 15 years.

The SBA rightly focuses on the number of small businesses that receive help from its entrepreneurial training partners. However, ensuring that only those individuals with the right aptitude start small businesses is as important as the provision of the technical assistance to businesses that have been in existence for years.

The Microloan Amendments and Modernization Act recognizes the importance of this training and increases the amount of pre-loan training that intermediaries may provide. H.R. 3020 also provides for an increase in the amount of technical assistance training that intermediaries can contract for from other sources.

As the committee heard in testimony from Professor Lisa Servon, this will enable intermediaries to focus on those services that they are best able to perform. Finally, the committee heard from two different witnesses that the cap on interest rates should be removed.

We also heard that a rise in interest rates will enable intermediaries to recoup more of their costs, thereby reducing the amount of funds that they must raise from other sources. I would ask that the chairwoman work with us as the bill moves through legislative process to ensure that intermediaries have maximum flexibility to operate their loan programs with the elimination of the interest rate cap.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for introducing this important piece of legislation, and I also want to thank the staff that worked on this legislation, from the minority staff, Barbara Pineles; from the majority staff, Ross Orban, Michael Day, Adam Minehardt and Andy Jimenez.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Microloan Program.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the

rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3020, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TO REMOVE BARRIERS TO UNITED STATES FINANCIAL SERVICES FIRMS DOING BUSINESS IN CHINA

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 552) calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to remove barriers to United States financial services firms doing business in China.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 552

Whereas well-functioning financial markets in China capable of accurately pricing risk, valuing assets, allocating capital to its most efficient use, providing financial products that allow savers to obtain a market rate of return, and capable of intermediating efficiently between savers and borrowers are essential if China is to move successfully to a market-based economy;

Whereas the lack of diversification and innovation among Chinese financial firms, particularly state-owned banks, limits the financial assets in which the Chinese people can invest and limits their access to savings and investment vehicles that would allow them to save safely and adequately for retirement and insure themselves against risks to health and incomes;

Whereas the current lack of well-functioning financial markets in China has the effect of misallocating capital and distorting investment in ways that subsidize capital intensive industries in China's manufacturing sector and distort trade with the United States and other trading partners as a consequence;

Whereas an increased presence of United States and other foreign financial services firms in China would provide substantial benefit to China by aiding in the reform and development of the banking, insurance, asset management, and securities industries and providing new products to Chinese consumers that would contribute substantially to their financial security;

Whereas the United States trade deficit with China in 2006 was $233,000,000,000, and this trade deficit has nearly tripled in size since China joined the World Trade Organization in 2001;

Whereas the United States financial services sector is a leading source of United States exports globally and has the potential to be a major exporter to China;

Whereas the United States maintains open and nondiscriminatory standards for trade in financial services, while China continues to protect large segments of its financial services markets from foreign trade;

Whereas China's World Trade Organization commitments fail to achieve an open and nondiscriminatory environment for foreign financial services firms seeking to trade with China;

Whereas China is one of the few remaining major emerging market countries that maintains limitations on foreign ownership of financial services firms;

Whereas foreign ownership restrictions severely limit United States firms' ability to operate in China across the financial services sector, such that United States and other foreign firms are not permitted to own more than a 49 percent stake in a Chinese asset management firm, a 20 percent stake in a Chinese bank, a 33 percent stake in a Chinese securities firm, a 24.9 percent stake in a Chinese insurance company, and a 50 percent stake in a life insurance joint venture;

Whereas foreign entities are not permitted to invest in Chinese A-share securities markets except through an onerous licensing and quota system for ''qualified foreign institutional investors,'' and Chinese institutional investors are also restricted in investing in foreign securities markets except through a licensing and quota system for ''qualified domestic institutional investors'';

Whereas the government of China has failed to meet its World Trade Organization commitment on licensing of foreign broker-dealers and maintains discriminatory restrictions on the scope of business of foreign securities firms;

Whereas the government of China maintains discriminatory standards for foreign banks in terms of capital requirements, restrictions on corporate operational form, and restrictions on bank branches, and has been slow to act on foreign banks' applications;

Whereas the government of China has approved no new enterprise annuities licenses for United States or other foreign firms since 2005 and maintains a cumbersome multi-agency process for approval of licenses;

Whereas the government of China maintains discriminatory practices for branch applications from foreign-invested life insurers, granting branch approvals slowly and consecutively, while domestic insurers receive concurrent approvals to open multiple branches;

Whereas major Chinese financial institutions have sought licenses to operate in the United States on the grounds that Chinese financial regulators satisfy consolidated supervision standards, at the same time the Chinese government restricts access to United States and other foreign firms on grounds that suggest that Chinese regulators may not satisfy these standards; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury has initiated the Strategic Economic Dialogue as a forum in which to engage Chinese officials on economic reform issues, including financial market issues: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the Government of the People's Republic of China should immediately implement all of its World Trade Organization commitments to date in financial services;

(2) the Government of the People's Republic of China should immediately implement all of its commitments to date made under the auspices of the Strategic Economic Dialogue initiated by the Secretary of the Treasury;

(3) the goals of the United States for the next meeting of the Strategic Economic Dialogue should be to achieve Chinese commitments toward—

(A) removal of all foreign investment ownership caps on banking, life insurance, asset management, and securities;

(B) nondiscriminatory treatment of United States financial services firms (including banking, insurer, insurance intermediary, asset management, and securities firms) with regard to licensing, corporate form, and permitted products and services; and

(C) nondiscriminatory treatment of United States financial services firms with regard to regulation and supervision; and

(4) United States financial service regulators, in assessing whether applications from Chinese financial institutions meet comprehensive consolidated supervision standards, should consider whether the applications are for operations and activities in the United States that are currently prohibited for United States financial institutions in China, and the extent to which such prohibitions reflect problems with the quality of home country supervision.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would ask to insert into the RECORD three letters that we have received in support of this legislation.

One letter comes from Engage China dated September 4, 2007. Engage China is a consortium which includes these organizations: The American Banker's Association, the American Council of Life Insurers, American Insurance Association, The Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers, Bankers Association for Finance and Trade, Financial Services Forum, Financial Services Roundtable, Investment Company Institutes, Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association.

The second letter, also dated September 4, comes from The Financial Services Forum; and the third letter, dated August 31, comes from The Investment Company Institute.

SEPTEMBER 4, 2007.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
*Rayburn House Office Building,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
*Rayburn House Office Building,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. JIM MARSHALL,
*Cannon House Office Building,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. PETER ROSKAM,
*Cannon House Office Building,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK, RANKING MEMBER BACHUS, CONGRESSMAN MARSHALL, AND CONGRESSMAN ROSKAM: As Chairman of the Engage China coalition, I write to applaud the focus on the critical importance of expanded access to China's financial sector in H. Res. 552. As members of the House Financial Services Committee, your leadership on this crucial issue is greatly appreciated.

Engage China is a coalition of eight financial services trade associations united in our

view that active engagement with China remains the most constructive means of ensuring that our two nations mutually benefit from our growing economic relationship, and that common challenges are effectively addressed.

The coalition is strongly of the view that a more open, competitive, and effective financial sector in China is a prerequisite to successfully addressing issues that have complicated the U.S.-China economic relationship—particularly currency reform and the trade imbalance. For example, access to sophisticated derivative products and hedging techniques will help Chinese banks, securities firms, and other businesses avoid the risks of a more volatile, market-determined currency. Similarly, financial products and services such as mortgages, credit cards, personal loans, pensions, and retirement savings and insurance products—to which most Chinese currently do not have access—would dramatically reduce the need for excessive savings and facilitate greater consumption.

The fastest way for China to develop the modern financial system it needs is to import it—that is, by opening its financial sector to greater participation by foreign financial services firms. By providing the products and services that China's citizens and businesses need to save, invest, insure against risk, raise standards of living, and consume at higher levels, foreign financial institutions (including U.S. providers) would help create what every U.S. manufacturer and services provider wants—a China that is less dependent on exports, more consumption-driven and, therefore, an enormously important and expanding market for American products and services.

Thank you for your work on this important issue. We very much appreciate your interest in opening China's financial sector to greater participation by U.S. financial services firms. We look forward to working with the Committee and the rest of the Congress to ensure expanded financial market access in China and other emerging markets.

Sincerely,

ROB NICHOLS,
*President and COO, Financial Services Forum, Chairman, Engage China Coalition.*

---

SEPTEMBER 4, 2007.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
*Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.*
Hon. JIM MARSHALL,
*Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.*
Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
*Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.*
Hon. PETER ROSKAM,
*Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK, RANKING MEMBER BACHUS, CONGRESSMAN MARSHALL, AND CONGRESSMAN ROSKAM: We are writing to applaud the focus you have given to market access in House Resolution 552. We commend your bipartisan effort to introduce a resolution that recognizes the importance of further access for U.S. financial services firms to China's markets.

The Forum is encouraged by your interest in the U.S.-China Strategic Economic Dialogue and additional efforts to remove market access barriers for U.S. financial services firms.

A more open, modern, and effective financial sector in China is a prerequisite to successfully addressing issues that have complicated the U.S.-China economic relationship such as currency reform and the trade imbalance.

The fastest way for China to develop the modern financial system it needs to achieve more sustainable economic growth, allow for a more flexible currency, and increase consumer consumption—thereby opening new markets for U.S. products and services—is to import it by opening its financial sector to greater participation by foreign financial services firms.

We look forward to working with all of Congress in continuing to draw focus and attention to this key issue for economic reform and financial modernization in China and other emerging markets. We thank you again for your important focus on opening markets in China to foreign financial services participation.

Sincerely,

ROB NICHOLS,
*President and COO, The Financial Services Forum.*

---

INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE,
*Washington, DC, August 31, 2007.*

Re H. Res. 552, ''Calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to remove barriers to United States financial services firms doing business in China''.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
*Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*
Hon. JIM MARSHALL,
*Member, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*
Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
*Ranking Member, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*
Hon. PETER ROSKAM,
*Member, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK, RANKING MEMBER BACHUS, CONGRESSMAN MARSHALL AND CONGRESSMAN ROSKAM: I am writing to express the support of the Investment Company Institute (ICI) for House Resolution 552 (H. Res. 552), ''Calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to remove barriers to United States financial services firms doing business in China.'' The Institute supports your efforts to recognize the importance of access for U.S. financial services firms, including the U.S. mutual fund industry, to the Chinese market.

Reform of China's financial markets is important to our members for investment purposes as well as for the provision of asset management services. Specifically, we appreciate the inclusion of provisions in H. Res. 552 addressing measures that unnecessarily limit the manner in which U.S. asset managers can conduct their business in China. These provisions include language calling on the Chinese government to remove all foreign ownership caps on asset management firms and highlighting the limitations on foreign investment in Chinese A-share securities and on Chinese investments in foreign securities markets. We also appreciate inclusion of language in the Resolution calling on the Chinese government to fulfill its WTO and Strategic Economic Dialogue commitments relating to financial services.

The continued reform and opening of China's financial services sector is in the economic and political interest of both China and the United States. Fair and competitive access to China's markets, including financial services, has implications for U.S. economic growth and job creation. For China, a vibrant and competitive financial system is essential to a strong and productive economy and will be essential in helping China address its retirement challenges. We believe the U.S. mutual fund industry is uniquely positioned to assist in the development of a strong financial services market in China.

Thank you for considering the views of ICI on H. Res. 552. Please feel free to contact me directly or Don Auerbach of the ICI staff if you have any questions with regard to this or any other matter.

With very best regards.

Sincerely,

PAUL STEVENS,
*President.*

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

This resolution, in essence, simply asks China to comply with agreements that it has already entered into. These agreements, its compliance with these agreements, would greatly benefit our financial services industry and we think, frankly, also benefit China.

That's for China to decide, where this resolution contemplates that China will immediately implement all of its world trade organization commitments, that it will implement all of its commitments made to date under the auspices of the strategic economic dialogue.

For the next strategic economic dialogue, our goals as a country should be the removal of all foreign investment ownership caps on banking, life insurance, asset management and securities, and the guarantee of nondiscriminatory treatment for the United States' financial services firms with regard to licensing, corporate forum, permitted products and services, as well as with regard to regulation and supervision.

Finally, this resolution contemplates that United States financial service regulators, in assessing whether or not applications from Chinese financial services institutions meets our requirements, do take into account whether or not the Chinese are living up to its end of our bargains.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, why do this?

Besides the natural inclination of Americans to insist that those that we do business with live up to their end of the deals, all Americans know that we have a very substantial trade deficit with China, and that China has eaten into our manufacturing sector in a very significant way.

At the same time that China is eating into our manufacturing strength, it is denying us access to its financial services market. If we have access to its financial services market, essentially that levels the playing field; and it will also reduce our trade deficit, because it is our belief that American financial services firms will be very successful in the Chinese business environment.

Part of the problem with our trade deficit is that the yuan is intentionally valued in a way to permit the Chinese Government, or the Chinese industries, to compete more effectively price-wise with our manufacturing sector. When challenged about this practice, the Chinese Government routinely explains that its banking industry lacks the expertise to appropriately hedge investments using derivatives swaps, other

structured instruments. And as a result, they have to be extraordinarily careful where they set the yuan.

Our financial services sector, if permitted to assist the Chinese Government and the Chinese economy, will eliminate that excuse.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, it's clear that giving access for our financial services sector into the Chinese market will be beneficial to Chinese consumers. They'll have more access to pensions, health insurance, retirement funds, those sorts of things. But it will also have the effect of freeing up capital.

At the moment, the Chinese Government is interested in migrating from manufacturing as its principal source of strength for its economy toward services. Given the nature of how that economy is set up, in order to do that, a very liquid, dynamic, adaptable capital investment system needs to be established which will enable individual Chinese and small groups of Chinese to form microbusinesses in the services sector.

If we are successful in assisting the Chinese in providing this capital, to enable it to move more toward services, that has the advantage to our manufacturing industries that's fairly obvious and to the world generally.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise today in strong support of House Resolution 552, a measure calling on the government of the People's Republic of China to remove barriers to the United States financial service firms doing business in China. And I'm pleased to partner with Chairman FRANK, Ranking Member BACHUS, and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL) on what I think is a really important initiative.

Some of my prepared remarks, Mr. Speaker, would be cumulative in light of the gentleman's remarks, but let me just kind of fill in some other aspects and highlight a couple of the points that he made.

First of all, these are all commitments that the Chinese Government has made. This is not negotiating a new set of agreements. This is not contemplating something that hasn't literally been agreed to before. All we're doing in this resolution is putting the Chinese Government on notice, A, that we're watching; and, B, that we have expectation that they're going to do exactly what they committed themselves to do.

Secondly, you know, if you look at what the gentleman from Georgia described, that is, the Chinese economy, there are some that suggest that of 1.3 billion individuals, Mr. Speaker, only 1 million Chinese individuals currently have use of credit cards in China, compared to 480 million people who have access to cell phones.

Now, if you begin to think about where this can go, right now the Chinese economy is somewhat held back in a way, because the Chinese consumers and the Chinese financial markets don't have these kinds of tools, and they have a savings rate that almost takes our breath away. About a third of the savings, you know, they're saving at about 33 percent, which, what does that mean? That means that those dollars or that currency is not available to purchase things, particularly from the United States, which, as the gentleman pointed out, creates a very difficult situation in terms of our trade deficit.

I view the Chinese economy almost like a potted plant, Mr. Speaker; a plant that, at first glance, may look to be flourishing, but over a period of time, as that plant matures, and as it develops, it reaches a point at which the roots need to go deeper. And I think that this is the point in the Chinese economic growth where China's roots need to go deeper. They need to go deeper into the ground. And our financial services sector, Mr. Speaker, is robust and dynamic, and offers something that I think is a great opportunity.

But the unnatural truncating, the unnatural prohibition of the Chinese Government of prohibiting American firms to come in, I think, ultimately has a negative impact on our economy, has a negative impact on our growth, and certainly has a negative impact on the 700 million people who are in China and who are still living in poverty.

And I just want to highlight an aspect of this that has an impact on my district, because I represent a district outside of Chicago that employs about 68,000 individuals, about 1,100 manufacturing firms, who are really suffering and struggling based on the currency manipulation issue that the gentleman outlined. This is a way out. This is a way to move forward. And I think it is incumbent upon us, and I very much appreciate the gentleman's work on this in a bipartisan way. It is incumbent upon us to move forward and to urge and cajole and push and give a sharp word to the Chinese Government that they need to make these reforms and do these things to which they've previously committed.

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, to the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), I would simply add that the Chinese economy at the moment is not very diverse. It's actually fairly fragile. It's quite large, but it's way too dependent upon manufacturing and the consumption of others, not its own consumers, but consumers throughout the world. If there's a downturn elsewhere in the world, it dramatically impacts the Chinese economy. And it is not in the interest of the globe, frankly, to have an economy that's as large as China's and as fragile as China's. So from our own economic perspective, it's good to cause the Chinese market to diversify.

In addition, as it stands now in China, there is a very thin middle class. The availability of American financial products can help expand the size of that middle class. And it is middle classes that head governments in good directions, that insist that governments be responsible and responsive to the people, that head governments more toward being democratic governments. So there's another reason that this is a very wise move, not only for the United States, but also for the Chinese Government.

I yield such time as he might consume to the chairman of the committee, who does a great job as our chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the very important work the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL) is doing on this, and the bipartisan cooperation we have.

It is really disappointing that we have to bring this resolution forward. It does not speak well of the government of the People's Republic of China that this is necessary, because they are trying to have it both ways in an inappropriate manner.

On the one hand, China insists on being treated with the respect due a great world power. And they are proud of their economic strength, and they say to America, in fact, they try to have it both ways in two ways. Maybe they're trying to have it four ways, because what they tell us is, open up, economic competition is the way. If we are selling more goods in your country than you are selling in ours, that's because we're doing a better job of it. And so they want respect as a world power, and they want an openness in the economy, but only in one way, because when it comes to areas of economic activity where they don't have that overwhelming advantage, where, frankly, cheap labor doesn't buy you a lot, where our technology and our level of sophistication works to our advantage, all the arguments they've used go out the window. Now they're no longer this great world power. They're a poor country that has to shelter its banking activity from the United States and others. They don't single us out. They shut out much of the world.

The argument that you should open up your economy and let economic forces play out, without imposing political barriers, that apparently works with manufacturing of their goods, but that's exactly the argument they repudiate when we talk about our financial institutions.

I would add that there is, of course, another example of this with regard to the intellectual property failings in China, but we're here to focus on the financial services. And so what we are saying to the Government of China is, essentially, I guess I would say this, they may be credited with one of the great engineering feats in history, even more impressive than the Great Wall of China, is turning the Pacific Ocean

into a one-way street, because when it comes to allowing the forces of economic competition to determine outcomes, where they would have an advantage, they're all for it. But where we say, look, we have these very important financial institutions, as my two colleagues have mentioned, institutions which will benefit the Chinese, which will help with the savings rate.

The gentleman from Georgia has made it clear. This isn't an assault on China by the outsiders. This is something that would be of interest to the Chinese because the Chinese use the same argument to us. They say, look what we're doing for you. We're giving you these cheaper products. Don't turn them down.

Well, I don't understand why that doesn't translate into their doing the same thing.

And so you cannot, I think, in this world consistently, at the same time, be a complete free trader where you have an advantage, but a mercantilist and protectionist and restrictionist society where you think somebody else might have the advantage.

But this resolution is aimed only partly at China. It is also a directive from this House. And I hope, with a very large vote, and I hope our colleagues in the Senate will do it, to the United States regulators, to the Securities Exchange Commission, to the bank regulators, to the Federal Reserve, the Secretary of the Treasury: do unto others as they do unto us in the financial area. Do not allow the Chinese financial institutions a freedom to operate in the United States that they would deny to us. And I want to stress that.

There have been criticisms that have come from China and from some in the United States who say, yes, China sells a lot, but don't be restrictive. The answer is openness.

Well, this is the test. Is openness a two-way ocean?

And if the Chinese continue to resist living by the doctrine they preach to us, then the United States regulators, those in the United States who decide whether Chinese institutions can have access here, really, in their own interest, should take account of that because if you continue to have a situation in which Chinese financial institutions are allowed activity in the U.S. that the Chinese Government denies to American institutions in China, I believe this body will go beyond a resolution. And I can tell you that the committee that I chair will begin to consider, then, legislative changes. And we're often told that you can't legislate that because of the WTO. But here we're asking them to live up to their WTO responsibilities. And if this continues, I will consult with our colleagues in the Ways and Means Committee, and I think we will try to put some binding legislation here. I hope it doesn't come to that.

And I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL) for taking the initiative here and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) and others. This is, I hope, unanimous, but certainly overwhelming, it was unanimous in the Committee on Financial Services' request.

And the gentleman from Georgia read a very impressive list. Every important entity of financial institutions in the United States was on the letters that the gentleman from Georgia read.

So we hope that the Chinese Government will listen. And if they don't, we hope the United States regulators will listen, because we are only asking here that the Chinese live by the doctrines that they profess to believe in. And we believe that this is something that is in the mutual interest of both countries.

I submit the following exchange of correspondence regarding H. Res. 552.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
*Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the bill, H. Res. 552, calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to remove barriers to United States financial services firms doing business in China. I understand there are certain provisions of this legislation as it will be presented to the full House that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In the interest of permitting your Committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important legislation, I am willing to waive this Committee's right to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the legislation which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction.

I would ask that you place this letter into the Congressional Record when the House has H. Res. 552 under consideration.

Sincerely,

TOM LANTOS,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, September 4, 2007.*

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter concerning House Resolution 552, calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to remove barriers to United States financial services firms doing business in China. This resolution was introduced on July 17, 2007, and was referred to the Committee on Financial Services. It is my expectation that this legislation will be scheduled for floor consideration shortly.

I recognize that certain provisions in the resolution fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives. However, I appreciate your willingness to forego action on House Resolution 552 in order to allow the resolution to come to the floor expeditiously. I agree that your decision will not prejudice the Committee on Foreign Affairs with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I will include this exchange of correspondence in the Congressional Record when this resolution is considered by the House. Thank you again for your cooperation in this important matter.

BARNEY FRANK,
*Chairman.*

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I don't have any additional speakers. Let me just yield myself another minute or two just to say this in closing.

We have before us, really, two competing economic systems that are playing out essentially. We have our system, which has a very high view of the individual, free people making free decisions within a free market. That is the great strength of the American system. We show great deference and great respect to the free market on balance.

China, however, is in some sort of transition right now, where they've not had that high view of the individual. They've not had that high view of the free market, and they're beginning this process of more or less dabbling in it. This is the call for them to stop the dabbling, as it relates to the financial services sector, and to fully embrace those things, those concepts that they propound around the world.

□ 1515

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to Chairman FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I misspoke. I said that this has passed our committee unanimously. I was reminded by our very able staff that the committee sentiment was so overwhelming that we unanimously decided we didn't even have to take it up in committee. So this did not pass the committee unanimously; this bypassed the committee unanimously.

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

I want to just take this opportunity to make an observation. This is absolutely the right thing to do. A deal is a deal. It is not a one-way street. We give accommodations; they agree to accommodations in exchange. They have got to live up to the accommodations that they have, in fact, agreed upon. If they don't, we need to take some action.

But I do want to not associate myself enthusiastically with one aspect of the arguments in favor of this, and that is that somehow we have got to turn the Chinese into better consumers. No question improving consumption can lead to some of the benefits that we have already discussed. But also adding another billion heavy consumers here and another billion heavy consumers there may not necessarily be in our best interest from a global perspective, and somehow we have got to find a balance here.

It is clear there is a large swath of the Chinese populace that could use some of the financial tools that we could make readily available to them and, as a result, wind up moving into the middle class. It is certainly something we should support and encourage.

But, frankly, that the Chinese save a lot is not necessarily a terribly bad thing. I think we all agree that Americans don't save enough and too many Americans get into trouble as a result of the fact that they don't save enough. Credit is not so wonderful for all, and somehow there needs to be a balance that is reached in our effort to improve the globe.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 552, "Calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to remove barriers to United States financial services firms doing business in China."

Attempting to force the hand of the Chinese government by requiring them to open their markets to United States financial services firms is akin to playing with fire. Politicians today fail to realize just how deeply our profligate fiscal and monetary policies of the past three decades have left us in debt to China. The Chinese government holds over one trillion dollars in reserves, leaving the future of the dollar highly vulnerable to the continued Chinese demand.

While I am in favor of unencumbered free trade, free trade cannot be enforced through threats or by resorting to international protectionist organizations such as the WTO. Even if the Chinese are recalcitrant in opening up their markets, it is not the role of the United States government to lecture the Chinese government on what it should or should not do in its own economy.

H. Res. 552 is a blatant encroachment on the sovereignty of the Chinese government. Were the Chinese government to pressure us into allowing greater access to the United States market for Chinese financial services firms, or to pressure us into allowing the sale of firms in strategic sectors of the market, we would justifiably resist this pressure.

Diplomatic efforts cannot work through blustering language and vague retaliatory threats. It requires an awareness both of the many benefits of trade with China and the fact that our current trade imbalances are largely the responsibility of our trade policies. We must understand that China is not a 98-pound weakling who can be bossed around. If we treat other countries with respect and as equal partners, we might be pleased to find that our requests receive a more attentive ear.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 552.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## NATIVE AMERICAN $1 COIN ACT

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2358) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue coins in commemoration of Native Americans and the important contributions made by Indian tribes and individual Native Americans to the development of the United States and the history of the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

***SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.***

*This Act may be cited as the ''Native American $1 Coin Act''.*

***SEC. 2. NATIVE AMERICAN $1 COIN PROGRAM.***

*Section 5112 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(r) REDESIGN AND ISSUANCE OF CIRCULATING $1 COINS HONORING NATIVE AMERICANS AND THE IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY INDIAN TRIBES AND INDIVIDUAL NATIVE AMERICANS IN UNITED STATES HISTORY.—*

*''(1) REDESIGN BEGINNING IN 2008.—*

*''(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective beginning January 1, 2008, notwithstanding subsection (d), in addition to the coins to be issued pursuant to subsection (n), and in accordance with this subsection, the Secretary shall mint and issue $1 coins that—*

*''(i) have as the designs on the obverse the so-called 'Sacagawea design'; and*

*''(ii) have a design on the reverse selected in accordance with paragraph (2)(A), subject to paragraph (3)(A).*

*''(B) DELAYED DATE.—If the date of the enactment of the Native American $1 Coin Act is after August 25, 2007, subparagraph (A) shall be applied by substituting '2009' for '2008'.*

*''(2) DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.—The $1 coins issued in accordance with paragraph (1) shall meet the following design requirements:*

*''(A) COIN REVERSE.—The design on the reverse shall bear—*

*''(i) images celebrating the important contributions made by Indian tribes and individual Native Americans to the development of the United States and the history of the United States;*

*''(ii) the inscription '$1' ; and*

*''(iii) the inscription 'United States of America'.*

*''(B) COIN OBVERSE.—The design on the obverse shall—*

*''(i) be chosen by the Secretary, after consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts and review by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee; and*

*''(ii) contain the so-called 'Sacagawea design' and the inscription 'Liberty'.*

*''(C) EDGE-INCUSED INSCRIPTIONS.—*

*''(i) IN GENERAL.—The inscription of the year of minting and issuance of the coin and the inscriptions 'E Pluribus Unum' and 'In God We Trust' shall be edge-incused into the coin.*

*''(ii) PRESERVATION OF DISTINCTIVE EDGE.—The edge-incusing of the inscriptions under clause (i) on coins issued under this subsection shall be done in a manner that preserves the distinctive edge of the coin so that the denomination of the coin is readily discernible, including by individuals who are blind or visually impaired.*

*''(D) REVERSE DESIGN SELECTION.—The designs selected for the reverse of the coins described under this subsection—*

*''(i) shall be chosen by the Secretary after consultation with the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate, the Congressional Native American Caucus of the House of Representatives, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Congress of American Indians;*

*''(ii) shall be reviewed by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee;*

*''(iii) may depict individuals and events such as—*

*''(I) the creation of Cherokee written language;*

*''(II) the Iroquois Confederacy;*

*''(III) Wampanoag Chief Massasoit;*

*''(IV) the 'Pueblo Revolt';*

*''(V) Olympian Jim Thorpe;*

*''(VI) Ely S. Parker, a general on the staff of General Ulysses S. Grant and later head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and*

*''(VII) code talkers who served the United States Armed Forces during World War I and World War II; and*

*''(iv) in the case of a design depicting the contribution of an individual Native American to the development of the United States and the history of the United States, shall not depict the individual in a size such that the coin could be considered to be a '2-headed' coin.*

*''(3) ISSUANCE OF COINS COMMEMORATING 1 NATIVE AMERICAN EVENT DURING EACH YEAR.—*

*''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each design for the reverse of the $1 coins issued during each year shall be emblematic of 1 important Native American or Native American contribution each year.*

*''(B) ISSUANCE PERIOD.—Each $1 coin minted with a design on the reverse in accordance with this subsection for any year shall be issued during the 1-year period beginning on January 1 of that year and shall be available throughout the entire 1-year period.*

*''(C) ORDER OF ISSUANCE OF DESIGNS.—Each coin issued under this subsection commemorating Native Americans and their contributions—*

*''(i) shall be issued, to the maximum extent practicable, in the chronological order in which the Native Americans lived or the events occurred, until the termination of the coin program described in subsection (n); and*

*''(ii) thereafter shall be issued in any order determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, after consultation with the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate, the Congressional Native American Caucus of the House of Representatives, and the National Congress of American Indians.*

*''(4) ISSUANCE OF NUMISMATIC COINS.—The Secretary may mint and issue such number of $1 coins of each design selected under this subsection in uncirculated and proof qualities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.*

*''(5) QUANTITY.—The number of $1 coins minted and issued in a year with the Sacagawea-design on the obverse shall be not less than 20 percent of the total number of $1 coins minted and issued in such year.''.*

***SEC. 3. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.***

*Section 5112(n)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—*

*(1) by striking the paragraph designation and heading and all that follows through ''Notwithstanding subsection (d)'' and inserting the following:*

*''(1) REDESIGN BEGINNING IN 2007.—Notwithstanding subsection (d)'';*

*(2) by striking subparagraph (B); and*

*(3) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting the subparagraphs appropriately.*

***SEC. 4. REMOVAL OF BARRIERS TO CIRCULATION OF $1 COIN.***

*(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to remove barriers to circulation, the Secretary of the Treasury shall carry out an aggressive, cost-effective, continuing campaign to encourage commercial enterprises to accept and dispense $1 coins that have as designs on the obverse the so-called ''Sacagawea design''.*

*(b) REPORT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress an annual report on*

*the success of the efforts described in subsection (a).*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2358, the Native American $1 Coin Act, requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue coins commemorating Native Americans and the important contributions they have made to the history and growth of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman FRANK and Mr. KILDEE for their hard work in making this legislation a priority and recognizing the importance of memorializing Native Americans who have been instrumental to the evolution of the United States.

H.R. 2358 calls upon the government to recognize and pay a long overdue tribute to Indian tribes and individual Native Americans for their significant contributions. This bill would allow for our country's acknowledgment of important events in Native American history.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2358, the Native American $1 Coin Act, and urge its immediate passage.

The legislation before us is essentially identical to a bill that passed the House in June by a voice vote, with minor changes made by the other body. H.R. 2358 complements the Presidential $1 Coin Act that passed in the last Congress thanks to the hard work and leadership of the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY). Like that program and the very popular 50-State quarter program, it will provide an enormous educational opportunity for parents and teachers, while also recognizing the immense and important contributions of Native Americans to the history of the United States. Passage of this legislation also could save taxpayers more than half a billion dollars over the next decade.

When Congress passed the Presidential $1 Coin Act in December of 2005, it contained a requirement that a third of all dollar coins minted each year bear the design of the Sacagawea coin that first was issued in 2000. The requirement was intended to keep the image and the memory of Sacagawea in people's minds while the mint issues presidential dollars.

Unfortunately, through no fault of the design or its subject, there is no real demand for the dollar coin with an unchanging design. At the current rate of issue of presidential coins, the mint would have to make 300 to 350 million of the current design Sacagawea dollars every year, resulting in some $60 million of material and labor costs per year, not counting storage for the unused coins.

Under H.R. 2358, the current Sacagawea design would appear on the front of 20 percent of all dollar coins. Similar to the changing design of quarters and presidential dollars, the reverse of the Sacagawea coin would be different each year, honoring such contributions to American history as the Iroquois Confederacy, the Cherokee written language, the code talkers who served the U.S. Army so heroically in both world wars, and individuals such as Olympian Jim Thorpe.

Let me close by congratulating the lead sponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and by thanking Chairman FRANK for bringing the bill to the floor today. I urge passage of H.R. 2358, and I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his leadership on this issue.

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

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee from the State of Massachusetts and a strong supporter of Native Americans (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the important role he has played in our committee as a representative from a State which has a very large number of Native Americans. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN) has played a lead role in helping us live up to our obligations to Native Americans. And I am very proud of the role that the committee has played in general in this area, in the coinage area, a couple of things that have come up in the housing area and elsewhere, and the gentleman from Oklahoma has been a major part of that.

I am also very pleased to be here with one of the great advocates for human rights in general and particularly for Native Americans, our colleague from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), who has been the major mover in insisting that we live up to the obligation we as a Nation have to Native Americans. This bill is in furtherance of that. It is, I am glad to say, and has been from the beginning, bipartisan, and I hope it is passed. And I just want to pay tribute to the work of both the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN), an active member of the Native American Caucus, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as Democratic chairman of the congressional Native American Caucus, I am honored to speak in support of H.R. 2358, the Native American $1 Coin Act.

As the chief sponsor of this bipartisan legislation, I am pleased that the House is passing this final version of the bill today. The House passed H.R. 2358 on June 12, 2007, and the Senate passed it by unanimous consent on August 3 with an amendment that makes minor changes to the bill. Both my friend, Financial Services chairman Barney Frank, and I support the Senate changes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will honor the strength and wisdom of Indian country by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue coins that commemorate the outstanding contributions of Native Americans by changing the design annually on the reverse side of the Sacagawea dollar coin. These designs will take the American people through a journey of different experiences of Native peoples by exposing them to their unique histories while preserving the memory of Sacagawea, the young Shoshone woman who assisted Lewis and Clark on their expedition to the Pacific Northwest more than 200 years ago.

I can think of no better way to pay tribute to the Native American people than to honor their contributions to the development of the United States and her history. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent a State that is home to nearly 40 federally recognized Indian tribes. Native Americans are not only a strong part of Oklahoma's history, they are also richly embedded in the history of the United States. H.R. 2358 allows the government to do its part to recognize the importance of Native Americans to our country's history and development.

Again, I thank Chairman FRANK and Mr. KILDEE for recognizing the importance of H.R. 2358.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for H.R. 2358, the Native American One Dollar Coin Act.

I want to thank my colleague, Representative DALE KILDEE, for sponsoring this bill and for all his great work as head of the Native American Caucus.

I also would like to thank Chairman FRANK for his efforts in guiding this bill through the Financial Services Committee.

This bill honors the history of the American Indian culture by authorizing the Treasury Department to mint and distribute coins that commemorate the contributions of Native Americans.

By annually changing the design on the reverse side of the Sacagawea coin, Americans

everywhere will be exposed to more of the unique histories of our country's native inhabitants.

At the same time, this legislation ensures we still pay tribute to Sacagawea, the young woman who bravely guided Lewis and Clark on their expedition to the Pacific coast.

The Native American one dollar coin is a fitting way to pay tribute to Native Americans while also educating current and future generations on their many contributions to the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support increased appreciation of the Native American culture, and cast a vote in favor of H.R. 2358.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2358.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE ROTUNDA AND GROUNDS OF THE CAPITOL FOR A CEREMONY TO AWARD THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO TENZIN GYATSO, THE FOURTEENTH DALAI LAMA

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 196, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 196

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

**SECTION 1. USE OF ROTUNDA FOR GOLD MEDAL CEREMONY FOR DALAI LAMA.**

(a) USE OF ROTUNDA.—The rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on October 17, 2007, for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Tenzin Gyatso, the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, in accordance with Public Law 109–287.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the ceremony referred to in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

**SEC. 2. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS IN CONNECTION WITH CEREMONY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The International Campaign for Tibet (in this resolution referred to as the ''sponsor'') shall be permitted to sponsor a public event on the Capitol Grounds (in this resolution referred to as the ''event'') on October 17, 2007, in connection with the ceremony to be held in the rotunda of the Capitol under section 1.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(A) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(B) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(2) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

(c) EVENT PREPARATIONS.—Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment, as may be required for the event.

(d) ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.—The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 196.

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

There was no objection.

## 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 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1803

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SCOTT of Georgia) at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2669, COLLEGE COST REDUCTION ACT OF 2007

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2669) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 601 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. HOEKSTRA

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Hoekstra moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2669 be instructed to agree to the provisions contained in section 801 of the Senate amendment, relating to the sense of the Senate on the detainees at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. I thank my good friend from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying how I wish we had followed a more open and inclusive process up to this point. My friends on the other side of the aisle pledged during the campaign that the 110th Congress would be the most fair, open and honest in history. Yet it is my understanding that the Democrats are close to finalizing an agreement on a conference report before conferees have even been named and with little input from House Republicans. There is nothing fair, open or honest about that.

The Senate Budget Committee chairman predicted months ago that the budget reconciliation process was in danger of being abused as a ''stalking horse'' for new spending, and looking back he could not have been more on target. The House bill in fact included one of the most significant increases in higher education entitlement spending we have ever witnessed, establishing nine new entitlement programs. And bear in mind most of that new spending isn't even targeted toward low-income students who need it the most, but rather at institutions, philanthropic organizations, and graduates.

That is a remarkable change from the historic function of Federal student aid programs. For more than four decades, these programs have existed for a single purpose, to give our neediest students a chance at obtaining a college degree and pursuing the American Dream. The House bill turns its back on that tradition.

House Republicans support strengthening our Nation's student aid programs, but we do not support targeting scarce Federal student aid resources at wealthy philanthropic organizations, universities with million- or billion-dollar endowments and college graduates, and we certainly do not support doing so at the expense of the market-

based FFEL program, which has been a success by any measure.

There is a way, Mr. Speaker, that we can avoid making this critical mistake. Slightly reducing the cuts to lender subsidies and redirecting funding to provide additional support for Pell Grants, rather than creating costly new entitlement programs, are two steps that could be taken in an effort to achieve bipartisan support for this bill.

I believe the final step is to include language that would allow for a careful analysis of possible auction scenarios to determine if an auction is really in the best interests of students and taxpayers before requiring its implementation. In fact, I have heard from many Members, including 14 Democrats, who expressed concern about the automatic implementation of an auction and encourage that we approach any auction proposal with caution.

If the conference report achieves these four goals, I believe we can achieve strong bipartisan support for this bill. Doing anything less could endanger our support and trigger a Presidential veto threat, just as the House bill did in July. So as we prepare to formalize a conference report, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to bear this in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I believe another part of the Senate's reconciliation bill also deserves the attention of this Chamber and inclusion in our conference report, specifically, the provision that would block the importation of terrorists detained at Guantanamo Bay into American communities.

We are a Nation at war and Guantanamo provides the highest level of security to ensure our enemies do not endanger American lives. Some Democrats have suggested that the site be closed and terrorists be sent into American communities such as Edwards Air Force Base in my district, Fort Knox, Kentucky, Quantico, Virginia, and others. But make no mistake: transferring terrorist detainees to these communities will create an opportunity for our enemies to escape, recruit and disseminate their terrorist skills, and it would make these domestic facilities prime targets for any attack that al Qaeda is able to mount within our borders.

Congress simply should not allow this to occur, and I thank the Senate for including this important language in its reconciliation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do the same by voting ''yes'' on this motion to instruct.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of proceeding with the conference negotiations on H.R. 2669, the College Cost Reduction and Access Act of 2007. In appointing conferees today, I am proud to say that we will be taking the first step in making college more affordable and accessible for students.

Overall, this is an opportunity for the conference to look at both bills, consider concerns and put forth the best possible compromise; and that is our goal. During this process, not only have we looked carefully at what will work for students and families, but we have done our best to listen to and address the concerns brought to our attention. In an attempt at bipartisanship, we have met with the administration, as well as the staff from the other side of the aisle, in such discussions and with the administration, and we believe at the end of the day the conference will include provisions that have broad bipartisan support while maintaining some of our key priorities. These include the following:

Significant investment in Pell Grants. We heard the concern voiced on this floor by Members on the other side of the aisle, and we believe it is important to include a significant investment beyond the House bill in this conference. Understanding that increasing Pell Grants is also an issue included in President Bush's budget, we believe this goal can and should be met.

Cutting interest rates in half will remain a key priority for helping the middle class as well as ensuring debt relief for students and delivery of such needed financial support for Historical Black Colleges and Universities and Hispanic serving institutions and other minority serving institutions.

I hope that we can continue the dialogue and work together on final passage in the conference. I am very proud to be here today to offer this motion to officially proceed in the conference with the Senate on legislation that will allow the Congress to do more to help Americans pay for the cost of college than any effort since the GI Bill at no cost to the taxpayers.

The College Cost Reduction and Access Act of 2007 will get us closer to the goal of ensuring access to higher education for all qualified students.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the Senate rejected transferring al Qaeda terrorists from Guantanamo to facilities in the United States by a vote of 94–3. Senator MCCONNELL stated at that time, ''It is better for the safety and security of the American people that terrorists at Guantanamo Bay are not moved to American communities. It is the sense of the Senate that detainees housed at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, including senior members of al Qaeda, should not be transferred stateside into facilities in American communities and American neighborhoods.''

Many senior members of al Qaeda are secured at Guantanamo Bay, including Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, who masterminded the September 11 terrorist attacks that killed approximately 3,000 Americans; Majid Khan, who developed plans to poison water supplies inside the United States; Abdul Rahim al-Nashiri, who orchestrated the attacks on the USS *Cole* which killed 17 United States sailors. This is just a sampling of the people that are in Guantanamo Bay.

Are Americans better protected by bringing these terrorists to our homeland, or by keeping captured members of al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations 528 miles and an ocean away from the homeland? Terrorists held at Guantanamo are treated in accordance with United States and international law and are held at the highest level of security, ensuring that they are not a threat to the United States citizens.

Gitmo alternatives include the use of up to 17 military detention facilities. Less secure facilities allow for the recruitment and radicalization of new members within the detention population as well as enhanced escape opportunities. Domestic detention facilities may become prime targets for terrorist attacks on United States soil and they will create uncertainties about detainees' ''constitutional rights.''

□ 1815

Standards at Guantanamo are equal to or better than similar institutions in the United States. They are relatively new facilities. They have culturally appropriate meals. They have Korans and respectful silence during Islam's five daily prayers. The detainees receive medical care and at least 2 hours of daily outdoor recreation. An inspection official from the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe in March 2006 called it a model prison.

Bottom line, the Guantanamo Bay facility is a clean, safe and humane facility for the terrorists housed there, as well as a facility that affords security and protection for American citizens. We should accept the Senate language in their bill and make it clear that these prisoners should stay at Guantanamo Bay and that they should not be transferred to facilities in the homeland.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and I thank him for his leadership on this very important piece of legislation.

It is imperative that we go to conference on this bill and that we pass the College Cost Reduction Act. It provides us with an unprecedented opportunity to help students afford college and to do so at no new cost to the taxpayer. Let me emphasize that point: At no new cost to the taxpayer.

We just heard this bill described, I believe, as containing unprecedented new spending, and I think it is important to point out that it is not new spending, it is redirected spending.

With this bill, the Congress is making a choice that we think it is important to take Federal resources, scarce Federal resources, and devote them to assisting needy students in meeting the cost of attending college, and it is more important to do that than it is to see to it that the student loan providers maintain what are already very healthy profit margins. I think that is a choice that the American people would support us in making, and it is certainly a reasonable choice.

If you were to look at today's front page article in the New York Times, an article that talks about how colleges are not raising tuition but they are raising fees, it underscores one of the central realities of higher education today, and that is, as public support for higher education is reduced, the burden falls on students and their families to make up the difference. We now have an opportunity to assist students and families with making up that difference.

This bill significantly increases the Pell Grant maximum, something, by the way, that the President has spoken quite favorably of doing. He has been promising an increase in the Pell Grant maximum since the campaign of 2000. It was not until the Congress acted with the continuing resolution for fiscal year 2007 that that increase became a reality for the first time. And now with this bill, we will dramatically increase the Pell Grant maximum to offset increases in tuition, increases in fees, and declining public support for education in other areas.

It also cuts student loan interest rates, which is very important. It is a point that continues to be missed by our friends on the other side. Access and affordability isn't just about the cost of attendance when the student is undertaking the cost; it is about looking at their future obligations. What this bill does is it enables students to make clear decisions about what they can afford and what they can't afford and have an expectation of what their future obligations are that is much more reasonable.

This is an investment. This is the kind of investment that we need to keep this Nation strong, to keep this Nation safe, to keep this Nation competitive. I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I thank again the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership on this important issue of Gitmo.

I rise today in strong support of the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2669. When the other body considered this legislation, the Republican leader inserted language to prohibit dangerous terrorists being detained at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, from being transferred to American soil. I believe it is crucial this language remain in the bill.

The findings of the sense of the Senate quoted threats of Osama bin Laden. Item 8, Osama bin Laden, the leader of al Qaeda, said in his 1998 fatwa against the United States that: ''The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies, civilians and military, is an important individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it.''

Item 9 in the same fatwa, Osama bin Laden said: ''We, with God's help, call on every Muslim who believes in God and wishes to be rewarded to comply with God's order to kill Americans and plunder their money wherever and whenever they can find it.''

These terrorists currently held at Guantanamo Bay are treated in accordance with U.S. and international laws. I have visited the facility two times, and both times I was impressed by the high level of security and the professional management of the detainees.

Importing dangerous foreign terrorists, like 9/11 mastermind Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, into American communities would be dangerous and irresponsible. Terrorists would have the opportunity to recruit and teach their skills. Additionally, I am very concerned that they could potentially escape and harm Americans here at home again.

Since April, American forces have captured two terrorists with strong al Qaeda ties: al-Hadi al-Iraqi, one of al Qaeda's highest ranking and most experienced senior operatives, and Haroon al-Afghani, who has admitted to being a courier for the al Qaeda senior leadership. Both men are currently detained at Guantanamo Bay. Inviting these criminals into American communities would be reckless. Any domestic detention facility would be a prime target for a terrorist attack that al Qaeda could mount within the borders of the United States.

As the former chairman of the Lexington County Law Enforcement Advisory Council of Sheriff Jimmy Metts and as a former member of the South Carolina State Senate Corrections and Penology Committee, I am very familiar with corrections facilities. The Guantanamo detention facilities are world class as to humane lodging and security of the inmates and for the personnel who serve as guards or medical support.

As America continues to fight the global war on terrorism, I am confident that Guantanamo Bay remains the safest place to detain captured terrorists who pose a serious threat to American families. These terrorists have disclosed terrorist cells which have been stopped from attacking Americans and our allies worldwide.

I urge my colleagues to rise with me in strong support of this motion that would ensure Americans are kept safe from known terrorists.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me first speak to the motion to instruct. I have no problems with the motion to instruct. I don't quite know why it is on this bill, but the Senate chose to put this language into the legislation. The motion to instruct would ask the conferees to maintain that language in this legislation so those who are currently at Guantanamo Bay who are among some very dangerous people in the world not be brought to this country in the event that Guantanamo Bay should be closed.

As we know, that is a matter of active debate here in the United States and certainly around the world and within the Congress of the United States of exactly how we extricate ourselves from the situation we have at Guantanamo Bay.

Early on after 9/11, the use of Guantanamo Bay became a rallying point against the abuse of human rights. Earlier practices there violated the protection of human rights. As the gentleman from Michigan has pointed out, much has changed there, but all is not well there yet, and there have been calls to close that facility. In the event they would be successful, as I understand this language, this would prevent the prisoners from being transferred to facilities in the United States, and I concur in that language.

If I might return back to the legislation at hand or the motion at hand, which is to go to conference with the Senate and work out the differences in this legislation, and there are significant differences between the House and the Senate legislation, the staffs of the committee have been meeting on those differences, and we would hope to be able to report back to the House and to the Senate in the near future.

It is important that we do that. We stand here at the beginning of yet another school year, another college year, if you will, and we see that families are struggling harder than ever to meet the cost of college. The gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) who has been so active in this field pointed out this fact to the House. We must do what we can to address and help families meet this cost.

This legislation does it in a number of ways, both by providing increased grants to the lowest income families of students who seek to attend college who are fully qualified to go to college, but too often economic barriers keep them from doing so.

This legislation makes a substantial increase in the Pell Grants, some $500 over the coming years in that grant. It was the goal of this President to do that. Previous Congresses never did that, and we do that in this legislation, and that is going to be a great benefit to those students and to their families who are struggling with the cost of college.

We also make a reduction in the interest rates. We cut the interest rates

in half on money borrowed from the subsidized loan program which includes those very same Pell Grant recipients. I think 25 or 30 percent of them go on to borrow money from this program, and also middle income families who are feeling the financial strain of having one kid or two or three kids in college at the same time.

We estimate that the savings over the life of that loan will be above $4,000, almost $4,500 for those individuals. That is a very substantial savings, and it is what we know that the young people calculate what is going to be the cost of college, and that includes the interest rates that they are going to have to pay back. As we know, there is forbearance against the payment of interest rates while the students are in college, but upon graduation, they start paying that money back, and that interest rate is a significant cost for those students.

We also try to make sure that those individuals who have chosen to go into public service can understand that there will be some relief for their efforts through a loan forgiveness program for policemen, firemen, teachers, teachers of special ed, prosecutors, public defenders, all of whom enter professions that don't have the highest economic rewards at the outset, but we want them to go into those professions as services to our communities. And we want to make sure that they do so so we can continue to hold civil society together in this country and receive the benefits of their work and they will not be so burdened by the loans that they will choose to go elsewhere and leave society without the use of their talents, as I say, in health care, law enforcement, education, and so many other fields that are important to this.

And following on the passage of the COMPETES Act, we provide for highly qualified teachers in every classroom. In the TEACH Act, we recognize the importance of highly skilled math and science teachers, and we identify those people who are performing in an exemplary fashion in college and offer them tuition assistance if they go into teaching math and science and go into those schools in high need. That would provide $4,000 in up-front tuition assistance for those individuals.

We also make landmark investments of $500 million in Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, tribal colleges, and Alaska/Hawaiian Native colleges. We have a problem of fully qualified minority students going to some of these colleges and really not being able to stay for a host of reasons. We have had discussions with the heads of State college systems and university systems and others about this problem, and the fact of the matter is we have to do more to support those students so they can successfully negotiate the college education that they seek to pursue.

So this legislation is comprehensive. It is important. We did it by taking away the excessive subsidies to the student lending agencies, subsidies that were identified as excessive a number of years ago in the President's budget and by the OMB, and we recycled those successive savings to the benefit of the students and their families who once again are going into great financial stress to make sure that their children will have an opportunity at a college education that we recognize is so important in terms of their future ability to fully participate in the American economy, the American society, and to provide for their families.

□ 1830

As we pointed out, this legislation is the largest commitment of Federal resources since the GI Bill of 1944. We think it's important. We would hope to have an affirmative vote to go to conference on the motion to instruct, and then we could proceed with the conference in the coming days.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I compliment my colleague. I thank you for the support on this motion to instruct, and with that, I would also then like to yield 4 minutes to my colleague from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, allow me rhetorically, if I can, just to concentrate on one issue, the one at hand, which is the significant proposal, the motion to instruct made by the gentleman from Michigan.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, as well as the Education Committee, I strongly support this extremely important motion that has been given to us today.

On the day in July when my State celebrates the arrival of the pioneers into Salt Lake Valley, in a remote Pakistani town, the Pakistani police were closing in on one house that had been given as an intelligence tip that the top Taliban leader was inside. According to the Washington Post, this Taliban leader, Abdullah Mehsud, if I have pronounced that properly, was a short, round man in his early thirties, who had been an active Taliban commander in Pakistan for many years.

Amazingly, though, this same man had been among the first military detainees at Guantanamo and had been released in 2004. Upon his release, what did he do? Go back to Pakistan, once again working with the Taliban, helping al Qaeda infiltrators coming into the rugged mountains area of Pakistan.

But on this fateful day back in July, with the Pakistani police closing in, this top Taliban leader, who only the year before had been leading terrorist activities against mosques, had kidnapped a couple of Chinese engineers, and who knows what else, pulled the pin on a hand grenade and blew himself up rather than resubmit to the authorities.

It's memorable and reminds one of the extravagances that took place in March of 2004 in Madrid when the subway bombings killed 200, injured 2,000 people. This al Qaeda-inspired terrorist activity and the leaders of that were tracked down by Spanish authorities; and as they surrounded the apartment where they were, the terrorists, the al Qaeda terrorists, had preplanned their own self-martyrdom by having wired their own apartment. So as the police closed in upon them, they pushed the button, not only blowing themselves up but also almost imploding the entire building, which would have killed hundreds of other innocent victims.

Now, the reason, Mr. Speaker, that I present these two anecdotal stories is simply this: these people are not nice people. They're murderers of the worst sort. They're ideologically driven to kill. They would stop at nothing to try and kill as many men, women and children, if possible, in their goals of maximizing the amount of pain and destruction, especially those relating to us. They do not belong on American soil, nor do they belong to be released back to their own countries, where they can reorganize again, in this war, not just again on terror, but also the war against civilization and basic humanity.

The motion to instruct asks this conference to accept the language passed in a similar bill in the Senate on an overwhelming 94–3 vote that rejects transferring a terrorist detained in Guantanamo to the United States soil. Our penal system, as we envision it, is one of rehabilitation. Obviously, these people have not been rehabilitated; and as we discuss what we will do as our options, as we discuss any kind of closure that may take place in Guantanamo, we should obviously say which options are not acceptable.

Moving any of these prisoners to the United States is simply not acceptable. Returning them to their homes is simply not acceptable. Destroying the intelligence value we have at Guantanamo is simply not acceptable.

This sense of the Congress resolution simply is one of those things that this body, the people's body, the House of Representatives, should overwhelmingly support. I cannot imagine anyone honestly believing it is a good idea to close Guantanamo and bring these individuals into our neighborhoods and into our backyards, nor to release them back to their country of origin where they'd be free to reorganize themselves.

As Mr. MCCONNELL said on the floor today, this is not a motion simply for the status quo. Flexibility of what our choices will be would still be allowed, but it does clearly say that the one option that is not acceptable would be a closing of Guantanamo Bay with the only option being of removing these people and bringing them back into our neighborhoods, back into our homes and back on American soil.

For that, I appreciate what the gentleman from Michigan has done in bringing this once again to our attention so that we can join the Senate in

making sure that this is very clear of what is not our policy option.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. I will be the last speaker, and I will close as soon as my colleague yields back.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. If the gentleman has no further speakers, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I just want to point out for a number of Members who have asked about what's the relationship of this reconciliation to the loan scandals that the Nation was witness to earlier this year, this legislation does not contain the language of the Sunshine Act that we passed overwhelmingly in May of this year. That will be contained in the Higher Education Act that the House and Senate plan to do soon. It's in the Senate bill, and we have passed the Sunshine Act.

As Members will recall, this was legislation that falls on the heels of public reports of colleges and lenders and their relationships between colleges and lenders and special relationships that were developed in some cases for the exchange of gifts, financial favors, holidays, special treatment to people working for the colleges that were steering people to a particular lender for their loans. Whether or not that was in the best interest of the student or not really didn't come into play.

These practices have gone on for a considerable period of time. In some cases, they've been brought to the attention of the Department of Education by the Inspector General. They were not properly dealt with, and the Attorney General of the State of New York, Mr. Cuomo, brought them to the Nation's attention with his investigation of some of the large lending institutions and these practices and entered into a number of consent agreements with those individuals.

We had hearings on this matter and the failure of oversight by both the Congress and the Department, and we passed the Sunshine Act in reaction to those hearings that we had, again, and was passed on a strong bipartisan vote.

We think these two things are connected. The terms are now removing the excessive subsidies that were used in many instances to grease these relationships for the benefit of the lenders and not for the benefit of the students and of their families who are borrowing the money to pay for their college education.

So I just wanted to bring the Members up to snuff on that matter.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I shall consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate rejected transferring al Qaeda terrorists from Gitmo to our homeland. That was a wise decision. That is a decision that my colleagues here in the House should support tonight.

Gitmo is a facility that is working. It's working in many different ways. It's keeping terrorists, these terrorists, away from the homeland. It's providing us with an opportunity to get the information that may be necessary and may be helpful in keeping America safe. When the Senate acted, they acted overwhelmingly, 94–3, to say make sure that these individuals do not come to the United States.

It provides us with the alternatives and the flexibility that, as we move forward in defeating radical jihadists, that we will have the strategies in place to keep us safe, to get the information that we need, provide us with the background to implement the correct strategies.

We are safer keeping these terrorists in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, 528 miles away from the homeland. I encourage my colleagues to vote for this motion to instruct conferees. It is a good motion. It's a good decision, a good direction that was put forward by the Members of the other body; and I hope that we stand with them tonight.

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 instruct.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. 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.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JOHN E. PETERSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN E. PETERSON, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, August 22, 2007.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a judicial subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. PETERSON,
*Member of Congress.*

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motions to suspend the rules with regard to H.R. 694 and H.R. 3020, and

Motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2669, in each case by the yeas and nays.

The vote on the motion to suspend the rules with regard to H. Res. 552 will be taken tomorrow.

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

## MINORITY SERVING INSTITUTION DIGITAL AND WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 694, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 694, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 331, nays 59, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 847]

YEAS—331

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abercrombie | Buyer | Donnelly |
| Ackerman | Calvert | Doyle |
| Aderholt | Camp (MI) | Drake |
| Akin | Capito | Dreier |
| Alexander | Capps | Edwards |
| Allen | Capuano | Ehlers |
| Altmire | Cardoza | Ellison |
| Andrews | Carnahan | Ellsworth |
| Arcuri | Carney | Emanuel |
| Baca | Carson | Emerson |
| Bachus | Castle | Engel |
| Baird | Castor | English (PA) |
| Baker | Chabot | Eshoo |
| Baldwin | Chandler | Etheridge |
| Bean | Clarke | Everett |
| Becerra | Clay | Fallin |
| Berkley | Cleaver | Farr |
| Berman | Clyburn | Fattah |
| Berry | Cohen | Ferguson |
| Bilirakis | Cole (OK) | Filner |
| Bishop (GA) | Conyers | Forbes |
| Bishop (NY) | Cooper | Fortenberry |
| Bishop (UT) | Costello | Fossella |
| Blumenauer | Courtney | Frank (MA) |
| Blunt | Cramer | Frelinghuysen |
| Bonner | Crenshaw | Gerlach |
| Bono | Crowley | Giffords |
| Boozman | Cuellar | Gilchrest |
| Boren | Cummings | Gillibrand |
| Boswell | Davis (AL) | Gillmor |
| Boucher | Davis (CA) | Gohmert |
| Boustany | Davis (IL) | Gonzalez |
| Boyd (FL) | Davis, Lincoln | Goode |
| Boyda (KS) | Davis, Tom | Goodlatte |
| Brady (PA) | DeFazio | Gordon |
| Brady (TX) | DeGette | Granger |
| Braley (IA) | Delahunt | Green, Al |
| Brown (SC) | DeLauro | Green, Gene |
| Brown, Corrine | Dent | Hall (NY) |
| Brown-Waite, Ginny | Diaz-Balart, L. | Hall (TX) |
| | Diaz-Balart, M. | Hare |
| Buchanan | Dicks | Harman |
| Burgess | Dingell | Hastings (FL) |
| Butterfield | Doggett | Hastings (WA) |

Hayes
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
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
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—59

Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Blackburn
Boehner
Broun (GA)
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Coble
Conaway
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Inglis (SC)
Jones (NC)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Linder
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Paul
Pence
Price (GA)
Rohrabacher
Sali
Schmidt
Sessions
Shadegg
Smith (NE)
Stearns
Thornberry
Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—42

Barrow
Costa
Davis, Jo Ann
Gallegly
Graves
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastert
Hooley
Hulshof
Hunter
Israel
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kucinich
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Lucas
Mollohan
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Poe
Pryce (OH)
Royce
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schiff
Schwartz
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (WA)
Souder
Tancredo
Taylor
Terry
Watson
Weller
Wilson (NM)
Young (AK)

□ 1913

Messrs. KINGSTON, GARRETT of New Jersey, HERGER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mrs. SCHMIDT changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. MURTHA, SULLIVAN, CONYERS, Ms. GRANGER and Mr. HOBSON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## THE RETURN OF SENATOR TIM JOHNSON

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

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to share with you and to share with all of our colleagues some truly wonderful news about a good friend and his health, a friend who is a former Member of this body, and the senior Senator from the State of South Dakota. This announcement is news of our friend, TIM JOHNSON.

Last week, Senator JOHNSON was welcomed home by his constituents for the first time since suffering a debilitating brain hemorrhage last December. It was a joyous day, full of smiles, laughter and tears. And after 9 months of hard work, determination, and strength of mind and spirit, all qualities that have marked his tenure in public service, tomorrow TIM JOHNSON will return to the Senate Chamber.

□ 1915

In Senator JOHNSON's recovery, the prayers of South Dakota families, the prayers of all of us, and indeed the prayers of countless people across the country have been answered. And TIM, his loving wife Barbara, and their beautiful family will continue to move forward as resilient and remarkable as ever.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

## MICROLOAN AMENDMENTS AND MODERNIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3020, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3020, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 5, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 848]

YEAS—385

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
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
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
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
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
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
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
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
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schmidt
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
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
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—5

Broun (GA)
Coble
Culberson
Flake
Paul

NOT VOTING—42

Barrow
Costa
Davis, Jo Ann
Gallegly
Graves
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastert
Hooley
Hulshof
Hunter
Israel
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kucinich
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Lucas
Mollohan
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Poe
Pryce (OH)
Royce
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schiff
Schwartz
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (WA)
Souder
Tancredo
Taylor
Terry
Watson
Weller
Wilson (NM)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1927

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, August 31, 2007.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a scanned copy of a Certificate of Election received from the Honorable Debra Bowen, Secretary of State of California, indicating that, at the Special Election held on August 21, 2007, the Honorable Laura Richardson was duly elected Representative in Congress for the Thirty-Seventh Congressional District, State of California.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
*Clerk of the House.*

Enclosure.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

I, Debra Bowen, Secretary of State of the State of California, hereby certify: That according to the official canvass of votes cast in the Special General Election held on the 21st day of August, 2007 in the 37th Congressional District, Laura Richardson was elected to the office of United States Representative, District 37 for the term prescribed by law.

## SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE LAURA RICHARDSON, OF CALIFORNIA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect RICHARDSON and the Members of the California delegation present themselves in the well.

Ms. RICHARDSON appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now a Member of the 110th Congress.

□ 1930

## WELCOMING THE HONORABLE LAURA RICHARDSON TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, as the dean of the California delegation, it's my privilege, my honor and distinct pleasure to introduce the newest member of our California delegation, LAURA RICHARDSON, elected to California's 37th Congressional District in a special election held just recently. LAURA RICHARDSON is a passionate critic of the war in Iraq, a supporter of universal health care, and a welcome addition to our delegation.

After three terms on the Long Beach City Council and several years as director for Lieutenant Governor Cruz Bustamante, LAURA was elected to the California State Assembly last November. And less than a year later, she won a special election to succeed our dear departed colleague, Juanita Millender-McDonald, and joins us here. It is a distinction that she is one of the few people in the history of this country to serve both in a local, State and Federal post within 1 year. She worked for Juanita as a field deputy, and she will continue her important work to ensure that all Americans can participate in a fair and free electoral process.

LAURA's career has many highlights. While on the city council, she was responsible for bringing Long Beach's inner city its first job training center for working families; she championed economic development and improved upon transportation services. And dear to my heart, she helped open the first new bank in the city's central area since the 1992 riots.

In the assembly, she became the first African American woman to serve as the Assistant Speaker pro tempore. In the House, she will keep California's Democratic delegation a majority female; of our 34 members, 18 are women.

She is a member of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, and she joins us as an effective voice for working families in Congress. I look forward to working with her to improve health care for everyone and address the disparities in our health care system, issues I know are important to her and should be to all of us.

At this time, I yield to my distinguished colleague and senior Member from the Republican delegation of California.

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

I would like to join with our colleague in extending congratulations on behalf of all Republican Members to our new colleague, Ms. RICHARDSON.

We were all saddened by the untimely passing of our friend and former colleague, Juanita Millender-McDonald, but knowing that her former field deputy is going to be representing her I know would make Juanita extraordinarily proud. And to go from the city council to the State legislature to the United States Congress within a 1-year period of time is a very, very impressive accomplishment.

And I will say that I know the California delegation will continue to work together in a bipartisan way. And we look forward to welcoming Ms. RICHARDSON as part of that effort.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield the balance of my time to the Honorable LAURA RICHARDSON, Representative of California's 37th Congressional District.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Speaker PELOSI, Leaders HOYER, CLYBURN, EMANUEL, BECERRA, Caucus Chairs LOFGREN, KILPATRICK, BACA and HONDA, the California delegation, thank you all for meeting with me, kind of putting me

under your wing, and really sharing your pearls of wisdom.

To Congresswoman WATERS, for the last 120 days you have been tirelessly, unrelentingly instructive and even graciously transparent in your efforts to help me to get here. Thank you.

To my supporters and friends and family in the gallery, my consultant, manager, labor brothers and sisters, volunteers, friends and staff, I will individually thank you in the reception that will follow, but I would be remiss to not publicly acknowledge the dedicated work that you did to get me here. Thank you very much.

To my new colleagues, yes, on both sides of the aisle, it is my desire to establish a reputation to be a Member's Member. What that means to me is to be a hard worker, to be responsive, to be straightforward and honest, even if we disagree; and I hear that happens a few times here. You know, or you will learn to know, that I will keep my word.

To the constituents of the California 37th Congressional District, my job will be to focus as much on the war in America, the war of crime, poverty, inadequate health care, failing education, crumbling infrastructure, and sparse development as much as I will focus on the war in Iraq.

My job will be to prove that the poor aren't just poor because they want to be or because they don't want to work, that with job training and livable wages, not all urban youth choose gang life, and that blighted areas are not a result of ''white flight.'' Rather, they're a result of lack of investments and revitalization.

I also believe I have a responsibility to unveil the shameful sin of injustice, inequality and inequities that still do exist, and I've seen them and lived them, in this wonderful country today.

To the McDonald family, I will always be grateful to Congresswoman McDonald, who first hired me and trained me over 10 years ago. As a staffer, I almost got fired my first week because I left her in a church. And I fondly recall her saying to me, ''I guess I can't throw the baby out with the bath water.'' I respectfully stand today on her legacy as I reach towards my own destiny.

Finally, to the God that I serve and to my family who support me and love me dearly, my mother, my sister, my uncle, my nephew, haven't we come a mighty long way? My maternal grandparents, who emigrated here freely from Ireland and from Germany, and yet my fraternal grandparents, completely the opposite, who came here forcibly in chains and centuries of bondage. Who would have thought that the cost had a price that would require my payment?

A seed of hope, yet equally a seed of despair, a seed of opportunity, yet equally a seed of why I can't, a seed of love that was met with seeds of hate. Who would have thought, I guess those who built and have served in this sacred Chamber, many of you, that after all, that's what this place is for. For a girl like me at the age of six, who chose, after watching and living the civil rights movement, that really those of us who lived through the pains of struggle would one day have an opportunity to make sure that everyone really was free. I welcome this responsibility. Thank you.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath of office to the gentlewoman from California, the whole number of the House is 434.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2669, COLLEGE COST REDUCTION ACT OF 2007

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. HOEKSTRA

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 2669 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 305, nays 83, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 849]

YEAS—305

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Ortiz
Pallone
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schmidt
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Sullivan
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—83

Baldwin
Berman
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Capps
Capuano
Castor
Clarke
Conyers
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Doyle
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Johnson (GA)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kilpatrick
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler
Obey
Olver
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Price (NC)
Rahall
Richardson
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sires
Snyder
Solis
Stupak
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—45

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Barrow | Johnson, Sam | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Costa | Kucinich | Schiff |
| Davis, Jo Ann | Lewis (CA) | Schwartz |
| Gallegly | Linder | Shimkus |
| Graves | Lipinski | Simpson |
| Grijalva | Lucas | Slaughter |
| Gutierrez | Marshall | Smith (WA) |
| Hastert | Mollohan | Souder |
| Hooley | Payne | Tancredo |
| Hulshof | Peterson (PA) | Taylor |
| Hunter | Pickering | Terry |
| Israel | Poe | Watson |
| Jindal | Pryce (OH) | Weller |
| Johnson (IL) | Royce | Wilson (NM) |
| Johnson, E. B. | Rush | Young (AK) |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1949

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. HIRONO and Ms. DELAURO changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCOTT of Georgia). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GEORGE MILLER of California, ANDREWS, SCOTT of Virginia, HINOJOSA, TIERNEY, WU, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. HIRONO, Messrs. ALTMIRE, YARMUTH, COURTNEY, MCKEON, KELLER of Florida, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. FOXX, Messrs. KUHL of New York, WALBERG, SOUDER, EHLERS, Mrs. BIGGERT and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

There was no objection.

## NOW IS THE TIME TO DECLARE A MILITARY VICTORY IN IRAQ

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the United States Government Accountability report, ''Securing, Stabilizing and Rebuilding Iraq.'' The Iraqi Government has not met most legislative security and economic benchmarks.

The President and Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense made a surprise visit to Anbar Province in Iraq. Out of their visit, I might imagine they would hope to have a counteroffensive against a number of hearings that the majority will be holding on the question of are we safer today than we were before the Iraq war. This report is both striking and provoking, provoking Americans to realize that the policy in Iraq has failed.

It is time now to declare a military success, a military victory. Our soldiers have done their job. They have created an opportunity for a democratic government in Iraq. But, unfortunately, the job that needs to be done by the Iraqi Government has not been done. There are no battalions that are ready to go on the ground.

So I will say to the administration, a surge will not work. Staying the course will not work. I ask that the troops be redeployed and a new direction be taken in Iraq.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from 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.)

## HONORING DR. JOHN FREIHAUT

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to honor a great friend and a colleague in the medical profession, Dr. John Freihaut, who passed away just before Congress broke for the August recess.

In addition to caring for the oral health of thousands of 11th District residents through his 27 years of private practice in Marietta, Georgia, the heart of my district, Dr. Freihaut held numerous positions in organized dentistry. Dr. Freihaut was a dedicated member of the 2007 Board of Directors of the American Dental Association's Political Action Committee where he insisted on attending meetings throughout his fight with cancer.

John also served as the president of the Georgia Dental Association from 2001 to 2002 and of the Georgia Society of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons between 1996 and 1998. Dr. Freihaut was named the Northwestern District Dental Society's Dentist of the Year in 2005. It was on these committees where Dr. Freihaut created his legacy.

Mr. Speaker, fighting for patients' rights in both State and Federal Government, John's dedication to his profession was unparalleled. During his life, John was one of the single-most significant advocates for the dental profession in the State of Georgia. In a State which has had one dentist and three physician Members of Congress, as well, of course, as our friend, the late Representative Dr. Charlie Norwood, and a recent American Dental Association president, John was still known as the State's dental expert and relied upon as an adviser to us all. I know that I sought John's expertise on several occasions throughout the years as I tried to make the best decisions for patients in the State of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, John was passionate about his family, his profession, and his responsibilities in life.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers go out to Dr. John Freihaut's family, and my thanks go to my friend, John, for his 25 years of dedication to improving the quality of health care in this country.

□ 2000

## IN MEMORY OF LEON SHULL, FORMER EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during the recess recently, one of the men from whom I learned a great deal, I hope with some impact about how to be a successful advocate for a better and fairer world, died.

Leon Shull had been, for many years, the executive director of Americans for Democratic Action. He had a passion for social justice which he combined with a clear-headedness about how to get there that was extraordinary.

Too often in our politics, we see a divide between the people with passion, the people with reason, people who feel very, very deeply about the need to correct injustice, and people who are able to calculate in a cool manner what types of political activity will be effective. Leon Shull was one of those rare people who combined both of them in a way that made each of those qualities more important. There wasn't any trade-off with Leon between his pragmatic and clear-headed political analysis and his strong idealism. His idealism and his pragmatism worked together. They strengthened each other.

He was determined to be effective because he felt that he had a moral obligation not simply to will a fairer world, a world with fewer poor children, a world with less discrimination based on race or gender or sexual orientation or religion, a world with less widespread killing for unjustified reasons; he felt the moral obligation to diminish those things to the extent that any one human being could. And because he felt morally obligated to do it, he knew he was morally obligated to be effective.

He worked with many people who would give in from time to time to that wonderful feeling of just lashing out, of just letting your emotions run. But he knew the work to which he was committed was too important for that, that he owed the children and the victims of racism and poor, elderly people and working people thrown out of jobs, people in other parts of this world living in dire poverty, he knew that he owed them not just goodwill, but a commitment to making their lives better.

He was for many years the leader of Americans for Democratic Action.

Americans for Democratic Action immediately after World War II under the leadership of Eleanor Roosevelt and John Kenneth Galbraith and Walter Reuther and others was a very important organization in which liberals fought a two-front ideologic war against conservatives who wanted to retreat from the New Deal on the one side and from Communists who were anti-democratic on the other.

As time went on, the Americans for Democratic Action, ADA as it is known, became less important, probably because the Democratic Party, I believe, moved more in that direction. But it was still important to have that organization then as it is now as an independent force, and Leon Shull kept that organization vibrant.

There is an expression used about boxers who are fighting in a weight class heavier than their own, that they are able to punch above their weight, that they have a strength and a physical ability that allows them to be competitive with people bigger and theoretically beyond their reach.

Leon Shull punched above his weight, and ADA under him punched above its weight. He was in this city for many years a beacon for those of us who believed that the liberal tenets of Franklin Roosevelt were still very relevant, that a wealthy society in the United States had both the obligation and the resources to diminish inequality, not to dispose of it altogether in a capitalistic system, but to diminish it.

Leon Shull was an ally of people fighting racism, of people fighting poverty, of people fighting unjust wars, of people fighting for rational environmental policy, of people fighting for free speech and fairness. And with all that, he was a gentle man. He was a fierce advocate of these policies, but in personal demeanor a man of gentleness, a man who inspired the love and affection of those who worked with him. In later years he retired and he moved away from Washington, and I saw much less of him.

Mr. Speaker, when I read of his death, I realized as I thought about it all that he is one of the people from whom I learned a great deal. To his wife, Anne, to his daughters and others who have lost this great man, I send my deepest sympathy; and to his memory I express my gratitude for being the model of an effective liberal.

## ILLUSORY PROGRESS IN IRAQ

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

Mr. WYNN. Good evening, Mr. Speaker. Last Friday, I had the unfortunate occasion to attend the funeral of Sergeant Princess Samuels, age 22, a graduate of Flowers High School in my district and one of the most recent casualties of our misadventure in Iraq.

I rise today to comment on what I consider to be a failed policy in Iraq, because she is only one of over 3,700 American soldiers who have been killed in Iraq. Meanwhile, 27,000 U.S. troops have been wounded in action, 12,000 of whom will not be able to return to action, and although we don't comment on it often, at least 50,000 Iraqis have been killed; 18,000 Iraqi civilians were killed in August alone.

It was very sad to be with the family of Sergeant Princess Samuels. Her mother, in an understandable note of bitterness, said that here she found herself prepared for a funeral while the Commander in Chief was preparing for a wedding for his daughter. Her anger was certainly understandable, and our sympathies and those of all us in the Fourth Congressional District go out to Ms. Samuels.

So I find it very unfortunate that we begin to hear comments such as ''the surge is working'' and that we need to ''stay the course.'' This is the wrong course. This is the wrong course. We need to stay engaged, but we need to move away from this military course.

Our troops have fought valiantly and they have done everything we have asked of them. They have done more. But, right now, the GAO report tells us that the strategy is flawed. You see, the strategy was to have a surge that would allow this government some breathing room, and in that breathing room they would have a reconciliation and begin to bring the various sectarian groups in Iraq together.

What we found from the GAO report is that that hasn't happened. The surge has only provided the illusion of progress. That is, if you put more troops in, you will reduce the casualties among those troops. But the fact is, the overall level of violence continues to be very high. The number of Iraqis killed remains about the same.

Now, last January the President laid out some benchmarks. He said that these ought to be completed, and this is why we are having the surge. The GAO report says only three of the 18 benchmarks have been met. Do the math: that means 15 have not been met.

These are not benchmarks that U.S. troops, no matter how valiant, can achieve. These are political benchmarks that this Iraqi Government has failed to achieve. The number of daily attacks over the last 6 months is about the same. In fact, the number of Iraqi army units capable of independent operation has actually decreased. And what we find is insurgents frequently work with the Iraqi police and military forces based on common sectarian ties.

There is an interesting article in The Washington Post today. Our U.S. troops are pinned down in a section of west Baghdad and they are calling for relief from Iraqi troops. The relief did not come. Why? Because the Iraqi troops were in league with the Shiite militia in that area and they did not respond. Fortunately, our American troops were able to reach cover and survive, but the story illustrates another failure that is occurring in Iraq as the so-called security forces that we are trying to prop up were in fact working with our enemies. The policy is not working.

We can't continue this policy. We need a new direction. We need to look to diplomacy as a way to resolve this problem. People say, well, if we withdraw U.S. troops, there is going to be a blood bath. There is a bloodbath now.

The fact of the matter is if U.S. troops withdraw, one of the major catalysts for violence will be removed from the situation. We will then be in a position to support diplomatic efforts, peace initiatives by Muslim countries, by the U.N., by internationally recognized military leaders. Sometimes this country has an arrogance and believes that we are the only ones that can promote peace. I disagree. I believe that other countries, Muslim countries, other people can also promote peace. And I also believe that they want peace, and given supportive conditions, they can in fact create peace.

I think we have to accept the fact that the surge gives an illusion of success, but the overall policy has not worked, because the GAO reported the benchmarks haven't been met, and it is time to move in a new direction. I also noted today the British, our allies in this adventure, have already begun to leave Basra, leaving the cities in the hands of the Iraqi security.

The point is, everyone but this administration realizes we need a new direction. I hope the administration will look at the GAO report and conclude, as it has, that this policy is a failure and that we need a new policy in Iraq.

## ENDING THE MADNESS IN IRAQ

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, there will be a great debate in Congress in the coming days about the administration's escalation strategy in Iraq. The administration has been trying during this time to influence that debate by launching a saturation public relations campaign designed to convince us that the escalation is working. Before the debate in Congress begins, however, it is really important for every Member of this House to know the facts; and the truth is the escalation is not working. It is failing. Here are the facts:

First, this summer has been the bloodiest summer of the occupation for American troops since the occupation began. Between June and August, 261 of our brave troops died. Over the same three months last year, 169 died. That is too many, absolutely; but it is a 54 percent increase this year over last year.

Second, the escalation has been deadly for U.S. troops ever since it began: 654 U.S. troops were killed between February, when the escalation began,

and this August. That is 63 percent more than over the same period last year.

Third, the escalation has been a disaster for the Iraqi people. Over 5,000 more Iraqi civilians were killed between the start of the escalation in February and this August than died over the same period last year; and according to news reports, the number of internally displaced Iraqis has more than doubled since the escalation began, from 500,000 to 1.1 million refugees.

Next, despite the administration's claims of progress on security, the Government Accountability Office has reported that average daily attacks against civilians have remained unchanged, unchanged, since the escalation began and that the Iraqi Government has failed to meet most of its key benchmarks for military and political progress. A National Intelligence Estimate describes the Iraqi leaders as unable to govern effectively and that the Iraqi Government's ability to bring about political reconciliation is likely to become even more precarious.

Fifth, and finally, the statement on Monday that the administration might, might, might, that ''might'' is the operative word, might consider bringing a few troops home, I believe that was a brazen political maneuver designed to give Members of Congress who are needing a reason to stay the course a way out.

Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous that the administration is playing politics with the lives of our troops and with the emotions of their families. But their real goal couldn't be clearer: General Petraeus told a congressional delegation that went to Iraq in August that American troops will have to be in Iraq for 9 or 10 more years. I doubt that even the White House's most ardent supporters want the occupation to continue for another 10 years. Yet, incredibly, that could be the plan.

We can only come to one conclusion, which is that under the administration's leadership, there is no light at the end of this tunnel. There will be more deaths, more wounded, more refugees and more destruction, with absolutely no end in sight. Meanwhile, our standing in the world will continue to deteriorate. The terrorists will continue to hatch their plots against us in their safe havens far from Iraq, and the occupation will continue to rob our Treasury of the resources we desperately need for healthcare, for education, for infrastructure, for energy independence, for the environment and real homeland security.

The administration will never end the madness in Iraq. The American people have called upon Congress to do it, and history will judge each of us by how we answer that call.

□ 2015

## ADDRESSING THE MURDERS OF WOMEN IN CIUDAD JUAREZ

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss recent efforts to address the ongoing murders of the women of Ciudad Juarez in Mexico, located just 5 minutes from our border near El Paso.

Over the past 14 years, well over 400 women, and I mean young women and girls, have been slaughtered, brutally murdered or raped in the city of Ciudad Juarez. I hold up this poster here tonight to show you the list of over 400 names of young women whose bodies have either not been found or identified, but we know have been missing, many who were those victims that were found slaughtered in the streets of Mexico. These are the names of young women who were taken from their families too soon. In fact, the profile of many of these young girls is within the age range of 15 to 20.

Slender with long black hair, olive skin, many working in the heart of Ciudad Juarez in what we call maquiladoras. Those are American-run corporations where many of these women were forced to work to help provide for their families.

The fact remains that many of these murders still remain unsolved. Many of these women were put on a track to work four different shifts. Given if you have a young woman or child working on a shift from 12 midnight to 8 in the morning, how was she transported there? Were there any security protections put in place to protect her? Was law enforcement aware and knowingly, maybe somehow acknowledged that these murders were taking place but did nothing?

That is why we are crying out today, along with the families of Ciudad Juarez and along with those families I represent in my own district. I was reminded that there are some relatives who were murdered. In fact, one young man whose cousin was missing went to Mexico to find out what happened. When he began inquiring about that particular case, the police there informed him that he should stay away and not ask questions and inquire about his cousin. Well, he didn't just leave it there. He kept insisting on finding out what the facts were and why this death was not given the full extent and force of the law. Evidently, at that point the police said, if you do not stay away, you will be the one that will end up in jail. And sure enough, that is what happened.

It is unfortunate that laws there are not given the same kind of credibility that we have here in the U.S. I cry out here with my friends and families because we are saying that the U.S.-Mexican Government has to do something.

After the recent election of President Calderon, he states that he is going to do everything he can in his power to provide enforcement of laws that protect women against violence, yet we still have not seen enough done where we find the culprits who have been involved in these vicious murders over the last few years. Given he has just recently been elected and has spoken about bringing his office behind the enforcement of violence against women, he has even helped to try to enact legislation to do that, but every single state in Mexico has to adopt those provisions and those codes. What I am finding is that many of those states in Mexico are not following along that line.

I have to ask myself, when we can help women in Iraq and Afghanistan who have been murdered by the Taliban, why can we not ask for the same kind of respect and dignity from our partners in the south, from Mexico. I know this is not a partisan issue. Here in the House we were able to send a letter to President Calderon. In fact, 90 Members of the House signed onto the letter, and I thank the subcommittee Chair, Mr. ENGEL, of the Foreign Affairs Committee on this particular area, and also DAN BURTON, for being so gracious and helping to support this resolution passed by this House, H. Con. Res. 90, and also a letter that we recently sent to President Calderon.

I ask that the House speak up about this issue because this continues to go on. In fact, I was pleased we had a delegation go down 2 years ago to visit alongside the border and meet with the families and meet with public officials and ask why there was nothing being done to help expedite these cases. In fact, our government went as far as to even provide assistance through USAID to have forensic experts come in to help identify the cadavers of these young women. I believe there are 79, maybe more now, cadavers that have not been identified.

Families have contacted me and other Members of Congress asking for help on our side because we have the tools and instruments to do that. I know this country has the goodwill and can do some things, but I am also pleading to those parliamentarians and to the President of Mexico to do the same thing. While he is asking for us to help in immigration reform, which I am strongly supportive of, I also ask him to do what he can to help with law enforcement, with reform, and also to help expedite those cases that still have to be processed, and would ask that our Congress also support the continuance of oversight on this particular issue for the women and families of Ciudad Juarez.

---

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 South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

(Mr. SARBANES 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.)

## IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for recognizing me for this hour. We are up here this evening because I have had a chance to go to Iraq recently, and some of the things that I have heard in the House just a few minutes ago don't ring up with what I observed when I was in Iraq.

But I want to start off by saying this: When I went back home this past month, all over my district the main thing I heard from the people on Iraq, get the politics out of it and just tell us the truth of what you know and let us try to figure it all out together, and why don't we try to figure this out together instead of thinking about who is going to win the next election or who is going to get the next advantage in the political process. I kept hearing that over and over.

I want to get up, and some of my colleagues tonight are going to talk about what they know. Some of them have a lot more wisdom than I do because they have been there more times than I have and have had more experiences.

My experience is relatively limited. I have been to Iraq four times since I have been in Congress, the last time being late in the month of July. I went on a long weekend to Iraq. So I was there the first time right after we caught Saddam Hussein. The second time I was there was just before the elections took place. The third time was May a year ago when we were pondering what to do and there was discussion of Petraeus having a plan. And then recently this July.

I can tell you that the difference between May and July is the difference between daylight and dark as far as the comments that I received from American fighting men and women and from Iraqis that I visited with while I was there for what was just a real long weekend.

Soldiers are always proud of their mission and accept their mission, and they do their mission and duty and we should always be proud of them. But you didn't hear the kind of comments that we have heard now about the enthusiasm that our soldiers have for the fact that ordinary Iraqi citizens, as we say in baseball, are stepping up to the plate and they are taking a swing, and that swing is helping our soldiers and our marines as they do their duty to try to eliminate al Qaeda from being that thorn in the side of Iraqi freedom that is causing the ultimate cause of all of this violence that is going on in Iraq.

Someone here tonight said there is brazen political maneuvers. Well, what I am saying has nothing to do with politics. It has to do with the fact that within my district, I have 52,000 soldiers who reside within my district, all of whom have been deployed at least once and some as many as three times in Iraq. I have the largest military facility that exists in the United States, Fort Hood.

Our guys told us a lot of good news, and I will report the bad news. The bad news they told us is that 15 months is tough and it is hard on their families and they hope we can get this mission done so we don't have to continue 15-month rotations.

So I don't come back just preaching good news. Our military, our soldiers don't like the 15-month rotation, but they do their duty. But time and time again I had soldiers tell me: Man, whatever you do, don't pull the rug out from under us just as we are starting to see daylight. We are committed in blood, sweat and tears over here, and the Nation has committed its resources and we are seeing the light at the end of the tunnel. Don't pull out the rug now. If you do, don't ask me to come back when this place goes to hell in a handbasket. That is a quote from a sergeant.

We have to think about this. We have big decisions to make this fall. General Petraeus is going to come over here, and he will tell us the truth about what is going on, and I don't think it is all going to be a beautiful, rosy picture. But I do think he is going to tell you what ordinary soldiers and ordinary marines told me, and that is, as compared to 6 to 9 months ago, it is substantially better. It has to do with the fact that we now have the necessary troops on the ground.

I would like to correct an error that a general asked me to correct. The surge did not start in February of this year. The surge was announced. The surge started the second week in July of this year. That is when the entire 30,000-soldier contingency was in Iraq, and at that point in time the plan began to be executed.

But the idea that we were building up troops brought good news. The surge is now less than 6 weeks old. That's the truth about what the surge is. In fact, one of the people who is in charge of bringing these additional forces to Iraq told me, he said: You know, I hear you are having votes to pull out in 2 weeks or 2 months. Well, just tell somebody it took us a hard 6 months to get 30,000 soldiers over here, and if you think you can move 160,000 out of here in 120 days, you have lost your mind. It can't be done.

The reality of that war is they come over there on ships, and just like they did in the Second World War, they train before they go in, and when they are ready, they go in. And the whole 30,000 finally arrived in July.

So the picture, as I see it, is good news because of Iraqi involvement, and we will talk some more about that. Right now I would like to recognize CHRIS SHAYS, my colleague who has probably been to Iraq more than any Member of this Congress. Congressman SHAYS, do you want to share your feelings.

Mr. SHAYS. I appreciate you holding this very important dialogue about Iraq. I appreciate your taking this Special Order to share what many of us have seen in Iraq.

I want to say that I go where the truth takes me, even if it counters something I believed and thought. I just go where the truth takes us. There is no question that 2003 was not a good year. When we attacked Iraq, there was tremendous euphoria and then we made mistake after mistake after mistake. Those have already been discussed. Half of 2004 wasn't particularly good, but when we transferred power to the new Iraqi Government, the Iraqi people, we began to see noticeable changes.

And then 2005 was a pretty amazing year. They had an election to create a government that would form a constitutional convention. They met the deadline to form a constitutional convention. They wrote their Constitution and adopted it in a plebiscite throughout Iraq, and then they elected a government under that new Constitution. So 2005 was a pretty astonishing year, a very successful year.

They basically had 18 months of progress from the deep hole we dug in

2003 and part of 2004, and then came 2006. It took them 4 months to establish a government, and then the Maliki government didn't do the kind of heavy lifting we were hoping they would do.

□ 2030

I took a position that I took then and hold today, that we need to prod the Maliki government. I believe the timeline is important, but not a timeline based on basically pulling the rug out from them and just leaving. We attacked them. They didn't attack us. We got rid of all their army, their police and their border patrol. We left them totally defenseless in a country where all their prisoners were let out, and then we would walk away? The neighbors to Iraq said we may not have wanted you to go in, in fact, said we did not want you to go in, but it would be an outrage if you left. And so now this is where we're at. Do we leave now? Do we leave sometime in the future? What do we do?

I think that what we knew we needed to do was have a new Secretary of Defense. That's what the American people asked. That's what some of us wanted to see happen, and we got someone who wasn't tied to the past in Mr. Gates. Then I think all of us were hoping and praying that Mr. Petraeus would be the general in charge to serve under Secretary of Defense Mr. Gates. General Petraeus who had been there three times, been involved in this effort, and knows Iraq cold and knows the insurgency concerns extraordinarily well, given that he spent a year of his life just studying it. He basically said, give me more people to see what we could do in the greater Baghdad area. It was referred to as ''the surge.'' He said give me more troops; we need to establish some security, and then we'll reappraise. And now we're coming to that point.

When I was there in December last year, they said we have lost Anbar province. We've just given up on it. We have no troops. It's totally in the hands of al Qaeda, and it sounded to me like a mini-Afghanistan. I go back in April. He said, we're winning Anbar province. I said, what do you mean you are winning Anbar province? You told me you'd given up on it. Well, the Sunni tribal leaders came to us, said we want al Qaeda defeated, we want your help, come on in and we will work with you.

That's what happened. It was a model that wasn't part of the surge, but then when I went back in May, he said the surge is working; we're starting to see some progress from the full complement in July. And when I went back this past August, they said the story is the surge is continuing to go in the right direction, and we have won Anbar province, and we are winning some of the other Sunni provinces. The tribal leaders have bought in to what happened in Anbar and said we want the same thing.

It's almost like, to some of my colleagues in this Chamber, that to say the surge is working and to say that there is progress, it's like they're angry and disappointed: how dare you say that. You had Mr. BAIRD, a Democrat, who voted against going into Iraq, who said what he saw, and he goes where the truth takes him, was that there is progress, and it would be a mistake to leave prematurely.

So this is what we're going to be debating. Do we leave right now or leave by April of next year or do we maintain the surge a little longer? We know we're ultimately going to bring a good number of our troops home. We can't maintain that surge, and Mr. CARTER's right. I have heard more of my constituents who serve in the military and those who don't, who I've met in Iraq. They said we could accept 12 months. Fifteen months is just too much. And I've had parents, they've come up to me, and they never did this in the past. They kind of put their arm around me. They whisper in my ear practically, and they say, my son or my daughter is in Iraq and they're exhausted.

We know that we have to reduce the workload of these troops. We have to start to tell Prime Minister Maliki what he needs to know, and I'll conclude by making this point: we can lecture Prime Minister Maliki all we want. We can do that if we don't mind being the biggest hypocrites around. So why would I say that? Well, we say, why don't you Sunni, Shias and Kurds get your act together, and I'm thinking, Republicans and Democrats can't even work together on this.

We have asked our Democratic colleagues to allow for some amendments, bipartisan amendments, amendments that would have support on both sides of the aisle. They don't want it. They have simply refused to allow any Republican amendment or any amendment that even their own side wants that would have attraction to Republican Members.

Too many on that side of the aisle want to continue to make this a partisan issue when the fact is we went into Iraq on a bipartisan basis, two-thirds of the House of Representatives, three-quarters of the Senate. The only way we're going to successfully disengage in a way that will enable the Iraqis to stand on their own and bring our troops home is if we do it on a bipartisan basis. I'm prepared to vote for some things that I don't want if it is a bipartisan effort that will ultimately lead to some common ground.

So I just want to say that it strikes me that we ask our troops to risk their lives. They have one request from us, that we, Republicans and Democrats, start working together for the common good of this country. That's their one request, and it strikes me that when we lecture Prime Minister Maliki, he's trying to run a government by consensus, Sunni, Shias and Kurds, all agreeing to take action. He could cut out the Sunnis and just simply agree with the Kurds, and they could run the government. The Shias and Kurds, they could get their more than 50 percent vote, but he is making a sincere effort to try to find common ground.

I thank my colleague for having this Special Order. I'd like to listen to my other colleagues, maybe jump back in, but my report to this Congress is this surge is working. My report to this Congress is that the tribal Sunni leaders that have asked us to help have seen a tremendous benefit in their provinces, and that has benefited them. It's benefited the Iraqi people, and it's benefited our troops. And so I can't say what will happen two months from now or four months from now; but as God is my witness, we are seeing progress in Iraq, as much as some of my colleagues don't want me to say that.

Mr. CARTER. Well, I thank my colleague for those very, very intelligent comments and for your experience. How many trips have you made?

Mr. SHAYS. I go every 3 to 4 months, and I've been there 18 times.

Mr. CARTER. Eighteen times. Well, my little four don't sound like a whole lot.

Mr. SHAYS. Well, you've been going more recently. I got elected before you.

Mr. CARTER. Well, that's true. I want to thank you and I'm sure our soldiers want to thank you, too.

The trip that I was on, I had some wonderful Members of Congress who are here. A couple of them are here tonight. My friend Mr. DAVIS from Tennessee was there with us, and I believe that was his first trip to Iraq. I would like to yield to Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank my friend from Texas for yielding and thank you for giving me the opportunity to visit Iraq.

Being from Tennessee, the Volunteer State, I volunteered to visit the men and women in uniform in Iraq. I wasn't disappointed. Our troops are well trained, well motivated, and successful.

After the fall of Saddam, the Iraqi people had a choice to make. They have lived for decades under totalitarian rule. Over the past 4 years, they've been divided and, quite frankly, confused about who their friends and allies really are. Is it the radical extremists such as al Qaeda or is it us?

During my visit to Iraq, I visited Ramadi, which until a few months ago was a killing field. For the past 4 years, the people of Ramadi were caught in a decision-making battle of which group, us or the extremists, offered them the best chance for a normal and free future.

The insurgent extremist chose to win the local people over with the use of force, force against their American troops and against any local who did not support their radical agenda. Our troops, on the other hand, have reached out in friendship and support.

The local people, seeing the difference, have chosen to have their lives returned to normal and live in freedom. Therefore, Ramadi has gone from a city of death and destruction to one of

rebuilding and hope. I was able to see it firsthand during my visit in July.

As I walked throughout the busy city market, it was very uplifting to see the local people interacting with our American troops in a very positive way. Now that the surge is under way, our troops are actually living in the city as trusted friends and allies. We're working with the local mayor and his directors to rebuild and totally rejuvenate the city. The city of Ramadi is located in al Anbar, a city that Chris just mentioned moments ago as being a lost hope at the end of the year.

Of course, these relationships take time to develop, but the time and effort are worth it. Helping the Iraqi people secure their freedom helps us to defeat global extremists and, therefore, secure our own freedoms for generations to come.

We have to be successful as well. Ronald Reagan once said, ''We win, they lose.'' If we choose not to succeed, that statement will be just the opposite: we lose, they win.

You may ask, who are they and why does it matter to me anyway? They are not the Iraqi people. I had the opportunity to meet with some of them during my visit. The Iraqi people are really no different than any of us. They want to live in a secure and safe country, have a job to go to in the mornings, be able to clothe and feed their families, walk across the street without fear of being shot or blown up, find reasonable health care, and to worship freely. These are the same things that any American mother and father would want for their children.

So who are our enemy in Iraq and other parts of the world? They're radical extremists who are willing to kill innocent men, women and even children to spread their ideology of hate.

We, the American people, have been lulled into believing that this is the President's war on the Iraqi people. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Iraqi people and the Iraqi Government see us as liberators from an oppressive regime, but they are just now learning how to live as a free people. Our common enemy do not want them to live free and productive lives. That would go against their ideology of hate, an ideology that they want to spread around the world, perhaps to a neighborhood near you.

We cannot let that happen. We either win and they lose, or they win and we lose. That is too big a price to pay. This Congress owes it to everyone involved to succeed, from the Iraqi people to our brave men and women in uniform who are serving on the frontlines of battle, to the American people. We cannot afford to lose. The price is too high and the cost is too much. Freedom isn't free. It has to be earned. It has to be cherished.

We're in a fight for the generations that will come after us. This battle isn't about a small hot desert land somewhere in the Middle East that most Americans will never visit or even easily find on a globe. This battle is about our future and that of our children and grandchildren.

We want the same things for our children that Iraqi mothers and fathers do for their children. We want to live in a secure and safe country, to have a job to go to in the mornings, be able to clothe and feed our families, walk across the street without having the fear of being blown up or shot, find reasonable health care and to worship freely. But our enemy, the radical extremists, want to deny us and our future generations those freedoms. They have proved it time and time again: for instance, the Iranian hostage crisis in 1979 where 52 Americans were held for 444 days, or the bombing of the Marine Corps barracks in Beirut where 241 marines lost their lives in 1983, or the first bombing of the World Trade Center in 1993, or the attack on the USS *Cole* claiming the lives of 17 sailors, or the deadly attack on September 11, where almost 3,000 Americans died.

We can either choose to fight and win the battle now or choose to lose the battle now and leave it for our children to fight.

A sentiment relayed to me by a general in Iraq was very simple, and it drove this point home. Our men and women in uniform are not fighting only for the 8-year-old Iraqi child and their security but also for the 8-year-old American child and for their current and future security and freedom. We do not want them to grow up to have to fight this battle that we chose not to finish.

As I mentioned, our enemy has proven they're dedicated and willing to shed American blood on American soil. Do we really want to tie our hands to the point that we encourage failure over success in Iraq in this global war on terror? Do we really want to live in an America where our future generations have to fear going to the park, going to the mall, going to school or to work? I don't think so and I sure hope not.

□ 2045

The choice is ours today. The American people, when provided with the facts, will choose freedom and security every time. I say, we win, they lose. The cost to the American family is just too great to allow any other outcome.

May God bless America and keep her strong and secure for generations to come.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my colleague from Tennessee. We had a great experience on that trip.

One of my good buddies up here and colleagues is PHIL GINGREY from Georgia. Congressman GINGREY has a more recent trip than the trip I was on in July. I believe Congressman GINGREY just got back a couple weeks ago.

So he will tell us about his experience on a trip that took place early in August and let him tell us what he saw and how he feels about things.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman, my good friend from Texas.

It is indeed an honor to be a part of this special leadership hour to share a little time with my colleagues, of course, Judge Carter leading the hour; CHRIS SHAYS, the gentleman from Connecticut, 18 trips to the Middle East, to some extent in harm's way.

I saw a couple of years ago, maybe it was 3 years ago, just happened to be channel surfing, watching C–SPAN. I guess I am an insomniac. There was CHRIS SHAYS having a town hall meeting talking to his constituents from Connecticut and taking some tough, the tough questions about this situation in the Middle East and why it was important and why he supported it. He outlined tonight the fact that he doesn't look at these things through rose-colored glasses. He understands that mistakes were made. We all do, but the mission is the mission.

He went on and talked about this surge and why it's so important that every Member on both sides of the aisle give it a chance to work. Judge Carter said the same thing, pointed out that this surge of 30,000 troops wasn't even complete until the beginning of July. Yet, many of our colleagues, unfortunately, it seemed like most of them on the other side of the aisle, wanted to declare that the new way forward was a failure before it even started, before it had even begun.

I remember back when I first came, I had the honor to come to this body with some of my colleagues that are here tonight on the floor, and people saying, well, you know, this mistake, the big mistake is we didn't put enough troops on the ground. I guess that's what General Shinseki had recommended. My Democrat colleagues kept pounding away, well, we didn't have enough troops.

Then when the President, based really on the report of the Iraq Study Group, two of the most distinguished public servants in the Federal Government that any of us know, James Baker, Lee Hamilton, a Republican and a Democrat, came and said, you know, we need a surge of troops, that's exactly what the President did. And then my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle, most of them, not all, said, too little, too late.

How do you satisfy some folks? I listened very carefully, of course, to my good friend and colleague, a freshman, but he seemed so much more experienced, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID DAVIS), talking about if we lose, they win. He is absolutely right. That just is so simple but yet so profound, and I really compliment the gentleman from Tennessee making his first trip and having that insight, that wisdom we all pray for. That's what we need for us to win.

Indeed, this is tough; it's not easy. But I heard some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle during the 5-minute remarks tonight, I heard the gentlelady from California say it was unconscionable that the President is playing politics with the war in Iraq;

yet she, as a cofounder of the Out of Iraq Caucus, and many of her colleagues voted in favor before the August recess of every one of these, let's see if we can tie General Petraeus' hands behind his back.

So, surely they don't want us to do poorly in Iraq. Surely not. I don't suggest that. But I just remind them that this Commander in Chief, I may not agree with him on every single thing. I think the issue of stem cell research is something I support him on. Some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle do not. His thoughts about a comprehensive immigration reform that includes what I think is amnesty, I don't support him on. Some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle do. But I can I think in the final analysis, this President, it may take 25 years, it may take 50 years, but I believe people will look back and say thank God that this man was in this place at this time after 9/11 and had the courage to stand up to finally say, you know, double-dog daring and triple-dog daring doesn't work.

Mr. DAVIS talked about the marine barracks and the USS Cole and the hostages in Iran for the 400 and something days, the 52 hostages. This President, this Commander in Chief had the courage to stand strong.

Now, my colleague just mentioned I had gotten back from Iraq, my fourth trip. I will probably never catch Mr. SHAYS. But each and every trip, honestly, I think I learn more and more. I want my colleagues to understand that. These trips, I hope the American people will listen. These trips are bipartisan. We go and, you know, we hear the facts. And the old saying, you are entitled to your own opinion, but you are not entitled to your own facts.

But I feel very strongly that General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker are going to come back and come to us as required by law, which we insisted on September 15, at least by that date, maybe a little bit before that date, and give us an accurate, fair, balanced report.

They are not going to try to paint this picture too bright. They are going to be accurate. I have said all along, we need to wait for that report before we all try to become 535 commanders in chief, many of us, including myself, who are not even veterans.

So I was very encouraged, I said to my colleague, Representative CARTER, on my trip, I think the troops are strong, absolutely. As Representative SHAYS said, they get weary, the families get weary. The American public is a little impatient. I understand that. War fatigue does set in. But this is not the time to give up. This is the time to be tough, stand strong and give victory a chance, because Mr. DAVIS said, if we don't, they win. The consequences of that are unfathomable.

As I conclude my remarks, I also want to say to a group of marines from my district, NAS Atlanta, deployed this morning, some of them for the third time. This is the ''Red Dogs'' HMLA–773, a squadron of 255 marines. They are helicopter guys, Mr. Speaker, and they are light attack helicopters. They are going to be in a situation there at the al Assad Air Base. The President just made the trip over Labor Day weekend to meet with the troops. That's where they are going.

I saw them with their families, with their wives, with their little infant children. In one case, a little baby 2 weeks old was there in his mother's arms. There were cousins, there were aunts, there were uncles, and there were brothers and sisters and grandparents. It humbled me to stand among these heroes as I talked with them and told them how much, how deeply I think Members on both sides of the aisle appreciate their dedicated service to this country.

I wish them Godspeed and hope they will come back safe and sound to their loved ones.

But not one of them wavered, even though this may have been their second or third deployment. They are still strong, and that's the same thing that I saw when I went to Iraq on this recent trip.

God bless them. Let's hang in there for a little while longer. Then we are going to hear from General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker on September 15, and it will be an encouraging bit of news.

Mr. CARTER. I told everybody about that trip to Iraq. The man who led that trip to Iraq is here, Congressman MIKE BURGESS, one of my classmates, came into Congress with me. He is from the great State of Texas, the northern part of our State, from the Dallas-Ft. Worth-Denton area.

Congressman BURGESS was the leader of our group that went over for our long weekend. Congressman BURGESS may tell us about the trip and has pictures to look at.

Mr. BURGESS. Let me respectfully point out we call that the Dallas-Ft. Worth area back where I come from.

I am going to reiterate many of the points that have already been made tonight. It's hard to not cover ground that's already been covered.

This was my sixth trip to the country of Iraq. I was there a year ago. We went in July, toward the end of July, a weekend trip, as Mr. CARTER already pointed out. I didn't know it was possible to do a weekend trip to Baghdad but, indeed, it is if the circumstances are correct.

The year before I was there and heard about some of the things that were happening in a hospital, a little town called Ramadi. General Peter Chiarelli, as I recall, said, I am not sure what this means and probably too early to talk about it, but it seems as if we have been invited into the hospital, which was one of the main headquarters of the insurgents, the Sunni insurgents there in Ramadi, and the building was turned over without firing a shot.

A year later, the situation is completely reversed, and Ramadi was so stable that not only could we talk about visiting it, we, indeed, did visit. It is that trip that really embodies the success that has occurred and, largely, the success that has occurred since beginning the additional troop strength in February and, of course, the ascension of General David Petraeus to be the commander of the forces in Iraq.

The fact is, I don't think you can deny that significant successes have been made and they continue to occur on an ongoing basis, returning control of the country to the Iraqi Government and to its people and delivering it out of the hands of criminals and murderers. But I don't think any of us would disagree. It's still a very dangerous situation and the sacrifice that's being made by all participants in the country is very, very real.

It is my opinion, and I spoke on the floor of this House right before we had the decision to support the President on the surge, it is my opinion that it is in America's broad interest that we be successful in this endeavor. It is also my opinion that it is, indeed, possible for us to be successful.

Nothing that I saw on this trip would discourage me from either one of those points. It is my opinion that a stable country in Iraq, with a representational government that's able to act as a partner in peace in the Middle East, would be vastly preferable to a lawless land ruled by terrorists, criminals, with sources and training capabilities where they would be able to expand their activities, not just to other areas of Iraq but, indeed, to other areas of the Middle East and, indeed, to other areas of the world.

Almost without question, the divergent future, the potential divergent future of that country was on the minds of almost everyone we encountered during that very brief 2-day trip. Certainly America's interest is going to be best served by stability in the country and their active participation in quieting a very troubled region.

In July of 2006, there was no way that we could have taken a congressional delegation into Ramadi. It would have been too dangerous, and we would have been turned down had we asked. But this time we got off of the C–130 in Baghdad and loaded onto the Black Hawk helicopters, and we were taken to Ramadi.

We met with the soldiers there. We met with the soldiers of the II Marine Expeditionary Force, which are part of the surge. General Gaston, who I believe is on the pictures with President Bush over the weekend, was part of that briefing that we had there, met the mayor, met the health minister.

The mayor of Ramadi sounded like a mayor in any one of the 60 cities that are in my district. He said, I need more Federal money. By the way, if you come back and visit next year, this place is really going to be something, so plan on coming back and spending some money when you get here. He sounded like a combination mayor and

chamber of commerce guy, but he really believed in what he was doing.

I guess, of all of the things that I didn't expect to find when I got to Iraq this time, it was that slow building of the institutions of local government, which previously had been lacking, that building of the institutions of government at the local level, which heretofore I had not witnessed on any of the trips that I had made to Iraq. That was the thing that probably gives me the most hope for what the overall future for that country may entail.

□ 2100

When we got to Ramadi, we had our briefings. We had our visits with the health director and the mayor. And then we went downtown. We went to an area that previously was involved in very, very heavy ground fire and ground fighting for the control of that city.

Remember, Ramadi is a city about the size of Fort Worth, Texas. It's about 400,000 to 500,000 people. It was designated to be the provincial capitol of the resurgent caliphate in western Iraq.

Well, we walked through the market, and it looks like a very normal market in a Middle Eastern country. And you can see the look on the faces of the people there. They're curious about people walking through their market. Clearly, we did not look like we were typical shoppers. But you see the faces of the children there, inquisitive and friendly.

A lot of stuff available for sale there, much more than I would have thought in an area that had been recently so hard pressed.

One of the very striking things to me again is the faces of the children, very energetic, very engaged, very trusting. These two young men came right up to us. I think they were interested in if we had any pens or quarters. Clearly, the close association with the American military has taught them a few things about life in this country.

But clearly, a very different picture on the street in Ramadi than you would have encountered a year ago.

From a military perspective, there's no question that success has been made and continues to be made on a near daily basis. The primary enemy, which is al Qaeda in Iraq, has not only been beaten but they've been vanquished every time there is an encounter. Al Qaeda has now about three options: they can move, communicate, or shoot. And if they do any one of those three things, they are met by our military, and they are dispatched.

Because of the increased military presence of our troops in Iraq, the confrontations are more frequent, and you see that reflected in statistics coming out of that country.

From the government perspective, there's not a Sunday morning that goes by that we don't hear someone complain about the government in Iraq, and I'll do the same thing. It's astounding to me that a country that young, a government that young can already have entrenched bureaucracies that exist within it. Iraq has a very centralized government.

But, again, I would stress the building up of the work that's going on currently of that sort of bottom-up work of building governments does seem to be a cause for some optimism.

Probably this conflict, unlike any other in our Nation's history, there are data points which are distributed all over the map. And anybody can take a handful of those data points and make whatever conclusion, draw whatever conclusion they have in their mind to make. It is going to take a lot more discipline for this body to look at the trends, analyze the data trends, look at the trend lines. But that's a discipline that we just have to undertake. There are people in the field who are counting on us to be able to make that rational, dispassionate assessment of trend lines; and it is the obligation of Congress to follow through on that.

There have been two or three years of serious brutality at the hands of al Qaeda, and this population now sees Americans as helpers and protectors. The tribal leaders that originally feared that the Americans would be occupiers quickly came to understand that the Americans have no such interest, but the same could not be said for the al Qaeda interests. Their clear intent was to hold territory for their own purposes for the foreseeable future.

The point was made over and over again on our trip that there is no easy, there is no overnight solution to the problems that confront us in Iraq. Unfortunately, leadership cannot be bought, and it has to be grown. It has to be part of an evolutionary change. But it can occur if the right environment is provided and appropriate, but not indefinite, time is given to develop those institutions of government.

Everything we have asked of our military they have delivered, they have produced for us. What we have asked of the Iraqi Government is still a work in progress, and we've set a pretty high bar. And it's a much shorter time frame than even our own country had available to it.

I think of the Articles of Confederation that ultimately led up to the Constitution. What if someone had said to us, time's up, and you've just got to get it done?

With continued pushing on the Iraqi Government and the recognition that there are cultural challenges before them, I am hopeful that it can mature into a stable partner for peace in the Middle East.

My opinion, my conclusion is that our presence in Iraq is still necessary. It's necessary for America's interests, not for Iraq's interests. I've said, and I think everyone in our group said every time we'd sit down with representatives from one of the ministries, you've got to show some evidence of success. You've got to achieve some benchmarks.

I think when we met with Dr. Sharistani, the oil minister, it's probably most evident. They've got problems in trying to achieve these benchmarks. Not every country that surrounds them is interested in Iraq being successful. Yeah, we all know about Iran and their influence; read more about it today. We all know about Syria and their influence.

But what about the Saudis? Do they have an interest in perhaps not getting that oil revenue sharing law passed? Well, this was brought up to us. It would have never occurred to me that this might be an obstacle to getting that law passed and enacted, but apparently there are some forces, and maybe even just some media forces within that country that work in a detrimental way to that kind of progress. But progress has to come and it has to be clearly evident for those on the outside. We perhaps have asked them to achieve the impossible in such a short time frame. But, again, many of us here tonight have made multiple trips to Iraq. Every trip I've made, I have seen progress, evidence of significant progress since the trip before. And I have no doubt that that progress has continued since our trip there the latter part of July.

Again, my opinion: it is in America's interest that we be successful. And to answer the question, is success still a possibility, I don't think there's any question after this last trip. The answer to that is a resounding yes.

I'll yield back to the gentleman from Texas, and I truly appreciate him calling this Special Order tonight.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend for his comments tonight. He led a really great congressional delegation over there.

My friend from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) is here. He just came in. And I would like to hear what he has to say about his experience in dealing with this issue of the war in Iraq. I yield whatever time he may consume.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Texas, for yielding time.

Let me start by saying, first, I want to thank our troops, our embassy personnel, State Department personnel and all their families for the sacrifices that they've dealt with as we've dealt with this problem in Iraq, this challenge that we're faced with.

I've come away from a trip just this past week and recognize that I truly believe that General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker are going to come forward with a very independent, unvarnished report about what's going on in Iraq. We're going to see what's working and what's not working, and I appreciate that. And I think that's going to be the most important report that this Congress will look at to determine how do we move forward; what steps should we take as a Congress with this situation in Iraq.

With that having been said, this past year was very difficult. We saw a lot of

violence. I know at the beginning of 2006, Iraq was really threatening to spiral out of control with violence. Some described it as anarchic fragmentation, which was really a very visual term for what was potentially going to happen in Iraq.

And when the President announced his surge strategy back in I think it was late December, I have to say I was very skeptical because I kept thinking, what's next? A surge is fine. We can get more troops in. The Iraq Study Group actually agrees that this could be a temporary measure to gain security. But what do we do following that to get political gains in Iraq? What can be done to help develop the economy in Iraq? These were the key issues to me.

Then it became clear, subsequently, that our State Department was working on a plan to deal with this. And it was unclear as to what exactly the steps were; but as things have unfolded, we have seen significant success over the past year.

And this was highlighted by my recent trip when I walked through the streets of Fallujah with three other Members of Congress. And I would have never thought that just even a month ago or two months ago a platoon of marines could even walk through the streets of Fallujah, much less four Members of Congress.

So as we walked through the streets, we saw shops that were open. Shop keepers were smiling, children were playing in the streets. There was a volleyball game going on on one block. Another block I saw some children playing soccer. There were families strolling through the streets and talking. And this clearly was a major change, a major departure from what we had seen just months ago in Fallujah.

And what we found out was that an Iraqi solution was being brought to bear in Fallujah, an Iraqi solution for security, which has allowed for security to grow throughout the city of Fallujah, creating an environment that's now allowing economic activity in that city.

Children are now back in school. We're seeing shops that are open, microlending programs are ongoing, and this is just tremendous success. And the hallmark of the plan that has been implemented by General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker is that you look at the circumstances in a particular local in Iraq, like Fallujah, or perhaps Ramadi or Tikrit, and work with the circumstances on the ground and make those institutions that are available work for the positive.

And what I mean by that is, what we have is a situation where, after getting security and working with the Iraqis to set up these joint security stations throughout the city of Fallujah, now we've got a provincial reconstruction team working in Fallujah. This is a team of civilians and military who are working on the political side of things, working to help build the political infrastructure from the ground up.

And now what we're seeing is tremendous success with this, with a sort of a grass roots movement. And I've said over and over, the most difficult thing is going to be to get the Iraqi central government to come to reconcile and to come to terms, because it's been a country that's been fraught with division. But it's going to be an Iraqi solution that will bring that together. And as this grass-root development happens in Fallujah, in Ramadi, in Tikrit and Mosul and other cities throughout Iraq and our communities throughout Iraq, we will see a coalescence of political activity which will put pressure on those central politicians to come forward. And that's part of the whole political process.

The Deputy Prime Minister of Iraq, the Sunni Deputy Prime Minister, his name is Salaam as Zobadaei, told us that you can look at the fruit, but the fruit will not come until you grow the tree. And that was a very, very, precise and visual way of describing what needs to happen. We need to see Iraqi institutions growing from the ground up, because then you'll have a sustainable government. To have an Iraqi Government impose from the top and to try to force it down is not sustainable. So I'm encouraged that this plan is working. We're seeing positive signs, and we need to give it further time.

These provincial reconstruction teams are doing an outstanding job. There are some 10 or 14, I believe, just in the Baghdad and Anbar area, and then one in each other province. And I think our State Department deserves tremendous credit for working under very difficult circumstances and putting these provincial reconstruction teams together to make this sort of political grass-roots movement occur.

And on the broader diplomatic front, we now know that the Saudis are looking at putting an embassy into Baghdad. Recently, the French Foreign Minister was in Baghdad and they expressed that the French want to play a bigger role. We need to have continued vigorous diplomacy to move forward to get debt relief on the Iraqi Government. And I believe if we move along on the diplomatic front, as I mentioned, on continuing to build this grass-roots political development internally in Iraq, economic development with microlending programs, all because we managed to get security, we're going to see a successful outcome in Iraq. And I think in short order we should be able to draw back down on our combat troops and offer more of a supportive role.

Mr. SHAYS. I wonder if the gentleman would yield a second.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I'd be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. SHAYS. Just to point out to him that what you're encountering is significant. When the Iraqis say to us, be patient, give us more time, what I encountered early on was they were constantly blaming the other groups. The Shiias would blame the Sunnis, the Sunnis would blame the Kurds, and so on. But what they're starting to do is they're trying to say, we're trying to work out our differences; give us more time to work together. And that's a significant change.

I likened this to a sixth-grade dance when they first started out. They didn't know how to interact with each other. But they're starting to learn how to interact. They're starting to be defensive of Iraq and speaking more with one voice; and I think it's not an insignificant event that's taking place.

□ 2115

Mr. BOUSTANY. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. And if you look at Iraq, there were 27 ethnic groups in Iraq, hundreds of tribes, and this was all held together artificially under Saddam Hussein's reign of terror, so to speak. And now that is gone and they are trying to figure out how to reconcile all of this.

And there are signs that there is Iraqi nationalism. Look at what happened recently with their soccer team, which was a phenomenal event where everyone was celebrating in the streets. It truly showed that they have that sense of nationalism and pride in their country.

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

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. The Iraqis would say to me, How dare you say we are not a country. We are the Fertile Crescent where two great rivers have met. We have been the center of Western civilization. And for us to say they are not a real country, for them they find it very insulting.

Mr. BOUSTANY. That is absolutely true. They are a proud civilization.

And I am not at a point now where I am ready to preemptively declare defeat in this, and I do believe we need to give it time. I believe the plan is working. And for the first time since I have been in Congress, I have got a level of comfort that I believe we are on the right track. So I would urge patience in this. I do believe we will draw down some of our combat troops in the short term, and I am guardedly optimistic.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, as I was listening to everybody talk here and listening to people talk earlier today, I get struck by the history of this Chamber. And as I was sitting here, I wondered how often this debate had occurred during my lifetime or did it occur during my lifetime. I would like to think I am a student of history, but I will admit that my concentration on history from the end of the Second World War until I was in high school, there is a gap there where it is only kind of the history of me and not the history of the United States. So I don't know a lot about it, but I was thinking the Second World War in Europe ended in 1944. Germany was divided into zones, I believe, until 1952. So we actually were the government of a zone, as were Britain and

France, from 1944 to 1952. I wonder if this debate took place in this Congress during that period of time: Bring our troops home. Why don't those people stand up a government over there? Why can't they get their act together? I wonder if that debate took place. I don't know. I might go look it up and try to find out.

Japan we defeated in 1945, unconditional surrender. And yet MacArthur established the occupation of Japan and, in fact, was heavily criticized when the Korean War broke out for still being the czar of Japan. And occupation forces remained in Japan until some time in the mid 1950s. I wonder if that debate went on about Japan. The last time I checked, which was the day before yesterday when I was talking to some soldiers at Fort Hood, we still have troops in Korea, and that war technically ended in 1954 I believe it was, 1952 or 1954, and we still have troops there. And I don't know if during the 1950s we had debates about why can't those people get their act together? Why do we have to defend that country? Why do we have to defend them? I don't hear that debate anymore, and there are still American soldiers standing watch in Korea.

I am not saying that we are going to occupy for this period of time, but where is our commitment to the commitment that our soldiers have given us? That deeply concerns me. I worry about it. And I can tell you our fighting men and women worry about it too.

So I guess that is why we get up here on the floor of the House and we want to let the American people know what we saw and what we heard and what we experienced. And I know the fighting generation that are living today; those soldiers are a great generation. The question is, will we be also ranked as a great generation, the people back home, for standing behind this great generation as they have done an outstanding job in defeating our enemy.

## THE NATIONAL DEBT AND THE WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, this evening, as on most Tuesday evenings when Congress is in session, I rise on behalf of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition. We are a group of 47 conservative to moderate Democrats that simply want to come here, put an end to the partisan bickering, and restore common sense and fiscal discipline to our Nation's government.

This evening, as we begin this hour-long conversation, we are going to focus on Iraq, and specifically we are going to focus on how your tax dollars are being spent in Iraq.

You have heard a lot of talk this evening about Iraq. And I can assure you as long as we have our men and women in uniform in harm's way, we are going to support them. They are doing everything that has been asked of them and then some. My brother-in-law is in the U.S. Air Force. He has been in the region several times. My first cousin is in the U.S. Army, and he is in Iraq this evening. It has affected all of us in one way or another. We have all had family or friends serve there.

This evening we are going to specifically focus on how your tax money is being spent in Iraq. For the last 5 years, the President has pretty much asked for a blank check, and if you ask him to be held accountable for how your tax money is spent in Iraq, he will tell you that you are unpatriotic. It is time that we stood up to this President and demanded the kind of accountability on how your tax money is being spent in Iraq just as we demand accountability from local and State governments when they receive a Federal grant. To put it another way, $16 million of your tax money is being spent in Iraq every hour; $16 million of your tax money is being spent in Iraq every hour. That is $16 million an hour that can't go to replace the bridge in Minnesota that fell. And, by the way, there are thousands more structurally deficient bridges in this country, and this should have been a wake-up call for all of us to get about the business of rebuilding this Nation's infrastructure and begin to invest in America again.

Just in my congressional district during the month of August, some people think we go home and go on vacation for a month, but what we really do is we go home and see the people, which I think is an important part of this job. If you are going to represent folks, I think it is important you get out of Washington and you go home and you see them. And as I traveled my 29 counties and 150 towns in Arkansas's Fourth Congressional District, every town I went to I learned of a project, of a need. On the western side, they want to finish I–49, which can create jobs and economic opportunities. An interstate where construction started on it back when I was about 5 years old entering kindergarten. I am now 46 and have a daughter in college.

When I go to the eastern side of my district, I hear a lot of talk about wanting to complete I–69, which was announced 5 years before I was born. In the central part of the district, I hear a lot of talk about four-laning U.S. 82, four-laning 167, how we need money to invest in getting off the Sparta aquifer and having more and more commercial and residential people getting their water from other alternative water sources. As I traveled and toured Millwood Lake, I learned about how this wonderful recreational lake, a lake that contributed to the economy, it is now becoming very difficult to fish in about a quarter of it and they are worried about the rest of it. Why? Because of the neglect. The neglect in our Nation's infrastructure, the neglect in our waterways, in our highways. And yet we continue to spend $16 million an hour of your tax money in Iraq. Mr. Speaker, I say it is time to start investing in America again, and we are going to talk more about that this evening.

During the past 6 years, we have had a President that has given us the largest debt ever in our Nation's history, the largest deficit ever in our Nation's history, for the past 6 years, during the time that we had Republicans controlling the White House, the House and the Senate. We have passed a budget this year that will put us back in balance by 2012 and will begin to restore common sense and fiscal discipline to our Nation's government.

But this is what the new Democratic majority inherited in January: a debt that is $8,993,600,200,089 and some change. That is a big number. What does it mean? If you break it out and divide it by every man, woman and child living in America, including those born today, each one of us, our share of the national debt: $29,704. It is what those of us in the Blue Dog Coalition refer to as the ''debt tax,'' d-e-b-t, which is one tax that cannot be repealed, that cannot be cut. And that is one of the reasons that we are not able to invest in America's priorities, investing in our homeland, investing in our veterans, investing in education, investing in rebuilding America's infrastructure. No. We are too busy paying interest on this debt.

Our Nation is borrowing about a billion dollars a day, but before we borrow a billion dollars today, we are going to spend a half billion today paying interest on the debt we have already got. That is above and beyond the $16 million an hour that we are sending to Iraq, much of which goes unaccounted for.

So we are going to spend this hour addressing that and other issues surrounding Iraq. And I am absolutely delighted to be joined by a number of my Blue Dog colleagues. I mentioned there are 47 members in the Blue Dog Coalition, and I would like to take this opportunity to welcome the four newest members: CHRISTOPHER CARNEY from Pennsylvania's Tenth Congressional District, GABRIELLE GIFFORDS from Arizona's Eighth Congressional District, BART GORDON from Tennessee's Sixth Congressional District, and ZACH SPACE from Ohio's Eighteenth Congressional District.

At this time I am pleased to yield to a fellow Blue Dog, someone who has become very involved in this conservative-moderate Democratic movement on Capitol Hill, someone who is not afraid to take a stand for what is right, and that is my friend JOE DONNELLY from Indiana's Second Congressional District.

Mr. DONNELLY. Thank you, Mr. ROSS.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to have the chance to speak here again in the House.

Almost $9 trillion in debt. I just came back from a month in my district, as Mr. ROSS had indicated, going to see constituent after constituent, talking about issues of critical importance to them. And I met a good friend of mine named Jim Fleming from LaPorte, Indiana. And Jim's company makes defense aerospace products. And he said, JOE, we try everything we can. We employ hundreds of people. We work extraordinarily hard. And, JOE, we get beat out by China on bid after bid. Not even competitive with our prices but below our cost of production. And, JOE, what saddens me so much, Mr. Fleming said, is that we have over $1 trillion in debt to China. So I know when it is time for you to stand up, it is only made more difficult because of the debt that we have, a debt that we assumed because it was easier to do than to make the hard choices like the PAYGO system that we put in.

We look at Iraq now. We have lost $12 billion that came in in currency in a plane, shrink wrapped, Mr. DAVIS, on pallets, never to be seen again once it came off of that plane. Think of what $12 billion could have done in help creating the Hoosier Heartland Highway in my district.

We paid a gentleman Ahmed Chalabi and his group, the Iraqi National Congress, $300,000 every month for information that they basically made up in the back room over a Coca-Cola.

□ 2130

Just one more example: instead of probing and finding the answers, we just threw money away. And, Mr. ROSS, think of what $300,000 could do in your district every month, or to my good friend, who you will see, Mr. Michael Arcuri, in his district in Utica. $300,000 could provide health care for an incredible amount of Americans.

So we have come to this Congress to try to make sure, through our PAYGO system, that the debt goes no higher, that we start to reduce it, that in Iraq we get answers, answers that, instead of letting $12 billion disappear, that those funds be used either in our district, or to provide up-armored Humvees and MRAP vehicles that will save our soldiers lives. Appropriate armored vests, the kind of things that will protect our soldiers, not feather someone else's nest.

Mr. ROSS, I'm proud to stand here with you tonight and have this opportunity.

Mr. ROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONNELLY. Absolutely, sir.

Mr. ROSS. You mentioned something that really piqued my interest, and that is making sure that we are providing our soldiers with the best technology in armored vests. And I want to thank you for raising that this evening.

I've got a constituent in my district whose son is getting ready to go back for the second time, Arkansas National Guard, 39th Brigade, being asked to go back for a second time. And when you sign up for the National Guard, you're supposed to spend 1 year out of 5, and now they were there in 2003 and 2004, they're being asked to go back again by Christmas of this year or early next year. And he raises a very important issue. This is a constituent from Garland County in Pearcy, Arkansas, near Hot Springs, and that is, he wants to ensure that our men and women in uniform, his son, has the best armored body gear and protection available. There are a lot of tests going on right now; there is a lot of debate going on. There have been hearings on this in the Congress. But 5 years into this war you would think, if our government, if this administration is sending $16 million an hour of your tax money to Iraq, the very least they could do is ensure that our brave men and women, our soldiers that do everything that is asked of them, have the very best in body gear and protection.

Mr. DONNELLY. There is no question, Mr. ROSS, that when we look at our soldiers, nothing but the best is acceptable.

As you mentioned the soldiers in your district, we just had, about three weeks ago, our South Bend, Indiana, National Guard unit head over to some of the most dangerous duty in Iraq. And, again, they went with their pride and with a determination to do well. And our job, my job, your job is to make sure they have the very, very best. And it's not appropriate to see money disappear, to see it wasted at the tune of $300,000 a month it was. To some gentleman who is making up stories in the back room when we think he's providing information. Our job is to make sure that the young men and women of Arkansas, New York, Indiana, Delaware, Pennsylvania and all our States have the very, very best armored equipment, armored vehicles. Their safety and their return home to their loved ones is the utmost importance.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman. And he makes some very good points.

And regardless of how you feel about what's going on in Iraq, and I personally have voted three times for a new direction in Iraq, but one of the things that I think we can all agree on is that we need more accountability for how our tax money is being spent in Iraq. And we need to ensure that money is going to provide our men and women in uniform with the very best equipment that's available to them today, not what was the best equipment 5 years ago, but what is the best equipment today to best protect them as they perform their duty and service to our country. And that's one thing that we can all agree on.

At this time, I'm pleased to introduce another fellow Blue Dog, a new Member in his first term in the 110th session of Congress who is rapidly and quickly becoming very involved and immersed in the fiscal issues of the Blue Dog Coalition, and that's my friend, Mr. MIKE ARCURI from New York's 24th Congressional District, who just returned from a trip to Iraq.

Mr. ARCURI. I thank my friend from Arkansas for yielding, and I would like to thank you for what you do for the Blue Dog Caucus.

You know, the thing that first attracted me to the Blue Dog Caucus was the fact that they believe so strongly in fiscal responsibility in the pay-as-you-go idea, and the fact that we have to tighten our belt, we have to make some very difficult decisions. It's not easy when there are things that we need for our district and things that we know we need here domestically, and yet we can't spend more than we have. And it's no different than we would in our own home. You don't buy things that we can't afford. We can't enact legislation, we can't create bureaucracies that we can't pay for. And that's why I'm so proud to be a member of the Blue Dog Caucus.

I did just return from Iraq just a few days ago. And I couldn't help, while I was there, noticing immediately the amount of money that we have spent in Iraq. You know, when you look at the fact that you ride along and you see that we have literally created, built whole cities in the middle of the desert, in the middle of this expansive environment we have actually created cities and the amount of money, the amount of cement, the amount of wood that we've used to build these bases and the amount of material that we have there. I can remember that in one of the bases we pulled up to one area, it was huge, and there was nothing but electric transformers in a huge field; and those were transformers that they were using to put new electric and bring new power to different places in Iraq. And then we drove a little further and there was another area with nothing but Humvees and another area with nothing but bulldozers. And you can't help but realize just how much money and how much time and expense we're expending to rebuild Iraq.

And during the course of our conversation while we were there, we were talking about some of the things to one of the members of the military, one of the things that they needed there. And I couldn't help but think back in my district in upstate New York, back in Utica, there are things that we need that we don't have. We need improvements to our airport that we don't have. We need improvements to our roads. And much like your district in Arkansas, we have been waiting for a connection between Utica and the city of Binghamton, a Route 12 extension. We've been waiting for years and years, since before I was born, for that; and still we talk about it. And yet we spend billions of dollars. You quoted the figure $16 million an hour we are spending in Iraq. We continue to spend it, and we've been doing it for years and years.

And while we continue to spend that money, we continue to spend resources that are critical to us while countries like China are continuing to invest

their money in their own economy, in creating jobs within their country. We need to be spending our money to create jobs in our country.

And, you know, while I was in Iraq, the one thing that I was struck by probably more than anything else is the incredible job that our troops are doing. Anybody that you talk to that's been to Iraq, the first thing they talk about is the incredible job that our troops are doing. And I couldn't help but think that any just cause anywhere in the world that we ask our troops to perform and complete, I have utter confidence that they can do it. Our military is just an incredible organization. They do what is asked of them and much, much more. And they have done the same in Iraq. And I think that it's time that we give them more direction in terms of a mission and that we start to give the Iraqi people a little more ability to stand on their own. I think when we start to bring our troops home, when we start to allow them to stand up and handle their own affairs, they will do it, and they will do it in a good way and in a fine way and we will be there to help them.

But, you know, there was a book written about 2,500 years ago by the Chinese general Sun Tzu, and it was called ''The Art of War.'' And in that he writes an interesting paragraph and he says that in any extended confrontation, regardless of how wise a nation's counselors are, no country can win in a prolonged war.

This war has been prolonged far too long. It is time, I believe, for us to focus upon what is important here domestically, that we stop focusing on spending so much money in Iraq and we begin to focus again on the things that are happening here in this country. So I believe that it's time that we allow the country of Iraq to stand up for itself, and that we begin to bring our troops home.

I thank you, and I yield back.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from New York for his insight on his recent return from a trip to Iraq.

I was last there August 11, 2004, when we had the 39th Brigade from Arkansas' National Guard there. Now they're ready to go back, and I hope to be able to go back while they're there because the least we can do is go there when our troops are there from our respective districts and let them know that we support them and make sure that some of this millions of dollars is being spent on providing them the very best equipment that technology and money can afford to buy.

What we're talking about this evening is the cost of Operation Iraqi Freedom. The gentleman from New York is absolutely correct, we need a new direction in Iraq. Basically, we're there fighting their civil war for them. And as long as they're shooting at us instead of shooting at one another, there is no incentive for them to learn how to get along. No one fought our Civil War for us, and I'm absolutely convinced that the only people that can decide the fate of Iraq are the Iraqi people.

We have had a lot of victories there. We went there because of weapons of mass destruction. We now know there are no weapons of mass destruction. It's debatable whether there ever was or not, but that's an issue that we can debate all night. But hindsight is 20/20. We stayed until Saddam was removed from power. We stayed until he was brought to justice and executed. Clearly, he was an evil dictator. We have evil dictators all over the world, many of whom remain in power today. We stayed until a new Iraqi Government was installed. We stayed and tried to train their police and military force. And yet this administration continues to move the goal post on our soldiers. And so how many victories are they going to have to accomplish before we allow them to come home and allow the Iraq people to decide the fate of their own country?

The cost of Operation Iraqi Freedom, this is one statistic that is not debatable. You want to know how well it's going? In 2003, we spent $53 billion of your tax money in Iraq. In 2004, that increased to $75.9 billion. In 2005, that increased to $84.7 billion. In 2006, that increased to $101.7 billion. And in 2007, $135.2 billion so far. The administration is getting ready to come back here shortly for more. That's $11.3 billion a month, that's $370 million a day. You do the math. That's between 15 and $16 million an hour of your tax money going to Iraq and, as Congressman DONNELLY mentioned, much of which is unaccounted for.

At this time, I yield to my friend, fellow Blue Dog member from my neighboring State of Tennessee, and that's LINCOLN DAVIS, an active member of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition that's never afraid to speak his mind. We're glad to have him here with us this evening. And sorry about Tennessee's loss this Saturday. We're looking forward to playing y'all in football.

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. You're starting us off on a bad note.

It's good to be here this evening and to engage in conversation and dialogue certainly on the situation that we are in today in Iraq, and certainly in this country.

I want to deviate just a little bit and talk a little bit about my study hall period. Folks say that Members of Congress had recess. When I was in school and we had recess, we played most of the time; but I can assure you for the last several weeks of the month of August I did a lot of traveling in the district I represent, listening to a lot of people, the chamber of commerce, business people, individuals on the street, country stores, wherever I might have been, restaurants, coffee shops. We talked about a lot of things. People are worried about the war in Iraq. People are worried about the war in Iraq to the point where we know we can't lose there or we can't allow this nation to go into anarchy, but how do we prevent that from happening?

And as I listened to those debates and those dialogs, I realized that people were seriously concerned about what we're doing and how we're engaged. I hear people talking about whether we should have gone or not. That's legitimate, and I think historians, probably political scientists over the next several years, next decades and next centuries will obviously gauge that and will judge that. We can talk about whether the war was prosecuted right or not; and, quite frankly, I think there are some questions there as to whether or not this administration, Mr. Speaker, and whether this White House, Mr. Speaker, has engaged the way that would bring about a quicker resolution to where it would win much quicker in Iraq.

But when I went home on Sunday, I drove back down through the Shenandoah Valley, down Highway 81, hit Interstate 40, went across the Cumberland Plateau, and I realized what a beautiful Nation we have. When you look at those hills along the Blue Ridge down through the Shenandoah Valley and then the Cumberland Plateau near the Cumberland Gap and realize the beauty of this vast Nation that we have and the people who live here.

I had an opportunity, my first day off, to spend about 7 hours fishing at a great warrior's old mill, Sergeant Alvin C. York, in Palmyra where I live.

□ 2145

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. ROSS, I had an opportunity with my oldest daughter and two of my grandchildren to go fishing. We were going to spend probably a couple hours there. We wound up spending over 7 hours. The last day that I spent in my district, I did the same thing, not intentionally. My middle daughter called and came up on Sunday, and I spent, as I did my first Monday home, my last Monday home I spent fishing in the rivers there below Sergeant York's home in the mill pond. Now, Sergeant York was a great American hero. But we have had other great American heroes, as well, Eisenhower being one of them.

I want to mention something about Eisenhower in just a moment. But first of all, I want to talk about what someone that America respects greatly said a few years ago. Clark Clifford and Richard Holbrooke wrote a book in 1991 called ''Counsel to the President.'' After Winston Churchill had made his ''Iron Curtain'' speech in Fulton, Missouri, they were traveling back on the train from Missouri. President Truman and many of his staff members had already retired for the evening. The three people who were basically sitting in the room at that time were Charles Ross, who was the press secretary for Truman, and Clark Clifford and Churchill. They talked about how our lives are influenced strictly by the accident of our birth.

What Churchill said, and I am quoting him as quoted in the book, ''If I were to be born again, I would wish to be born in the United States. Your country is the future of the world. You have natural resources, the spirit, the youth, the determination, which will steadily increase your global influence.'' He was correct in making that assessment over 60 years ago as he made this speech. He was correct then. And we are correct today to say that America's presence in the world today is recognized.

But why has it changed? Why would a great Brit, who is considered the Brit's Britishman, say, ''If I were to be born again, I would love to have been born an American''? How many people in the world today would say that? I would say that because when God put my soul in the body of a woman who lived in America, it was a great blessing for me just to be born in this country. We have got to regain and recapture throughout the world that spirit that folks from nations abroad have seen in this country, and I think we can recover it, to where we are looked upon, as Ronald Reagan said, as that shining light of freedom that folks can look at and aspire to.

We need an Eisenhower moment in Iraq. It has been said that after Eisenhower was elected President in 1952 that as he was ordered up he asked, as a general, from the military people in the field, the Army, if he could be able to have a few small planes that he would fly over South Korea and in parts of North Korea. It is also said, and his memoirs pretty much confirmed this, that after they landed he was silent for a few moments. And he basically said, We cannot win this war the way that we are fighting it, but we can't afford to lose it, either. We cannot win this war the way we are fighting it. He knew we would have to engage in a much greater, larger war that would include perhaps even China, which would have stretched America's resources and I think America's fiber to the breaking point.

Eisenhower understood that we were in a war that we should not have been in. Now some will question what I am saying. But that was Eisenhower's comments. It is a war that we are not ready to win. It is a war that we can lose, and we can't afford to lose. In his first 6 or 8 months of his Presidency, he brought about a resolution of a ceasefire in Korea. Did we stay there? Sure, we have been. Will we stay in Iraq? Sure we will. Every resolution that we passed on this floor that calls for a date certain authorizes this administration and authorizes the Defense Department to keep adequate personnel in the field and military presence in the field to help protect the resources, the assets of this country and protect our friends in the area and to help train the troops and the soldiers of the armies, the policemen, and the civilians of Iraq. We will be there several years from now, just as we were in South Korea, as we were in Western Europe. It is how we stay that makes the difference. It is how we stay that will make the difference.

The way we are there now I don't believe is the way we ought to be. We can no longer be the army for Iraq. We can no longer be the policemen in the streets, on the beat, providing security for the folks in Iraq. The Brits just pulled out. This great British leader named Winston Churchill, his country just pulled their troops out of Basra. Are we going to have a surge in Basra with American troops?

Mr. Speaker, let's ask the President that. Is that our intention now, that we will have a surge and resupply the troops there? Because it seems in southern Iraq obviously there is a lot of turmoil, a lot of killings, basically a civil war between the Shias, now some folks say are happening. In northern Iraq where the Kurds are, we are not there operating as the army or the policemen on the beat. In northern Iraq where the Kurds are, they are providing their own autonomy.

It is my opinion that the longer we stay in Iraq, the worse we will be. We need an Eisenhower moment in Iraq, not a General Custer moment, not a charge into the Little Big Horn to where we get destroyed. It is time that we reassess our situation in Iraq to a war that we win in Iraq.

I am saddened as I watch TV. I am seeing Iraq being sold by TV commercials as if we are selling an automobile to the American public. That saddens me when I see some of our wonderful soldiers, and I applaud them, who are saying, We cannot cut and run. I agree with them. We can't cut and run. But we don't need to be selling this war on TV commercials as the right thing to do.

The thing that we have not done, in my opinion, is that we have allowed Afghanistan to be left pretty much as an island to themselves. Oh, we are there. But just think what we could have done if we had spent the time and resources and kept the number of troops in Afghanistan that we moved to Iraq.

It is my belief that Karzai would have probably been, and still may be, someone that we may call their George Washington. We now see troubles in Pakistan. We are now seeing countries in Central Asia after the dominance of the Soviet Union for many years, many are floundering around trying to figure which is the best route to go. Each feels, I believe, that democracy is the best route to take. Many are struggling with their democracies in Central Asia. Just think of what we could have done in Afghanistan if, in fact, we had stayed there, helped build that country to take out those that would do harm to them, to destroy Afghanistan. We could have helped build a democracy that I believe would have been infectious, and an epidemic of democratic nations would have been springing up all over to continue to bloom and to progress in Central Asia.

It would have been infectious, in my opinion, in the Middle East, as well, and we would have seen I think the tumbling of the strongman-type governments. In every one of those countries surrounding Iraq, there is a strong person who runs those countries. If we had stayed and continued in Afghanistan, we would have seen, in my opinion, a much different Middle East than we see today and a much different Central Asia.

One of the real problems we have today is I think even Pakistan would have seen the success in Afghanistan and might have wanted to move further in that direction. In fact, the Taliban-type warriors and al Qaeda led by Osama bin Laden did attack us. I keep hearing these folks from the side saying, If we don't fight them there, we will fight them here. What do you think happened on September 11? They were here. And we have forgotten who attacked us. It wasn't Iraq. It was Osama bin Laden and the al Qaeda network. They are now, in some folks' opinion, in the areas of Waziristan and Pakistan. If, in fact, we allow, or if, in fact, Pakistan were to fall, guess who gets the nuclear weapons?

So our foreign policy, in my opinion, needs to be revisited. All of us need to start being American Democrats and American Republicans, not right-wingers and left-wingers. It looks like we have chosen up sides here and we have started to listen to the talk shows on one side or we look at the liberal communications on the other side, and all of a sudden that is what drives us in this country. It is time we start being Americans again, American Democrats and American Republicans, and look at our failures. Eisenhower understood it. George Custer found it out. We don't need a Custer move. We don't need to have advertisements telling us we need to have a war in TV commercials.

We need honesty, Mr. President. We need honesty. My request to you is that you have an Eisenhower moment, one of honesty. Let's get on with making sure we rebuild that area, put our troops out of the kill zone and stop requiring them to be the soldiers. Because if in Basra and southern Iraq and northern Iraq our troops are not there, and the only place where it seems the most violent actions that take place is where our troops are, that should tell us something.

We need to be sure that we keep enough troops to keep Syria or Iran, or quite frankly even our friend called Turkey, from invading Iraq for their own beneficial gain and let Iraq work its problems out. It is time. We have given them a government. They have accepted their government. They have elected their government. It is time for them to start leading and taking on the responsibility. I call upon this President, this administration, and this Congress to work together to make that happen.

□ 2200

We have built and helped build in South Korea over a period of 30–40 years one of the strongest democracies in the Asian-Pacific rim and Asia, the strongest economy called South Korea. It took a long time. It will take a long time to resolve the differences in the Middle East. It will take a long time to resolve the differences in Iraq. But we cannot do it the way we are doing it today.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. He raises an excellent point. All this started after 9/11, and we all know Osama bin Laden was responsible for 9/11. We now have some 25,000 troops in the Afghanistan region. Contrast that to be a quarter million troops in the Iraq region. Eighty-something percent of the people in Afghanistan want us there. Contrast that with Iraq. 71 percent of the Iraqi people don't want us there, and 60 percent of them think it is okay to kill a U.S. soldier. I believe it is time for a new direction in Iraq. Three times this year I have voted for a new direction in Iraq.

Let me be perfectly clear: As long as we have got troops in harm's way, I am going to support them. As I indicated, my brother-in-law is in the Air Force. He has been in the region. My first cousin is in the U.S. Army and is back for the second time in Iraq right now.

Back home in Arkansas, young people I have taught in Sunday school and duck hunted with will soon be going back for a second tour of duty in Iraq. I will be there every step of the way to support them. But I also want this administration and this Congress to give them a mission that is obtainable, one that will take them out of harm's way.

I have had too many soldiers from my district die in Iraq. Just in the last few weeks, Specialist Donovan Witham from Malvern, Arkansas, gave his life in Iraq. Just a few days ago, I was able to spend some time with his family in their living room letting them know that his service to this country will not be forgotten. I will make sure of that. His family remains in my heart and in my prayers, as do all the family members of the nearly 4,000 troops that we have lost in Iraq.

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the things we really need to make sure of is that the American public as they watch this Blue Dog Coalition group here talk tonight, every one of us to the ''T'' comes from rural areas basically. We love America, we love our troops, we visit them.

I have been to Iraq five times and Afghanistan twice. I went for a reason, to tell our troops thank troops thank you, we love you, we appreciate you. We pray that an umbrella of safety will be put over our troops. We work for those back home to be sure that their families are recognized and that our communities uphold them and undergird them.

I don't want anybody to have a misinterpretation of what we are saying here tonight. This is about America, and it is not about TV ads that try to justify a war going on in Iraq. I am ashamed those things are on TV. We support our troops, and we will continue to do that.

Mr. ROSS. I appreciate the gentleman joining me and his commitment to our brave men and women in uniform. I thank the President for going to Iraq. He was there, I think it was his third trip, he was there for a few hours. I spent a day in Iraq. You have been several times. I think it is important that we go and we let our soldiers know we support them and make sure some of this money over there is being spent on them and providing them the best equipment that money can buy. They deserve nothing less.

But the type of folks that I think the President needs to spend a lot more time listening to are the type of Members of Congress that have served in the military, like PATRICK MURPHY from Pennsylvania. PATRICK, not too long ago, was known as Captain MURPHY and spent not a few hours in Iraq, but a few months in Iraq, nearly a year. PATRICK MURPHY from Pennsylvania's Eighth Congressional District, a fellow Blue Dog member who helped write H.R. 97, which is a bill endorsed by the Blue Dog Coalition to provide for Operation Iraqi Freedom cost accountability to ensure that this $16 million an hour of your tax money, Mr. Speaker, which is going to Iraq, is being spent on our soldiers.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman-Captain PATRICK MURPHY.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas. It is an honor for me to be here tonight.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Arkansas, that is exactly right. One of the things I plan on talking about tonight are really two things, the small business tax cuts that we established in this Congress this past May, and also the Iraq Accountability Act, because I think it is telling.

There are a couple of housekeeping things if I may mention, Mr. Speaker. I know the gentleman from Tennessee was just speaking about an Eisenhower moment and talked about reaching out to those Americans from both sides of the aisle and letting them know about this common sense leadership we are trying to propose. What he mentioned was we need to listen and look at some common sense solutions. I think that is what people appreciate about the Blue Dogs. We are willing to reach across the aisle when need be to move our country in a new direction.

I know there are a lot of folks back home I know, some of which are my wife right now. My wife Jenny is at home. I left this morning. I spoke at the Rotary Club and I was at a school for the first day of classes starting back today back in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Then I had a meeting, and then I rushed down here in Washington.

It is an honor for me to be here tonight. It is tough as far as leaving your wife, and we are blessed with a 9 month old daughter Maggie Murphy, who we had her swimming out there yesterday. She was adorable.

I know this is a different form of public service. I know the gentleman from Arkansas mentioned that I served in the military. I am very proud of my military service. I am very proud that I wore that U.S. Army uniform for the first time back in 1993, and now that we are here in 2007, I am proud to be a Member of Congress. This is a different form of public service, but one just as important. I know the sacrifices that we have to give up, leaving our families to come down here to Washington and then to go back home on the weekends. It is a tough schedule, but one that we promised to do to the best of our abilities.

I know my colleague over here from New York, Mr. ARCURI, MIKE ARCURI just got married the other day. I want to congratulate him on his marriage. I think he believes in what we all believe in, that we love our troops so much, I think he spent his honeymoon going over to see those troops in Iraq, leaving his new wife, Sabrina, to go over to those troops.

We had a conversation on this floor tonight when we were voting talking about his trip over there, how he went and let those troops know, especially the ones that are from New York, from his district, that he cares about them, that he took the time out of his schedule to be there with them, to break bread with them and let them know that he is fighting for them here in Washington.

I believe those troops understand what the stakes are right now. They understand that this United States House of Representatives, this body supports the troops 100 percent. We may disagree with our colleagues on the foreign policy and the foreign aspects of it, but never question the commitment and the honor that our troops are serving with. I believe that is why we all take time out of our schedules to let them know we care for them, to make sure that we draft the most effective policy to support them and do everything possible to make sure their families back at home know we are supporting them 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk first, because after I left that Rotary Club this morning and then I was at that opening day of school at the Abrams Hebrew School in Yardley, Pennsylvania. I went down the road to two small businesses that are in Yardley, Pennsylvania. My district, as you know are, is all of Bucks County, northeast Philadelphia and a small slice of Montgomery County.

But when you look at Bucks County, there are 60,000 small businesses in Bucks County. Ninety-nine percent of our businesses are small business. And

what we passed in this House, I am very proud about, is $1.3 billion in tax cuts for those small businesses. We did it not just writing a blank check and passing that debt that we talk about to our kids, we did it in a fiscally responsible way, the way that Blue Dogs believe, a pay-as-you-go system.

Everyone is real quick to write tax breaks and tax cuts, but never figure out to how to pay for it. Just increase our debt. Increase our debt. When the President signs $1.7 billion in tax cuts, it sounds great. Everyone wants a tax break. I want a tax break. But how are you going to pay for it, Mr. President? Not on the backs of our kids. Not on the backs of the next generation. We need the pay-as-you-go.

So when my daughter was born 9 months ago, when Maggie Murphy was born, she was born in Lower Bucks Hospital, she was born in this country owing $29,000 to our national debt. We owe $9 trillion in this country. A lot of that debt we owe to foreign countries, China, Korea, Japan. We borrowed $367 billion from Mexico.

So that means per month, per month we average about $21 billion just to pay the interest on this debt. It is like a credit card. You have to pay interest on your credit card before you even get into paying the principal off. Per month we have to pay $21 billion in interest.

To make a comparison, budgets are choices. Budgets are moral documents. Per month in the Federal Government we spend $21 billion just on the interest, but we only pay $5 billion on the Federal level on education. And to keep America more competitive, we need to invest in education. So that is why it is important that we partner with small businesses. That is what we do with the $1.3 billion in tax cuts.

How it worked out, I had two business owners, one was a CEO, his name is Neil Matheson today, and when he started a business, he was the only employee. You fast forward it, now it is a 250 person business. They have 140 of those employees in my district, and I am proud that many of them live and work in Bucks County. I talked to him. And another president of a small business was Kevin Kruse.

I talked to Neil Matheson and I talked to Kevin Kruse, and I talked to them about the challenges they faced before I was running for Congress and then I talked to them when I became a Member of Congress. We passed this, and they talked about how important this bill was that we passed.

Per year, they commented, Kevin Kruse specifically commented, big corporations which employ Americans, big corporations can sell if they needed some money infusion, they can sell stocks or go public. Small businesses don't have that option. So they have to worry about their cash intake and their cash flow.

So what Mr. Kruse said today when I was with him, he said this tax cut that the Democratic Congress passed, that the Blue Dogs championed, saves my business $13,000 more in deductions per year now because we established it through the IRS Tax Code through a pay-as-you-go system. That is serious money. That is serious money. That is why they stood with me today when we talked about it.

Before I joined the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, I talked about more accountability and greater oversight in Iraq and over the Iraqi war operations. I am a proud Member of the Blue Dog Coalition. I have been calling for accountability in Iraq on the floor of this great body for 8 months now. In fact, some of my Blue Dog colleagues have been demanding common sense oversight on the floor of this House for more than 4 years before I even got here.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the problem with these repeated calls for action is they seem to be falling on deaf ears down the road at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue at the White House.

Mr. Speaker, the American public and our families at home are demanding some answers. Earlier this year we introduced House Resolution 97, to set up a Truman-type commission to track fraud, waste and abuse in Iraq. This was after the reports from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction came to the House Armed Services Committee, came to the committee that I have the honor to serve on, and he said there is $9 billion missing and 14,000 weapons that are missing in Iraq. But recently, the Government Accountability Office, again, nonpartisan, came and reported that now the number of weapons that are missing in Iraq went from 14,000 to 190,000. Think about that; 190,000 weapons, and 110,000 of those weapons were AK–47 rifles.

Now, when I was in the military when I joined, I used to sing a cadence when you are running in the morning, we call it PT, physical training. The cadence said, ''Used to date a beauty queen; now I date my M–16.''

See, you held that M–16 rifle to you as if it was your girlfriend or your loved one, because you can never miss it. When you are in the field at night and you fell asleep and you had a few hours to catch some shuteye, you tied it around your leg so no one would steal it from you.

That is called accountability. That is what the Blue Dogs stand for. That is why I joined this organization when I came to Congress. I was honored to be selected and to be part of them.

You think about 110,000 weapons just missing in Iraq. Just missing. Imagine those weapons in the hands of Muqtada al-Sadr's militia.

The accountability is not happening in Iraq. It is not our troops' fault, it is the Iraqi people's fault, because they are not stepping up to the plate. You know, you lose a weapon in the U.S. military, you are probably going to be court-martialed. In Iraq, you are probably given a new one. That is a major difference and one that we can't stand for.

These rifles are like the ones I used to carry when I was in Baghdad, Iraq. When I was there four summers ago, Mr. Speaker, August was called fire month. The month of August in Iraq is called fire month because it gets so hot. Imagine our troops over in Iraq right now, in 130 degree weather, with all that equipment on, every day working their tails off to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America, that oath that they took when they became members of our great military.

You look back at January when the President made the decision to escalate our troops over there. I spoke out against it. I thought it was the wrong policy. But the President overrode our decisions in Congress and he said, just give us 6 to 9 months for a political solution.

You look now, and I said then I am against the policy but I hope this surge works. I hope the escalation of troops works. I want our troops in Iraq to succeed. I spent months of my life there, and I care for the Iraqi people and I love our troops.

But now it has been 9 months. Now you look at what is really happening. They said 6 to 9 months to allow a political solution to happen. Nine months later, you had the Iraqi Parliament take a summer vacation. Take a summer vacation, when our troops are fighting every single day.

You had the Shia government that is in power now, before the Sunnis were in power, now it is the Shia, it is a democracy, they have to reach across the table and work with the Sunnis. They have got to put their personal beliefs aside for one Iraq.

So the Shia leadership, President Maliki said, okay, we are going to reach these benchmarks. We are going to do these commonsense things that we pledged to do now for years. They still haven't done them. Things like sharing oil revenue with the Sunnis, they haven't done them.

So what political solution do we have right now, Mr. Speaker? We have the Sunnis saying I quit. I quit. You don't see our troops quit. You see our troops standing up every single day.

For those listeners at home, you make sure when you see a troop, whether it is in a restaurant or airport or train station, you don't have to give them a long speech. You might not agree with the foreign policy of the United States of America. But I ask my fellow Americans, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that you tell those troops when you see them out there in every day America, say thank you very much for serving our country. That is all you need to say. It means the world to them.

I took my wife out, I had a date night the other night. I took my wife out, we went to Red Lobster. My wife's grandmother watched our little daughter. We went to date night, and, Mr. Speaker, after dinner she went to the restroom to use it at the Red Lobster.

I am waiting in the car, and waiting to get into the Red Lobster was a member of the Pennsylvania National Guard. He was there with his family. I took the keys out of the car. I ran up to him real quick. I was dressed not like a Congressman, I was just like a regular guy, just a regular shirt and I had shorts on him. I said to him, I said, hey, troop, I just want you to know that I appreciate your service to our country.

□ 2215

Then we started talking a little bit and at the end I told him I was a congressman and gave him my card. I said, If there is anything I can ever do, you let me know, and I will keep you in my prayers.

He got choked up and said, Thank you, Mr. Congressman, I appreciate that.

I told him, Just call me ''Patrick.'' You don't have to call me ''Mr. Congressman.''

We have meetings in Washington on the Armed Services Committee. I am also honored to serve on the Intelligence Committee. We also have meetings of the Blue Dog Democrats. We talk about these things at the Blue Dog Democrat meetings. We care with every fiber of our being for these troops.

Mr. Speaker, I was at a meeting with the Blue Dogs at 5:00, or 1700 as they say in military time. I passed around a sheet talking about how can we take care of our troops.

When troops get orders to deploy, sometimes they don't have a lot of time. Sometimes they have rent. Well, they don't need to have an apartment if they are in Iraq or Afghanistan for 15 months, so they want to break their lease. There is Federal law, there is the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, so they can break their lease. It is a commonsense bill that this Congress passed. There is a bill that says expand that now to allow our troops who have cell phones, a 1-year or 2-year program, why not allow the troops to break their cell phone contracts. Their cell phones are from Verizon or Cingular, and they don't have cell phones over in Baghdad or in Afghanistan. That commonsense approach says let them break their cell phone lease under Federal law. That is the type of backing that they need.

To get back to the Iraq Accountability Act, Mr. Speaker, you look at what this Iraq Accountability Act has done to shed light on fraud, waste and abuse. The report that I just mentioned about the 190,000 weapons is a disgrace when you talk about accountability.

Last month, there were a total of 73 criminal investigations related to contract fraud in Kuwait, Iraq, and Afghanistan; 73 criminal investigations. That is 73 investigations on contracts totaling $5 billion. That is billion with a ''b,'' Mr. Speaker. The charges so far identify more than $15 million in bribes. If there is ever a time for a new direction in Iraq, now is the time, Mr. Speaker. If there is ever a time for accountability and oversight, now is the time, Mr. Speaker.

And as long as my fellow Blue Dogs and I are here in the House's great body, we will keep calling, we will keep fighting for what American families and what American troops deserve, and that is civilian leadership that is just as smart and savvy as those troops on the ground.

I want to thank again the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. ROSS, for allowing me to speak. I appreciate your leadership role with the Blue Dog Democrats.

When I was home, Mr. Speaker, and I was talking to those families in Bucks County, many told me, Mr. Congressman, I like that are you a Blue Dog and that you are standing up for fiscal responsibility and you stand up for change. I like the fact that you stand up for a new direction. I like the fact that you talk about that $9 trillion in debt that we have right now and how it is immoral to pass it on to our kids, because it is. I like the fact that the Blue Dogs stand up and say you have a pay-as-you-go system, not a pass-the-buck system. That is what happened before. That's leadership.

And, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Arkansas, to my colleague from the great State of New York, it is a great honor to be among your midst as a fellow Blue Dog.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his insight as someone who has served in the war in Iraq as a captain in the Army, and we appreciate his service here in the Congress and his insight into helping us draft proposals like H.R. 97 to restore accountability and common sense on how your tax money is being spent in Iraq and ensuring that it is directed towards our brave men and woman in uniform and protecting them and keeping them safe.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for a new direction in Iraq, and that is what this Blue Dog hour has been about this evening. I thank my colleagues who have joined me.

If you have any comments or questions, you can e-mail us at BlueDog@mail.house.gov. That is BlueDog@mail.house.gov. We stand here on behalf of 47 fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog members that make up the Blue Dog Coalition.

## HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for half the time before midnight, which is approximately 50 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to come to the floor of the House this evening and do as I do many times late in the day after the official business of Congress has concluded and talk a little bit about health care.

Health care is going to be one of the things that we hear about a lot over the next 14 to 16 months before the next Presidential election. There are a lot of areas that I could discuss, but I want to concentrate on two areas. Those are the physician workforce itself, who is actually going to provide the care. And we are coming up on the 4 year anniversary of a law that was passed back in my home State of Texas that dealt with significant medical liability reform, and I would like to spend a few minutes talking about that also this evening.

We have to, as a Nation, look at the effects that some of the policies that we have generated here in Congress, quite honestly some of the policies that we have had that have been prevalent in our Medicaid and Medicare system that have resulted in physicians not continuing their practices, or, I am afraid to say, in some instances young people even deciding that the practice of medicine may not be for them.

Now, right before we left on break, we had an opportunity to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program. It was a program that is now going on 10 years since its inception, passed by a Republican Congress, signed into law by a Democratic President, so truly a bipartisan effort 10 years ago. It is going to expire at the end of this month.

Mr. Speaker, every one of us who stood in this Chamber and raised their right hand and swore an oath on January 3 that we were going to do the country's business this year, every one of us knew that the Children's Health Insurance Program expired at the end of the fiscal year, which is less than 30 days away.

Still, we waited until the absolute last minute before we broke on our August recess. A bill came to the House floor after some fairly contentious committee proceedings. Regular order in the committees was not adhered to. We didn't go through a subcommittee process. We got a big bill dumped on us right before we had a full committee hearing, and as a consequence, there was no time to evaluate that in my Energy and Commerce Committee. It was brought to the House floor and it passed largely on partisan lines. It is strikingly different than the bill passed in the Senate, and the President had already indicated that he would not sign but veto the bill passed in the Senate. And I have to believe that the bill that was passed at the last minute, in the waning moments before the August recess by the House of Representatives, I have to believe that the President feels the same way about that bill as well.

It is significant, of course, because there are a lot of people who depend on the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I can name one person in this body on either side of the aisle who wouldn't be for a reauthorization of this program if we could simply sit down and do it in a reasonable fashion. Unfortunately,

that was not available to us. So now, we will go through and watch the drama of naming conferees and having conference committee hearings and we will have a bill that will come to us which may or may not be acceptable. I have to believe at the end of the day it is going to be very, very difficult for us to pass a conference report that the President can sign before the 30th of September.

There was a lot of good stuff in the bill. There were a lot of good things in the bill that should have been tackled as separate entities, not rolled into this one big amalgam that was spread out before us right before the end of the session.

One of the things that was addressed in the bill that I was grateful for was an attempt to deal with one of the things that has been a very contentious issue the entire 5 years I have been in this Congress, and that is the issue on physician payments. But as a consequence of how the bill has been handled and how the bill was brought to the floor of the House and how the bill was pushed through the committee process, again it is unlikely that the reasonable things that were in the bill will ever see the light of day and those things will still be requiring our attention before we get to the end of this year.

Mr. Speaker, one day right before Chairman Alan Greenspan concluded his tenure as chairman of the Federal Reserve, he came and talked to a group of us here on Capitol Hill, and the question came up: Mr. Chairman, what do you see about the problems ahead for the Medicare program?

Chairman Greenspan thought about it and he said: I think when the time comes, you will make the necessary hard choices that are required to keep the Medicare program solvent. He then went on to say what concerns me more is will there be anyone there to deliver the services when you actually require them.

Those have been words that have stuck with me since the time Chairman Greenspan came and talked to us early that morning. He has since been back and talked to a different group, and I asked him if he feels the same way today, and the answer was not only yes, but yes and more so.

Back in my home State of Texas in March, the lead article in a magazine that is published by the Texas Medical Association called Texas Medicine was an issue about running out of doctors and how medical schools were having to work extra hard to develop new doctors, and since this was a Texas-based article, to keep those doctors practicing in Texas.

There is a series of three bills that I have recently introduced this year to try to deal with the oncoming physician manpower shortage as I see it. Now, the first of these bills would be to deal with graduate medical education and some enhancements to graduate medical education.

This would help younger doctors with the creation of new residency programs. A strange thing about doctors is, and one of the things that was stressed in this article in Texas Medicine, we have a lot of inertia. A doctor is very likely to go into practice within a 50- or 100-mile radius of where that doctor does their residency. They don't show a lot of originality of thought when it goes into establishing that private practice. They tend to stay where they were in training.

There are a lot of reasons for that: Comfort and knowledge of the other practitioners in the medical community, knowing those pathways for referral, perhaps even already having established some pathways for referral sources while in the residency program. For whatever reason, doctors tend to practice very close to where they trained in residency.

But a lot of smaller and medium-sized communities with hospitals that have a patient load that would sustain a residency program, in fact, don't have a residency program. The barrier to entry for a hospital like that to set up a residency program is quite expensive, and so the barrier to entry is significant. And as a consequence, those residency programs are just not done. They are not established.

The bill I proposed is designed to get more training programs into areas where medical service is less than optimal, perhaps rural or inner city areas, to get young doctors training in locations where they are actually needed.

□ 2230

Now, the Graduate Medical Education Enhancement Act, as introduced, would develop a program that would permit hospitals that do not traditionally operate a residency program, it would allow them the opportunity to start a residency training program to begin building that physician workforce of the future.

Now, on average, it costs about $100,000 a year to train a resident, and that cost for a smaller rural hospital can, in fact, be prohibitive. Because of the cost consideration, the bill would create a loan fund available to hospitals to create residency training programs, again where none has operated in the past. The program, of course, would require full accreditation and be generally focused in rural suburban, inner urban areas, areas where, again, the need is greatest.

Now, a diverse group of professional organizations, including the American College of Emergency Physicians and the American Osteopathic Association, have been very supportive of this legislation, and I think realistically this is something that this Congress could take up and could agree upon in a bipartisan fashion, and in fact, we likely could do that before the end of the year if we were to set our minds to it.

But locating young doctors where they're needed is part of solving an impending physician shortage that realistically could encompass the entire health care system in the country.

Another aspect that needs to considered is actually training the doctors for those high-need specialties. Now, a second bill introduced, H.R. 2384 for those of you who are keeping score at home, the High Need Physician Specialty Act of 2007, establishes a mix of scholarships, loan repayment funds and tax incentives to entice more students to medical school and to create incentives for students and newly minted doctors. This program will establish a repayment program for students who agree to go into high-need specialties, again family practice, internal medicine, emergency medicine, general surgery, OB/GYN, and practice in a medically underserved area. It will be a 5-year authorization at $5 million per year.

This bill would provide additional educational scholarships in exchange for a commitment, and that commitment is to serve in a public or private, nonprofit health facility determined to have a critical shortage of primary care physicians.

Other prominent groups such as the American Association of Retired Persons and the American College of Physicians support this high-need physician specialty legislation, and Mr. Speaker, I would just parenthetically point out, we did earlier this year a similar bill to offset some of the costs of educating young lawyers. And perhaps we should devote some similar attention to young physicians as well.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, in addressing the physician workforce crisis, in a little bit we're going to focus on some liability concerns in reforming the liability system. I've already talked about placement of doctors in locations in greatest need and the financial concerns of encouraging doctors to remain in high-need specialties.

But the other thing we've really got to focus on is perhaps the largest group of doctors, and I know for a fact it's the largest and still growing group of patients, that group that's encompassed by the so-called baby boom generation and their effect on the entire Medicare program.

We've all heard it before. The baby boomers are going to grow older and retire, and the demand for services are going to go through the roof, and if the physician workforce trends continue as they are today, that is, a downward trajectory, we may not be talking about just simply funding a Medicare program. We may be wondering where all the doctors are who are supposed to be taking care of those seniors.

Again, I allude back to the comments of Chairman Greenspan, and I think those comments echo very strongly today. But year over year, one of the reasons for this happening is year over year there's a reduction in reimbursement payments from the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services to doctors, to physicians for services that they provide to Medicare patients.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not a question of doctors just wanting to make more money. It's about stabilized repayment for services that have already been rendered, and it isn't affecting just doctors. This problem affects patients and becomes a real crisis of access.

Now, Mr. Speaker, not a week goes by that I don't get a letter or a fax from some doctor back in Texas who said, you know what, I have just had enough, and I am going to retire early or I'm no longer going to see Medicare patients in my practice or I'm going to restrict those procedures that I offer to Medicare patients.

Mr. Speaker, I know this is happening because I saw it in the hospital where I practiced in my own hospital environment before I left the practice of medicine to come to Congress back in 2003, but I hear it in virtually every town hall that I do back in my district. Someone will raise their hand and say how come on Medicare you turn 65 and you have to change doctors? Mr. Speaker, the answer is because their doctor found it no longer economically viable to continue to see Medicare patients because they weren't able to cover the cost of delivering the care.

Medicare payments to physicians are modified annually under something called the sustainable growth rate formula. You probably hear it referred to in the Capitol as the SGR formula. There are flaws in this formula. There's flaws in the process, and the SGR-mandated physician fee cuts in recent years have only been averted at the last minute by fixes that Congress does legislatively, usually at the eleventh hour right before we wrap things up at the end of the year.

If no long-term congressional action plan is implemented, the SGR, the sustainable growth rate, formula will continue year over year to mandate fee cuts. Mr. Speaker, let me also point out that these last minute fixes, Mr. Speaker, they're not free. They add to the cost of ultimately repealing the SGR.

One of the things we hear over and over again, it just costs too much, we can't repeal the SGR. But every year that we delay fixing the SGR, we add billions and billions of dollars to the total cost of ultimately repealing this sustainable growth rate formula, the formula under which no physician can continue to practice and see Medicare patients.

Mr. Speaker, unlike hospital reimbursement rates, which closely follow what's called the Medicare economic index, that's basically a consumer price index or cost of living adjustment, however you want to look at it, it's called the Medicare economic index which measures the cost of providing care. What is the cost of input for taking care of a patient in either a hospital or medical practice setting? But physician reimbursements don't track the Medicare economic index.

In fact, Medicare payments to physicians at present only cover about 65 percent of the actual cost of providing services. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine anyone in business or any industry and ask them to continue in business if they receive only 65 percent of what it costs them to deliver whatever good or service it is that they're providing? There's a recipe for financial disaster if you're in that sort of business. If you're losing 35 cents out of every dollar that is spent on health care, guess what; you don't make it up in volume.

Well, currently, the sustainable growth rate formula links physician payment updates to the gross domestic product, and Mr. Speaker, for the life of me I don't understand that. There is no relationship to the gross domestic product to the cost of providing care to America's most vulnerable patients, most complicated patients, our senior citizens.

But we hear it over and over again. Simply repeal of the sustainable growth rate formula is cost prohibitive, but you know, maybe if we do it over time, maybe if we don't try to do it all at once right here and now, maybe there is a way forward in this.

Last year, I introduced a bill, H.R. 5866, which sought to repeal the SGR straight up, just get rid of it, and the cost for that was scored by the Congressional Budget Office as being $218 billion. Reality is today, because of the cost of doing nothing, that repeal would likely cost in the neighborhood of $265- to $275 billion over that 10-year budget window, that elusive 10-year window that we're always talking about.

Mr. Speaker, paying physicians fairly will extend the career of many doctors who are now in practice, who otherwise some mornings may wake up and just opt-out of the Medicare program and may seek early retirement. They may run for Congress or they may restrict those procedures that they offer to their Medicare patients. You know, I talked about ensuring an adequate physician workforce. If we were to fix this problem with the sustainable growth rate formula, if we were to evolve to a Medicare economic index way of paying for those costs of actually delivering the care, maybe then older Americans could have the insurance that they will have the access to the coverage that they want, they need and that they expect.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot in this body about things like pay for performance. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the question, how does driving out perhaps some of the most capable doctors, doctors who are mature in their practice, who have developed practice patterns that are economical, they've developed efficiencies in their practice, that they are the doctors who are the most proficient in the operating room, the ones that will come to a diagnostic conclusion quickest, if we drive all of those doctors out of practice, how much are we going to have to pay for performance in that scenario?

Mr. Speaker, in a bill that I introduced, H.R. 2585, the physician payment stabilization bill, the sustainable growth rate formula would be repealed in 2 years' time, in 2010. That's 2 years from now, and by some other budgetary techniques, resetting the baseline in the SGR formula, provide physicians the protections that they would need for 2008 and 2009 so they would not see reductions in reimbursements over those years and would then provide them the sustained protection of the Medicare economic index in 2010 and beyond.

Now, recently, again the Congressional Budget Office estimated that the practical effect of my payment bill would bring a 1.5 percent update in 2008 and a 1 percent update in 2009 and then a complete elimination of the sustainable growth rate formula in 2010. The CBO also calculates an additional savings of $40 billion off of the total price tag of the SGR elimination.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, we always hear how things like improving health information technology and, indeed, reporting and incorporating some performance measures will lower the cost of care. Included in this bill would be two voluntary programs which would augment physicians' payments 3 percent for a physician or group who instituted some changes in their information technology and a 3 percent update for physicians that would participate in a voluntary reporting process, for those individuals who want to further offset the damaging effects of what the last 10 years of cuts in the sustainable growth rate formula have brought to their practices.

But Mr. Speaker, the concept here is very simple. It's so simple that sometimes we forget what the concept is. The concept is stop the cuts and repeal the SGR formula. It's the only logical, economically viable solution, and Mr. Speaker, it is the only solution that has in its focus the long-term problem.

Again, a lot of people say why not just bite the bullet and go with the full repeal of the SGR and get it out of the way. I tried that last year. I really found no enthusiasm for it, either in this body or any of the professional organizations that are out there that ostensibly would be there to help push a concept like this.

And Mr. Speaker, again, on paper it costs a tremendous amount of money to do that, and we're required here in Congress to live under the rule of the Congressional Budget Office to find out how much things cost: If we're going to be spending the taxpayers' money, how much are we going to spend, over what time will we spend it.

Because of the constraints of the Congressional Budget Office, we're not allowed to do what's called dynamic scoring. We can't look ahead and say, you know, I think if we do things this way, we're actually going to save some money. You can't do that under the current Congressional Budget Office constraints, and maybe that's okay, but it certainly puts some limits on some of the things that you're able to do.

Mr. Speaker, case in point is the trustee's report from Medicare that came out earlier this summer, and the bad news is that Medicare is still going broke. But the good news is that Medicare is going to go broke a year later than what they told us, 2019 instead of 2018.

The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is because 600,000 hospital beds in 2005 were not filled in the Medicare program. Those were beds that were expected to be filled, but in fact, those patients weren't admitted to the hospital. Because why? Doctors are doing things better. Doctors are doing more procedures and offering more in their offices, in their ambulatory surgery centers. Because of the way that the Medicare payment works in Part a, Part B, Part C and Part D, money that we save for Part A, because we spent more in Part B, never gets credited to Part B.

□ 2245

That's why we have such a difficulty in offsetting these costs. This bill that I have introduced would actually take those savings, sequester them, aggregate them, protect them, and 2 years later, cost savings from part A would, in fact, be applied to part B to bring down the cost of repealing the sustainable growth rate formula.

One of the main thrusts of the bill is to require the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services to look at the top 10 things that cost the most amount of money each year, to require the CMS to adopt reporting measures relating to these top 10 conditions. These things have already been developed. This is not reinventing the wheel.

The American Medical Association and several medical consortia have already developed reporting measures on the 10 conditions that drive medical costs so high.

We all remember the famous bank robber Willie Sutton. When they asked him why does he rob the bank, he replied because that's where the money is. Let's go where the money is. Let's go with these top 10 things where the greatest amount of money is spent because that's where the greatest amount of savings can occur.

If we can deliver care in a more timely fashion, if we can improve outcomes, we are actually going to spend less. If we spend less, let's give credit where credit is due. That's not by building up the trust fund in part A; that's by buying down the SGR formula in part B and ultimately repealing it once and for all.

The same considerations may apply to the Medicaid program as well, so it will be a very useful exercise to go through and identify those top 10 conditions, and where the savings can be the most easily gathered. Not only will it have an effect on Medicare, but I suspect Medicaid as well.

I think we ought to report back to the doctors to how they are doing, confidentially, of course, and individually. We don't tell everyone about every doctor, but let the doctor know how he is doing compared to his peers, how he or she is doing as far as their Medicare expenditures.

You know what? Since we will have the data there, and it's already collected, I think we should share data with the patient as well. How much did your care cost the government last year? Try to encourage patients to do those things to participate in their own care and see if they will not participate in bringing the cost of that care down.

Now, why do I spend so much time talking about this? Because it's a very important concept. Now, in the SCHIP bill, as was passed by the House, there was a modest physician fix for 2008 and 2009. It was less than the CBO scores, the physician fix for my bill, but the reality is, that the SCHIP bill, the physician fix contained within the SCHIP bill did not have as an end point the repeal of the SGR.

I reiterate, if you don't repeal the SGR, you only make the problem worse than in the out years. By 2010, what happens under the SCHIP bill? All those cuts come back, 10 percent, 13 percent reductions in payments to physicians that year alone, and it continues year over year for the remainder of that budgetary cycle.

In fact, the scenario, as it was described to me, is modest update in 2008 and 2009, you fall off a cliff in 2010, and you are frozen in 2013. It doesn't sound like an attractive proposition to me.

There is a way forward in this that makes sense. I encourage Members of Congress to look at 2585. It is a reasonable alternative to what was proposed in the SCHIP legislation. The reality is, as we all know, the SCHIP legislation is going to change radically before it ever sees the light of day. It's unclear and uncertain at this time whether a physician fix will, in fact, survive in that bill.

Whatever minutes I have left, I want to talk for just a little bit about medical liability reform, because I think this is an issue that this House still needs to address. My home State of Texas, now going on 4 years ago, September 12 of 2003, passed a major piece of legislation that was modeled after a bill passed in the State of California back in 1975.

I hate to admit that California was ahead of the curve on this, but the Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act of 1975 passed in the State of California, which capped noneconomic damages, had a very, very significant effect on what, at the time, was an out-of-control liability climate in that State.

The State of Texas adopted a similar program in 2003, modeled after the Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act of 1975 in California. The Texas bill actually puts a $250,000 cap on noneconomic damages as they pertain to the physician, a $250,000 cap on noneconomic damages as it applied to the hospital, and a second $250,000 cap on noneconomic damages if there is a second hospital or nursing home involved, for an aggregate cap of $750,000 for noneconomic damages. Actual medical injuries are paid at the actual rate, but noneconomic damages are capped at $750,000 under the Texas law.

This was a major, major change for Texas when this happened back in September of 2003. We had been undergoing many years of 20 to 30 percent increases in premiums for physicians' practices in Texas. In the late 1990s, we had 17 medical liability insurers in the State of Texas. In 2002, we were down to two medical liability insurers in the State of Texas. The rest had fled because the litigation climate was so unfavorable in my home State of Texas. You don't get very much competition. You don't get your very best competitive rates when you have only got two companies continuing to write business in your home State.

In 2003, we did pass the medical liability reform based off the California law, and a legitimate question to ask is how has Texas done since then? Remember I said we dropped from 17 insurers down to two, because the medical liability crisis rose very quickly. Within 2 years' time, we were back up to 14 or 15.

I don't know the total number today, but I believe it is either in the high 20s or perhaps even as high as 30 carriers in the State, a significant change from the environment from just 4 years ago. Most importantly, the carriers that have come back to the State have returned to the State of Texas without an increase in their premium.

In 2006, only 3 years after its passage, the Medical Protective Insurance Company had a 10 percent rate cut, which was its fourth reduction since April of 2005. Texas Medical Liability Trust, my last insurer of record, declared an aggregate of 22 percent cuts. Advocate MD, another company, filed a 19 percent rate decrease, and Doctors Company announced a 13 percent rate cut. Real numbers, real numbers that affect real people and affect real access for patients in a State that realistically was in peril in 2002, a significant reversal. More options mean better prices and a more secure setting for medical professionals to remain in practice.

One of the unintended beneficiaries of this act was the effect on small community not-for-profit hospitals, the type of hospital who would have been self-insured for medical liability.

They have been able to take money out of their escrow accounts and put it back to work in those hospitals to capitalize improvements, pay for nurse's salaries, just the kinds of things you would want your small, medium-sized not-for-profit community-based hospital to be doing, not holding money in escrow against the inevitable liability suit that might occur.

I took the language of the Texas plan, worked it so it fit with our constructs here in the House of Representatives. I took that language to the

ranking member of the Budget Committee before we did our budget vote earlier this year.

Representative RYAN, Ranking Member RYAN on the Budget Committee had that proposal scored by the Congressional Budget Office. The Texas plan, as applied to the House of Representatives, to the entire 50 States, would yield $3.8 billion in savings over 5 years' time; not a mammoth amount of money, but when you are talking about a $2.999 trillion budget savings of any size, moneys that we will leave on the table in this budgetary cycle that could have gone into some other spending priority, I've got to ask you, I've got to tell you, I just frankly do not understand why we would not look more seriously about taking up that type of plan.

Now, on the fourth anniversary of the passage of the Texas plan, I do intend to introduce this legislation. I think it is commonsense legislation that would bring significant relief to our doctors in practice and be a significant source of monetary savings for this House.

If Texas is doing such a good job as a State, why do I even care about it? Why do I even bring up that maybe we ought to look for a national solution?

Well, consider this. A 1996 study done at Stanford University revealed that in the Medicare system alone, that's a system that we pay for, that we have to come up with the money for every year, in the Medicare system alone, the cost of defensive medicine was approximately $28 to $30 billion a year.

That was 10 years ago. I suspect that number is higher today. That's why we can scarcely afford to continue on the trajectory that we are on with medical liability in this body and in this country. Again, I frankly do not understand why we will not embrace and capture those savings that are sitting out there within easy reach.

I began this hour talking about the physician workforce, and let me conclude this part of the liability discussion by coming back to the issue of the physician workforce.

No other issue in the practice of medicine, and I speak to you for someone who had a medical license and who still has a medical license, but it was an active practice for over 25 years before coming to Congress. No other issue grates on the sensibilities of a doctor in practice as a constant concern about a medical liability suit. We go into practice to do good work. We go into practice to do good things.

If a mistake is made or if an outcome is bad, it doesn't always mean that the next step has to be a trip to the lawyer's office and going through one of these egregious, emotionally trying lawsuits. That's one of the things that keeps young people away from the practice of medicine. They look at it and they think, well, it will cost me an awful lot to get that education. You know what, those courses are real hard, and by the time I get there, I will have to pay an enormous amount of money for my liability policy, and I don't even want to think about what it would be like if I actually got sued.

Young people getting out of college, are they considering medical school under those conditions? Unfortunately, a lot aren't.

We are keeping some of our best and brightest young people out of the health care profession because of the burden that we put upon them, the burden economically that we put upon them to get that education, just the burden that the education itself entails. It can't lighten that burden. It takes a lot of effort to study medicine. It takes more effort, I would suspect, here in the early 21st century than it did late in the 20th century when I was in my medical school classes.

But we have to consider the emotional price that we are asking young people to pay if they are go into the practice of medicine. It is within our grasp to reform this system. It is within our best interest as a country to reform this system, and financially, it makes tremendous sense to reform this system.

So I ask other Members of Congress to join me when I introduce this legislation later this month. This, again, is a commonsense, practical approach, proven in the laboratory of the States, my home State of Texas, to be a proven and effective method of reducing the cost of medical liability.

You have been very indulgent this evening.

## AMERICAN PATENT LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to raise a red flag to draw attention, the attention of my fellow Members, who are here assembled, as well as those listening on C–SPAN and those who will be reading this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On Friday, legislation is scheduled to come to the floor of the House that will have a huge impact on the American people, yet it is receiving little attention. What is it? It is a proposal to dramatically diminish a constitutionally protected right by fundamentally altering America's patent system.

If H.R. 1908, the bill in question, passes, there will be tremendous long-term negative consequences for our country.

Patent law is thought to be so complicated and esoteric that most people tune out once they realize that's what the subject is. Yet our technological genius and the laws protecting and promoting that genius have been at the heart of America's success as a Nation. America's technological edge has permitted the American people to have the highest standard of living in the world and permitted our country to sail safely through troubled waters, the troubled waters of world wars and international threats.

□ 2300

American technology has made all the difference. And it is the American patent law that has determined what technology, what level of technology development that America has had. Protecting individual rights, even of the little guy, has been the hallmark of our country. Patent rights, the right to own one's creation, are one of those rights that are written into the United States Constitution. In fact, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, George Washington and others, all our Founding Fathers were not only people that believed in freedom, but they also believed in technology and the potential of American genius. Visit Monticello and see what Thomas Jefferson did with the time after he penned the words of the Declaration of Independence and after he served as President of the United States. He went back to Monticello and he spent his time inventing things, inventing pieces of equipment and technologies that would lift the burden from the shoulders of labor.

And then there was Benjamin Franklin, again, a man who participated in the Declaration of Independence as well as the Constitution. He was the inventor of the bifocal. He was the inventor of the stove that kept people warm. Until then people only had fireplaces. He had many other inventions to his name. Yet he was also a man, one of our cherished Founding Fathers, who helped us create this free Nation. He believed in freedom and technology and believed that with freedom and technology we could increase the standard of living of our people, not just the elite, but of all the American people.

We have had the strongest protection system in terms of patents in the world; and that is why, in the history of humankind, there has never been a more innovative or creative people. It didn't just happen. It happened because in our Constitution, our Founding Fathers saw to it that the laws protecting one's intellectual creations, both technology and written communications, that those creative people would own their creations. No, it's not just the diversity of our society that has created the wondrous standard of living that we have all bragged about. This is not simply the diversity of our people and some notion that we have by coming from all over the world that has created the idea that all people should have opportunity and provided our people with opportunity. No, the innovation and progress and opportunity that we've enjoyed in America can be traced to our law, the law that protected the property rights of our people, just as we protected the political, just as we've protected the personal rights of our citizens.

Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin. But he also invented interchangeable parts for manufacturing. How did that

change America? How did that change the world? It uplifted us so people could have different sets of clothing that they could wear. The common person was helped by the fact of America's creative genius. Eli Whitney was a product of the American Constitution.

Cyrus McCormick invented the reaper. Before that people had to carry heavy pieces of equipment, scythes and reapers that were based on human strength and not strength of technology. With the invention of the reaper, people had more food, people had full stomachs.

Samuel Morse invented the telegraph, and from it came, of course, the telephone. And then there was Thomas Edison who invented the light bulb and so many of the other inventions. These were not just accidents. These were created because these people were able to flourish because they had constitutional protections for their rights of their invention.

One segment of our population, black Americans, were prolific inventors. Even at times when their rights were not being recognized, even when they faced major discrimination in our country, and at that time, even then, the issue of patent protection for our black citizens was recognized and because of that, many black Americans excelled in the area of inventions, men like Jan Matzeliger, who invented a machine that was used in shoe manufacturing. And before Matzeliger, and he was a former black slave, before he invented this shoe manufacturing machine, people in this country and all over the world usually wore one or two pairs of shoes for their entire life. And it was he that brought down dramatically, brought down the cost of shoes for the entire population. One of our product American black inventors.

George Washington Carver, a world respected scientist and inventor, and so many more in the black community. Why? Because in that era, when blacks were discriminated against, as I say, we actually respected the rights of ownership of black inventors and thus they excelled when their rights were protected.

We are proud of our history of technology, because we know, as Americans, we have, as we have always known throughout our country's history, that these inventions that we're talking about, made by Americans of every background, helped elevate the standard of living of all Americans. It created more wealth, wealth that was created with less labor and less burden on our people. It increased the standard of living of working people in this country so that not only the elite prospered, but all of the people had a full belly and clothes for their children.

The opportunity of all people who are part of the American brotherhood and sisterhood, the well-being of those people can be traced, not just to our diversity, which is something we celebrate, but also to the constitutional protection of our rights. And one of those rights which is so often overlooked is the right of people, the creators of new ideas, to own those ideas, whether we're talking about the written word or whether we're talking about technological advances.

And then of course, when we're talking about this, how can anyone forget the Wright brothers. The Wright brothers. We remember the Wright brothers. They were two guys who worked in a bicycle shop. They ended up inventing something just less than 100 years ago, or just about 100 years ago actually, just a few more years than 100 years ago, and they were told, 110 years ago that it was impossible for them to make this invention. Yet, they went ahead. The elites were telling them it was impossible. They went ahead and they spent their own money, their own time. They saved up. They had very little capital. They were the ultimate little guys, and they moved ahead and they did finally receive a patent because they changed the future of humankind, because they were the ones, of course, who took us from our feet planted on the ground to taking us off the ground and putting us on the road to the heavens. Just two ordinary Americans.

We Americans are proud that with our opportunity all people have a chance and all people can help pull the rest of us up into the heavens like the Wright brothers.

It was not only the raw muscle of every American. And so often people mistakenly think that human progress is a result of whether people work hard or not. That is not why people have higher standards of living. There are many people all over the world who work hard. They work strenuously hard. They work 15 hours a day. Their jobs are grueling. But no matter how hard they work, their society doesn't progress. Their families don't live any better.

No, hard work is not the only thing. Yes, hard work is part of it, but ingenuity and creativity, the intellectual part of the equation is vitally important to the success of any nation. And, yes, the legal system is also a vital part of that formula that will lead to uplifting all of humankind and can be seen in the example of the United States. So, yes, Americans work hard, just as others have. But Americans had their rights protected under law. And that's what permitted the innovators and the creators and the technologists to thrive in this country and what pulled the standard of living of all of our people up. What was established was a system in our Constitution and with our laws and our patent system that would protect ingenuity and creativity.

We treated intellectual property, the creation of new technologies, as we treated property, as we treated personal, and as we've treated political, rights. And that is what America is all about.

Every person has rights. Now, we didn't always live up to that dream; and, yes, there was discrimination, terrible discrimination against black citizens and we always have to recognize that. And against Indian Americans and others. But we have tried our best, and we are moving forward trying to perfect our system.

But every American, every American has benefited by the fact that our technologies have been protected under constitutional law; and thus our creators, our creative population has managed to bring about a higher standard of living and opportunities for all Americans.

Today we face a great historical challenge. And this challenge comes at exactly a time when our country is threatened from abroad economically, as never before. We must prevail over our economic competitors and adversaries, or the American people will suffer.

There are people who think of themselves at war with us. We know that radical Islam thinks they're at war with us. But we also have people who think they're at war with us economically. They're at war with the well-being of the American people. They see us and the well-being of our people as their target. We must win this war, this economic competition that we are entering, this economic competition based not on hard work but on technology and creative genius; and if we do not win this war, our people will lose. Our people will lose especially if we permit the technology and creative genius of our people to be stolen by people who are our economic adversaries and to be used to outcompete our own people. If we lose this battle, our people will suffer. Future generations will see their standard of living decline, as well as the safety and strength of our country. If we do not remain technologically superior, we will find that in the future the livelihood of our people and the safety of our country will be in jeopardy.

Our economic adversaries, and their allies within the American business community, and let us note that, that our economic adversaries have allies in multinational corporations, many of them who are, what, part of the American business community. But these economic adversaries are engaged in a systematic attack on our well-being, and thus they have noticed one of the strongest and most important elements of America's success has been the patent protection that we have offered the American people.

Today, multinational corporations, some based here in the United States, run by an elite whose allegiance is to no country, these people have tremendous influence near the Nation's Capitol. You can see it when it comes to China policy. You can see it when it comes to trade policy. And, now, in their attempt to undermine patent protections, you can see that in this effort to undermine the constitutional patent protections that our people have enjoyed for over 200 years.

There is a corporate elite at play who don't give it a second thought to move their manufacturing operations to China. Now, here you've got Americans supposedly, American businessmen. They're moving their manufacturing to a country run by a Marxist dictatorship. This corporate elite betrays American values and betrays the American working people themselves. What? Why do they do this?

Well, they would rather exploit Chinese slave labor with the full cooperation of a dictatorial Chinese regime, than they would pay the market rate for the American working person and as well, which is part of the price, of course, of having a free society in which they are protected here at home. Yet, they would go to China and make a deal with the world's worst human rights abuser to set up a manufacturing unit there. And this very same elite will do that and betray the American worker in order to make a 25 percent profit rather than a 10 percent or a 5 percent profit at home, while at the same time the American working people will get their share of the benefit because they're working in that company. No, the American corporate elite that goes to China would rather do that. Many of them, by the way, are part of the electronics industry, as we know. The electronics industry has moved in a big way to China. They've even, in fact, claimed that, oh, well if we just have more interaction economically with China, that, what will happen? Well, China will evolve into a democratic society.

Yet, these same corporate leaders, supposedly Americans, help the Chinese Government set up a computer system that will aid them in tracking down democratic opponents of the dictatorship. We know now that the Falun Gong in China is suffering immense repression, as are other believers in God. Yet, we have a business elite that doesn't blink an eye at that and goes there and invests their technology and their capital in creating manufacturing there.

□ 2315

Well, people who will do that won't think twice about stealing a small inventor's or a little guy's invention so that they won't have to pay royalties to that American inventor. Why should they? If they are willing to deal with the tyrants and the gangsters in China and betray the American workers, why would they care about giving royalties to some inventor? And what are they doing? They are helping steal the American inventors' products without giving the royalties, and, worse, they are taking it to China to use in manufacturing facilities over there that will even put more Americans out of work here.

How could any American do that? Well, they aren't Americans. What they are, if you get right down to it, they are globalists. Yes, people have to understand that here we are, our country has evolved into now this new dichotomy of globalists versus patriots.

Well, put me on the side of the patriots. We are supposed to be watching out for the interests of the American people. We are not supposed to be watching out for the American business elite any more than we are supposed to be watching out for the American worker. They are supposed to have equal rights. And one of those rights has been the protection of intellectual property. But the business and corporate elites that want to move to China, the same ones who are behind this legislation, H.R. 1908, the electronics industry, want to steal the technology being developed by the little guy in America so they won't have to pay royalties. That is what it comes down to. And these same people who are building the factories in China, the same people who are giving technology to China, the same people now who want to take the ideas of American inventors and take them to China and elsewhere without having to pay royalties, these are the people behind 1908.

The justification for this attack on the patent system, guess what, it is called harmonization of our laws with the rest of the world. If you ask those people why do we have to make these fundamental changes to our patent law? Our patent law has been there for 200 years. They will tell you that we have to harmonize our law with the rest of the world and our laws are totally different.

We cannot permit corporate elitists who consider themselves globalists to mold our policies, especially if it means diminishing the legal protections for our American citizens, especially those inventors and creative people who are coming up with the technologies that Americans are going to need to have if our country is to be prosperous and secure in the future.

If the globalists are successful, 20 years from now our citizens will wonder what hit them. Pearl Harbor happened in a moment. Our people woke up to the threat and they mobilized. Today it is happening slowly, and the attack is less evident. But rights are being eroded by the changes in our law that will cause a decreasing standard of living to our people and damage our way of life, and that damage will be devastating to the American people in years ahead, and they will never know what hit them. This attack is being conducted not by bombers in Pearl Harbor and Hawaii, but it is being done by lobbyists in the Nation's capital who are out to pillage our wealth and transfer that wealth and power overseas. You see it everywhere.

Who is watching out for the interests of the American people? We will let the public determine that. But first we have to get the public's attention. And these moves on this patent bill have been so quiet. The vote is going to be Friday, H.R. 1908. They are going to try to slip this by. One of the steps necessary for them to transfer the wealth and to cut down this dominance that the American people have over the global economy, one of the things they have to do to achieve that goal so we are harmonized with the rest of the world is to destroy our patent system and make it like the patent system from other countries.

Lobbyists have been hired by well-heeled multinational corporations and by companies who no longer have any desire to pay for the use of technology that has been developed by other American citizens, little guys. They, of course, are not saying we are out to destroy the patent system. They will be aghast when they hear that I am suggesting they want to destroy the patent system. They know that is what it is, but they will act like they are aghast.

Now, there are lots of flaws in our patent system. We hear about a widespread problem, and there are some problems. But we know that many of the problems are just being exaggerated. For example, we hear horror stories concerning companies that are tied up for years in court and eventually have to relent to trial lawyers in terms about delays in the system. We hear about that. We hear about examiners who are overworked, which is true. Our patent examiners are heavily overworked. They aren't getting the training they need, and they are not getting the pay they deserve. So we have got some problems in our patent system that we need to take care of. But that has nothing to do with H.R. 1908.

In reality, of course, some of these problems aren't real. Patent lawsuits are not a major problem, as people are claiming they are. Between 1993 and 2005, the number of patent lawsuits versus the number of patents granted has been steady at around 1.5 percent. In fact, in 2006 only 102 patent cases actually went to trial. So when they say we have got to do this to correct the lawsuit problem, there isn't a major lawsuit problem.

But there are real problems that need to be solved. Our patent examiners, as I said, are overworked and they are underpaid. They need to be trained. More money that comes from people buying patents, we need to keep that right at the patent office and train those patent examiners and give them the money they need so we can hire the top quality people.

Unfortunately, the legislation making its way through the system does not correct the problems. The problems are being used as an excuse, but the proposed changes that we are talking about here are not dealing with the problems. So there must be some other goal of this legislation.

So let's understand we need patent legislation that speeds up the patent process, provides training and compensation for the patent examiners, and helps us protect our inventors against theft. Yes, we need to help our inventors protect themselves against foreign threat and, yes, even domestic

threat. And we need to put some work into patent reform which will protect our inventors. Well, the bill that we are talking about has nothing to do with that. A bill that handled those goals would be justified and welcomed.

Unfortunately, what we are witnessing is a replay of the illegal immigration strategy. The American people are crying out for protection against a virtual invasion of illegal immigrants into our country. The special interests who benefited by this flood of illegals tried to push an immigration bill through the Congress that would have made the situation worse. That's right. They had a bill in the name of illegal immigration reform that would have made it worse. To confuse the public, they kept calling it a ''comprehensive'' bill as if it was designed to fix the problem. Instead, it was designed for one thing and one thing only. The comprehensive bill for illegal immigration was designed to give amnesty to all those illegals who came here illegally, which would have attracted, had we given them that amnesty, tens of millions of more illegals into our country. So it would have made it worse. But with a straight face, those who were advocating illegal immigration reform kept calling it a ''comprehensive'' plan even though they knew that implied they were reforming the system to make it better when, in fact, they were going the opposite direction of what the vast majority of people knew was the problem. And the problem was what? A huge influx of illegal immigrants into our country, and giving amnesty would have made it worse.

Well, the same strategy is seemingly being used by those who are behind the effort to destroy the American patent system. So you will never hear them say they want to destroy the American patent system the same way that the advocates of comprehensive immigration would never admit what they were doing was amnesty. No, they are out to destroy the patent system as it has worked since the founding of our country. Instead of arguing their case, they are simply calling it a ''comprehensive'' bill. Does that sound familiar? A ''comprehensive patent bill,'' that makes it sound like you are going to make it better. No, you are out to destroy the patent system. A ''comprehensive immigration bill,'' that sounds like you want to end this immigration influx into our country. No, it is going to make it worse. Well, that is why the American people are a little bit confused.

Who is watching out for the American people? The American people have got to pay attention to this.

This bill, H.R. 1809, is similar to the one that we barely beat back 10 years ago. I called that the ''Steal American Technologies Act,'' and that was back 10 years ago. And, believe me, we were up against the most powerful corporations. We were just a ragtag group of people. Marcy Kaptur on that side of the aisle and Steny Hoyer helped us out as well, Don Manzullo and myself and just a couple others. We fought these special interests, and no one thought we had a chance. But we won. And we won because the American people got wind of what was happening, and we won. We beat it back, and that was in 1997. But here we go again with a bill that looks almost exactly like that bill in so many ways. So I will just call H.R. 1809 the ''Steal American Technologies Act, Part Two.''

First and foremost, we have to, of course, look at what does H.R. 1908 do? First and foremost, it is designed to weaken the patent protection of the American inventor. So let's just note that right off. The purpose of the bill is to weaken the patent protection, the constitutional rights that the American inventor has had since the founding of our country.

I support real reform, as do the others who oppose this bill, but the proposed changes in H.R. 1908 will cause the collapse of the American patent system, the system that has sustained America for 200 years, and that is the real purpose behind this bill. Make no mistake about it.

For the RECORD I would submit a list of those major people and organizations who are opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

At this point in my remarks, I submit that list for the RECORD.

ORGANIZATIONS AND COMPANIES WITH OBJECTIONS TO BERMAN PATENT LEGISLATION (H.R. 1908)

3M, Abbott Accelerated Technologies, Inc., Acorn Cardiovascular Inc., Adams Capital Management, Adroit Medical Systems, Inc., AdvaMed, Advanced Diamond Technologies, Inc., Advanced Medical Optics, Inc., Advanced Neuromodulation Systems, Inc., Aero-Marine Company, AFL–CIO, African American Republican Leadership Council, AIPLA—American Intellectual Property Law Association.

Air Liquide, Air Products, ALD NanoSolutions, Inc., ALIO Industries, Allergan, Inc., Almyra, Inc., AmberWave Systems Corporation, American Conservative Union (The), American Intellectual property Law, Association (AIPLA), American Seed Trade, Americans for Sovereignty.

Americans for the Preservation of Liberty, Amylin Pharmaceuticals, AngioDynamics, Inc., Applied Medical, Applied Nanotech, Inc., Argentis Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Arizona BioIndustry Association, ARYx Therapeutics, Ascenta Therapeutics, Inc., Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM).

Asthmatx, Inc., AstraZeneca, Aware, Inc., Baxa Corporation, Baxter Healthcare Corporation, BayBio, Beckman Coulter, BIO—Biotechnology Industry Organization, BioCardia, Inc., BIOCOM, Biogen Idec, Biomedical Association, BioOhio, Bioscience Institute, Biotechnology Council of New Jersey.

Blacks for Economic Security Trust Fund, BlazeTech Corporation, Boston Scientific Corporation, Bridgestone Americas Holding, Inc., Bristol-Myers Squibb, BuzzLogic, California Healthcare Institute, California Healthcare Institute (The), Canopy Ventures, Carbide Derivative Technologies, Cardiac Concepts, Inc., CardioDynamics, Cargill, Inc., Cassie-Shipherd Group (The), Caterpillar, Celgene Corporation, Cell Genesys, Inc., Center 7, Inc., Center for Small Business and the Environment (The), Centre for Security Policy, Cephalon, CheckFree, Christian Coalition of America.

Cincinnati Sub-Zero Products, Coalition for 21st Century Patent Reform (The), Coalitions for America, CogniTek Management Systems, Inc., Colorado Bioscience Association, Conceptus, Inc., CONNECT, Connecticut United for Research Excellence, Cornell University, Corning Incorporated, Coronis Medical Ventures, Council for America, CropLife America, Cryptography Research, Cummins-Allison Corporation.

Cummins Inc., CVRx Inc., Dais Analytic Corporation, Dartmouth Regional Technology Center, Inc., Declaration Alliance, Deltanoid Pharmaceuticals, Digimarc Corporation, DirectPointe, Dow Chemical Company, Dupont, Dura-Line Corporation, Dynatronics Co., Eagle Forum, Eastman Chemical Company, Economic Development Center, Edwards Lifesciences, Elan Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Electronics for Imaging, Eli Lilly and Company, Ellman Innovations LLC, Enterprise Partners Venture Capital, Evalve, Inc.

Exxon Mobile Corporation, Fallbrook Technologies Inc., FarSounder, Inc. Footnote.com.

Gambro BCT, General Electric, Genomic Health, Inc., Gen-Probe Incorporated, Genzyme, Georgia Biomedical Partnership, Glacier Cross, Inc., GlaxoSmithKline, Glenview State Bank, Hawaii Science & Technology Council, HealthCare Institute of New Jersey, HeartWare, Inc., Helius, Inc., Henkel Corporation, Hoffman-LaRoche, Inc.

iBIO, Imago Scientific Instruments, Impulse Dynamics (USA), Inc., Indiana Health Industry Forum, Indiana University, Innovation Alliance, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE)-USA, InterDigital Communications Corporation, Intermolecular, Inc., International Association of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), Invitrogen Corporation, Iowa Biotechnology Association, ISTA Pharmaceuticals, Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Johnson & Johnson, Leadership Institute (The), Let Freedom Ring, Life Science Alley, LITMUS, LLC.

LSI Corporation, Lux Capital Management, Luxul Corporation, Maryland Taxpayers' Association.

Masimo Corporation, Massachusetts Biotechnology Council, MassMEDIC, Maxygen Inc., MDMA—Medical Device Manufacturer's Association, Medical College of Wisconsin, MedImmune, Inc., Medtronic, Merck, Metabasis Therapeutics, Inc., Metabolex, Inc., Metabolix, Inc., Metacure (USA), Inc., MGI Pharma Inc., MichBio, Michigan Small Tech Association, Michigan State University, Millennium Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Milliken & Company, Mohr, Davidow Ventures, Monsanto Company, Motorola.

NAM—National Association of Manufacturers, NanoBioMagnetics, Inc. (NBMI), NanoBusiness Alliance (The), NanoInk, Inc., NanoIntegris, Inc., Nanomix, Inc., Nanophase Technologies, NanoProducts Corporation, Nanosys, Inc., Nantero, Inc., National Center for Public Policy Research, Nektar Therapeutics, Neoconix, Inc., Neuro Resource Group (NRG), Neuronetics, Inc., NeuroPace, New England Innovation Alliance, New Hampshire Biotechnology Council, New Hampshire Department of Economic Development, New Mexico Biotechnical and Biomedical Association, New York Biotechnology Association.

Norseman Group (The), North Carolina Biosciences Organization, North Carolina State University, North Dakota State University, Northrop Grumman Corporation, Northwestern University, Novartis Corporation, Novasys Medical Inc., NovoNordisk, NUCRYST Pharmaceuticals, Inc. NuVasive,

Inc., Nuvelo, Inc., Ohio State University, OpenCEL, LLC,

Palmetto Biotechnology Alliance, Patent Café.com, Inc., Patent Office Professional Association, Pennsylvania Bio, Pennsylvania State University, PepsiCo, Inc., Pfizer, PhRMA—Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, Physical Sciences Inc., PointeCast Corporation, Power Innovations International, PowerMetal Technologies, Inc., Preformed Line Products, Procter & Gamble, Professional Inventors' Alliance, ProRhythm, Inc., Purdue University, Pure Plushy Inc., QUALCOMM Inc.

QuantumSphere, Inc., QuesTek Innovations LLC, Radiant Medical, Inc., Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Research Triangle Park, NC, Retractable Technologies, Inc., RightMarch.com, S & C Electric Company, Salix Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Sangamo Biosciences, Inc., ScanDisk Corporation, Semprius, Inc., Small Business Association of Michigan—Economic Development Center, Small Business Exporters, Association of the United States (The).

Small Business Technology Council (The), Smart Bomb Interactive, Smile Reminder, SmoothShapes, Inc., Solera Networks, South Dakota Biotech Association, Southern California Biomedical Council, Spiration, Inc., St. Louis University, Standup Bed Company (The), State of New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development, Stella Group, Ltd. (The), StemCells, SurgiQuest, Inc.

Symyx Technologies, Inc., Tech Council of Maryland/MdBio, Technology Patents & Licensing, Tennessee Biotechnology Association, Tessera, Inc., Texas A&M, Texas Healthcare, Texas Instruments, Three Arch Partners.

United Technologies, University of California System, University of Illinois, University of Iowa, University of Maryland, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of New Hampshire, University of North Carolina System, University of Rochester, University of Utah, University of Wisconsin-Madison, US Business and Industry Council, US Council for International Business.

USGI Medical, USW—United Steelworkers, Vanderbilt University and Medical Center, Virent Energy Systems, Inc., Virginia Biotechnology Association, Visidyne, Inc., VisionCare Opthamalogic Technologies, Inc., Washington Biotechnology & Biomedical Association, Washington University, WaveRx, Inc.

Wayne State University, Wescor, Inc., Weyerhaeuser, Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF), Wisconsin Biotechnology and Medical Device Association, Wyeth.

That list includes some large companies. It includes biotech companies, for example, who are putting out so much of the technology that we will need for the future. It includes pharmaceuticals who know that there are companies around the world who are waiting to steal the product after they have spent hundreds of millions of American dollars into developing new pharmaceuticals. Almost all of our major universities are against this patent bill because they themselves are developing new technologies and they know that the new patent bill will undermine, undermine, their efforts to create these new technologies and to benefit from the technologies, as they should because they are the creators. The patent examiners are against this legislation. Labor unions are against this. The AFL–CIO is against this legislation. That is why we have another bipartisan coalition with Ms. KAPTUR and Judge Hastings and others who are on our side in this battle. It is a bipartisan Republican-Democrat coalition. It is the patriots versus the globalists.

□ 2330

So why are so many opposed to it? Perhaps it's easiest to understand the issue, because if you talk about what this bill does in terms of disclosure, and what does that mean, in this bill it's called publication.

From the founding of our country until recent years, it has been mandated that every patent application be held confidential until the patent was issued. So if you're an inventor and you've got an idea and you've developed it, you filed the application; but you know that that's going to be held secret. In fact, patent examiners could be put in jail for felonies if they release that information.

Well, this, of course, is dramatically different than the rest of the world. In the rest of the world, after 18 months, in Japan and Europe, if you file for a patent, even if you don't get the patent, they're going to publish it for everybody to see. And the inventor is so vulnerable, they have to give up usually almost all the rights to the things they've invented. That's why you don't see the Japanese inventing many things; they perfect things, but they don't invent them.

In short, this bill, H.R. 1908, the Steal American Technologies Act, the sequel, now get into this, this is really important and it's easy to understand. This bill would eliminate the right of confidentiality to American inventors. What does that mean? H.R. 1908 would mandate the publication of all patent applications 18 months after the patent is applied for whether or not the patent has been granted.

Does everybody understand what we're talking about here? We're talking about American inventors up until now have known, if they so chose to do this, they would not have to reveal their secrets until the patent was given to them. Thus they had some legal protection. This bill will take that right away from the American inventors so that if they apply for a patent on very sophisticated technological breakthroughs, the Chinese, the Indians, the Japanese, the Koreans, they will have all have the information and be in manufacturing before our small inventors even get their patent.

With the Steal American Technologies Act, does that sound like that's what I'm describing? That's exactly what we're describing. We are inviting the foreign thieves to come in and take our most precious technological advances and use those technologies against us to put our people out of work. That's why the labor unions are against this bill. That's why the Democratic Party should be against this bill and the Republican Party should be against it. That's why patriots should be against it. It is easy for everyone to understand that.

Those pushing H.R. 1908 want China, Japan, Korea, India and others to have every detail of developing technologies and of our creative ideas even before the patents have been issued. This legislation will facilitate China, India, and other countries in their efforts to steal our creative genius. First they will say, oh, well the inventor then could come back and sue these companies overseas who are using their creation that they've gotten by taking it from the information that was published. Oh, give me a break. Does anyone really believe that an American inventor can go to China or India and can sue after they've been in production for years? They can't even get the information of how much has been produced over there at that time. So, yes, this is the Steal American Technologies Act, and we have got to stop them.

Secondly, this bill changes the fundamental concept of the American patent system, another fundamental concept which this will end up with very dramatic and confusing consequences, although it is a little hard to understand. Traditionally, ownership rights go to those inventors who were the first ones to invent the technology in question. That does not necessarily mean that they were the first one to actually file some type of patent application that dealt with that particular issue or that particular type of technology. No. If someone actually had an invention of a machine, their patent, if they actually invented it and they could prove that, it wasn't the first to file that counts, it was the person who actually invented something. That was a principle in our system. And basically what it did is it prevented businesses and individuals from having to, for every time they made a little bit of progress, to go out and try to apply for another patent.

Because with this system, what this bill will do, it will make sure that businesses now will be flooding the Patent Office every time they make one little step forward towards an eventual goal, rather than waiting for the goal to be achieved and have a complete new system that can be justified to have a patent.

So the people of the Patent Office believe that this change, which seems innocuous, from something that has worked well for the United States for 200 years, has worked well for us, and now they want to change it so that we can be like the rest of the world supposedly, while the rest of the world, the only people who can operate at this level are these big multinational corporations, the very elite rich guys. No. We want our regular Americans to be able to operate under this system. And making it first-to-file makes it so much more expensive because you have to apply for so many more patents, the little guy gets frozen out. Of course those people that are pushing this harmonization know that very well. They

just don't care about the little guy because they are Goliath, and the little guy is just a little David down there.

I am very happy that the history of the United States Government is the history of us being for the little guy over the big guy, that we protect the rights of the little guy. That's why our patent law is different than the patent law in Japan, where economic shoguns control their economy.

The third, H.R. 1908 fundamentally changes the legal criteria in which patents can be challenged. It provides numerous ways in which large companies, foreigners, and other infringers can attack and add costs to the inventors. So we've added all sorts of new ways for those guys to come in and attack that small inventor. We have opened up the system to the point where the inventor can be attacked before the patent has been granted, and also, the inventor can then, also with this legislation, be attacked after the patent has been granted. And this again changes those rules by offering new avenues to attack the small guy. Of course the big guys don't care; they've got lots of lawyers working for them. What this will mean is the big guys can beat down the little guys just like they do in Japan. Don't we want to harmonize with Japan? Don't we want to have a society like Japan where ordinary citizens never dream about increasing their standard of living and rising up and having their children live better? No.

This bill is a catastrophe for the little inventor, and that's why we have so many people who have opposed this bill, but yet it keeps moving forward. It keeps moving forward because there are special interests who will make huge sums of money by not having to may royalties, especially in the electronics industry, which is different. Remember, they are different, the electronics industry than pharmaceuticals and biotech and the universities and the others and the smaller inventor. Why are they different? Because what they do is they put together a product with many different components, all of which you have to pay a royalty in order to use them. They don't want to pay those royalties. They want to steal it from the little guy. Well, I'm sorry, the electronics industry has to pay for what they use. They're not going to set up a system that undermines the protection that the little guys, that we've had for 200 years in this country.

This bill complicates efforts to establish willfulness on the part of an infringer. So what happens is you have undermined some of the legal criteria used in the case if a small inventor or someone does go after an infringer. This bill changes some of the actual criteria that are being used. It creates a re-examined practice for facilitating attacks by infringers on legitimate patent holders. In short, this bill allows large companies to swallow costs and risks so that it can beat down the rightful owners of technology.

Now, it seems like a horror story to America's inventors, but we are told what is really going on here, of course, as I keep saying, it's an effort to harmonize our laws. Now, doesn't that sound nice? And doesn't comprehensive reform sound nice? Just like comprehensive reform sounded good for the immigration bill. We knew what that was now, don't we? Comprehensive reform was a way to give amnesty and destroy our protections against illegal immigration without having to ever confront the argument.

This comprehensive reform of the patent system is the same strategy. Yes, they are going to harmonize the law with the rest of the world. That's harmony. That sounds like a wonderful word. And ''comprehensive,'' that also sounds great.

Well, we have had the strongest patent protection of any country on this planet, just as we had the same and the strongest protection for the rights of freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and other rights that we hold sacred. What would happen if in order to harmonize the freedom of religion and freedom of speech for the rest of the world, we were told that the protection of our freedoms that we now enjoy need to be diminished so that they could be harmonized with the rest of the world?

Let's say we could be like the people of Singapore or some other country that is not necessarily democratic, but is not a dictatorship either. What would happen if the American people were told that? What would happen, I would tell you, there would be a revolution through the United States of America. You are not going to diminish the rights of the American people in order to harmonize the law internationally. Forget it. I don't care if it's personal rights, political rights, property rights or technology and creative rights like we're talking about tonight. The patriots in this country are not going to see their rights diminished in order to create a new world order where we can all live in harmony with the elite telling us what to do.

However, the move to harmonize patent law, of course, is going smoothly right now, unlike it would if we tried to say we're going to bring down and diminish all those other rights, because there would be a revolution right now. But with patent law it's going a lot more smoothly.

In fact, it's coming up to a vote Friday and most people have no idea it's coming to the floor, or most Americans and most people even in this body have no idea of the significance of H.R. 1908. Why? Because it's being kept very low key. There's no fanfare. Not many people can even understand it. As I say, they tune out as soon as they hear the word ''patent law.'' All of this, of course, while the freedom and well-being of future generations is being frittered away.

We are on the edge. If this bill passes, it will have dramatic impact on the well-being of average Americans. The fact is we have had the strongest patent rights protection, and that is why we have had more innovation and a higher standard of living than any other people in the world. The common man here has the opportunity that common people in other parts of the world do not have because America has had technological superiority, and we've had a system based on protecting individual rights, the individual rights of the little guy, not just the big guys.

If our rights to patent protection are diminished, which is what H.R. 1908 will do, if we do that, if we diminish the rights of our patent protection in order to harmonize with the rest of the world, we will end up with the same type of opportunity and the same type of rights that they have in Third World countries.

Is that what we want? Do we want our people to have harmonized rights, new world order so we can all live like they live in Third World countries? Perhaps if someone is a corporate elitist who lives in a gated community, that might sound good. Hey, we can have all kinds of peons just walking around who will do my bidding and I can send my kids to private school. We live behind a gated community, I can actually have a driver and my kids can have nannies and we could have people cleaning up the yard and I can have my manufacturing facility in China, where they don't care if they're polluting the air or not. Boy, I'll tell you, that doesn't hurt those guys because they don't identify, when you say Third World country, they don't say, gee, I would be living worse off, they think it's the other guy, the little guy. And they're right, it's the little guys. Yeah. These people don't even want to pay royalties.

The electronics industry, what this is based on, does not want to pay royalties to the little guys. If you want to see anything more about this, you want to know the historic background of it, go down to the Nation's Capitol and you will find a statue to Philo Farnsworth. Philo Farnsworth was the guy who invented the picture tube. RCA, Mr. Sarnoff, the president of RCA, tried to steal that technology from Mr. Farnsworth because he was just a little guy. And for 20 years they fought it out, the biggest, most powerful corporation. Instead of just paying Mr. Farnsworth a royalty and giving him some credit, they had to steal it from him, to beat him down in the ground and smash him like a bug. But luckily we live in the United States of America. That case went all the way to the Supreme Court; and God bless America, the Supreme Court sided with Farnsworth instead of this RCA that tried to dominate this man who gave them the genius that they needed to make the picture tube work. We wouldn't have had it. They were going in the exactly the wrong direction, but they couldn't even give him the credit.

That's what the corporate elite thinks about us little guys. That's the way they do it. That's why they want to change constitutional protections,

make it a new world order. That's why we have all of this talk about globalism and all these international bodies that we're going to give power to because our corporate elite doesn't feel threatened by that, but each and every American should because none of those people overseas are going to watch out for us.

H.R. 1908 is coming up on Friday. It's a major attack on a constitutional right that's been part of the American system, part of the American system since the founding of your country. It's written into our Constitution.

□ 2345

We cannot make those changes and expect things are going to stay the same. But we beat this before. MARCY KAPTUR, DANA ROHRABACHER, DON MANZULLO and a few others, we beat back this attempt. But we did it because the American people called their congressmen and said, ''Don't vote for the H.R. 1908 Steal American Technologies Act.'' That is what they did before, and we won. We contacted our congressmen.

That is how we beat comprehensive immigration reform. We can beat this bill, too, just like that. We can watch out for America if the PATRIOT Act and we watch out for the little guy together, if all of us come together and watch out for the little guy, all of our rights will be protected. That is what America is all about.

I beg my fellow Members to pay attention to this vote. I beg the American people to pay attention to this vote. There will be dramatic changes in our life and the opportunity our children will face and the safety of our country if we change this fundamental of our law.

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

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. HOOLEY (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of business in the district.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and until 1:30 p.m. on September 5 on account of medical reasons.

Mr. POE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of official business.

Mr. SHIMKUS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of attending the NATO Parliamentary Assembly in Afghanistan.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and September 5 on account of family illness.

Mr. ROYCE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

## 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. SOLIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SARBANES, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GINGREY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, September 5, 6, 7, and 11.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and September 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, September 5.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today and September 5, 6, 7, and 11.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 163. An act to improve the disaster loan program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Ms. Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 1260. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6301 Highway 58 in Harrison, Tennessee, as the ''Claude Ramsey Post Office''.

H.R. 1335. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 508 East Main Street in Seneca, South Carolina, as the ''S/Sgt Lewis G. Watkins Post Office Building''.

H.R. 1384. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 118 Minner Avenue in Bakersfield, California, as the ''Buck Owens Post Office''.

H.R. 1425. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4551 East 52nd Street in Odessa, Texas, as the ''Staff Sergeant Marvin 'Rex' Young Post Office Building''.

H.R. 1434. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 896 Pittsburgh Street in Springdale, Pennsylvania, as the ''Rachel Carson Post Office Building''.

H.R. 1617. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 561 Kingsland Avenue in University City, Missouri, as the ''Harriett F. Woods Post Office Building''.

H.R. 1722. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 601 Banyan Trail in Boca Raton, Florida, as the ''Leonard W. Herman Post Office''.

H.R. 2025. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11033 South State Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''Willye B. White Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2077. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20805 State Route 125 in Blue Creek, Ohio, as the ''George B. Lewis Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2078. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14536 State Route 136 in Cherry Fork, Ohio, as the ''Staff Sergeant Omer 'O.T.' Hawkins Post Office''.

H.R. 2127. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 408 West 6th Street in Chelsea, Oklahoma, as the ''Clem Rogers McSpadden Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2309. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3916 Milgen Road in Columbus, Georgia, as the ''Frank G. Lumpkin, Jr. Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2563. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 309 East Linn Street in Marshalltown, Iowa, as the ''Major Scott Nisely Post Office''.

H.R. 2570. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 301 Boardwalk Drive in Fort Collins, Colorado, as the ''Dr. Karl E. Carson Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2688. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 South Getty Street in Uvalde, Texas, as the ''Dolph Briscoe, Jr. Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3006. An act to improve the use of a grant of a parcel of land to the State of Idaho for use as an agricultural college, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3311. An act to authorize additional funds for emergency repairs and reconstruction of the Interstate I–35 bridge located in Minneapolis, Minnesota, that collapsed on August 1, 2007, to waive the $100,000,000 limitation on emergency relief funds for those emergency repairs and reconstruction, and for other purposes.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1927. An act to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to provide additional procedures for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence information and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 5, 2007, at 10 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 110th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

LAURA RICHARDSON, California, Thirty-Seventh.

## EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the first and second quarters of 2007, pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CANADA-U.S. INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP, CONFERENCE HELD IN WINDSOR, CANADA BETWEEN MAY 18 AND MAY 21, 2007

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem [1] | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] |
| Hon. Jim Oberstar | 5/18 | 5/21 | Canada | | 893.98 | | (3) | | | | 893.98 |
| Hon. Peter Welch | 5/18 | 5/21 | Canada | | 504.55 | | [3] 560.21 | | | | 1,064.76 |
| Hon. Michael McNulty | 5/18 | 5/21 | Canada | | 801.99 | | (3) | | 83.00 | | 884.99 |
| Hon. Cliff Stearns | 5/18 | 5/21 | Canada | | 756.82 | | (3) | | | | 756.82 |
| Hon. Donald Manzullo | 5/18 | 5/21 | Canada | | 252.27 | | (3) | | | | 252.27 |
| Hon. Mark Souder | 5/18 | 5/21 | Canada | | 756.82 | | (3) | | | | 756.82 |
| Hon. Carolyn Kilpatrick | 5/18 | 5/21 | Canada | | | | | | | | |
| Hon. Henry Brown | 5/18 | 5/21 | Canada | | 756.82 | | (3) | | | | 756.82 |
| Hon. Thaddeus McCotter | 5/18 | 5/21 | Canada | | | | | | | | |
| Hon. Paul Hodes | 5/18 | 5/21 | Canada | | 517.03 | | (3) | | | | 517.03 |
| Peter Quilter | 5/18 | 5/21 | Canada | | 756.82 | | (3) | | | | 756.82 |
| Janice McKinney | 5/18 | 5/21 | Canada | | 817.76 | | (3) | | | | 817.76 |
| Melody Hamoud | 5/18 | 5/21 | Canada | | 756.82 | | (3) | | | | 756.82 |
| Marin Stein | 5/18 | 5/21 | Canada | | 756.82 | | (3) | | | | 756.82 |
| Carl Ek | 5/18 | 5/21 | Canada | | 756.82 | | (3) | | | | 756.82 |
| Dr. John Eisold | 5/18 | 5/21 | Canada | | 756.82 | | (3) | | | | 756.82 |
| Representational | | | | | | | | | 212.49 | | 212.49 |
| Committee total | | | | | 9,842.12 | | 560.21 | | 295.49 | | 10,697.84 |

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Chairman, June 14, 2007.

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY SPRING MEETING IN MADEIRA, PORTUGAL FOLLOWED BY BILATERAL MEETINGS IN LISBON, PORTUGAL, TUNIS, TUNISIA AND RABAT, MOROCCO BETWEEN MAY 24 AND JUNE 3, 2007

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem [1] | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] |
| Hon. John Tanner | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) | | | | 1,558.90 |
| ; | 5/30 | 6/1 | Tunisia | | 298.00 | | | | | | |
| | 6/1 | 6/3 | Morocco | | 593.90 | | | | | | |
| Hon. Paul Gilmore | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) | | | | 1,558.90 |
| | 5/30 | 6/1 | Tunisia | | 298.00 | | | | | | |
| | 6/1 | 6/3 | Morocco | | 593.90 | | | | | | |
| Hon. John Boozman | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) | | | | 1,558.90 |
| | 5/30 | 6/1 | Tunisia | | 298.00 | | | | | | |
| | 6/1 | 6/3 | Morocco | | 593.90 | | | | | | |
| Hon. Ben Chandler | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) | | | | 1,558.90 |
| | 5/30 | 6/1 | Tunisia | | 298.00 | | | | | | |
| | 6/1 | 6/3 | Morocco | | 593.90 | | | | | | |
| Hon. Jo Ann Emerson | 5/28 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 304.00 | | (3) 3,517.61 | | | | 4,713.51 |
| | 5/30 | 6/1 | Tunisia | | 298.00 | | | | | | |
| | 6/1 | 6/7 | Morocco | | 593.90 | | | | | | |
| Hon. Baron Hill | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) | | | | 1,558.90 |
| | 5/30 | 6/1 | Tunisia | | 298.00 | | | | | | |
| | 6/1 | 6/3 | Morocco | | 593.90 | | | | | | |
| Hon. Kendrick Meek | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) | | | | 1,558.90 |
| | 5/30 | 5/31 | Tunisia | | 149.00 | | [3] 3,665.08 | | | | 4,481.08 |
| Hon. Charlie Melancon | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) | | | | 1,558.90 |
| | 5/30 | 6/1 | Tunisia | | 298.00 | | | | | | |
| | 6/1 | 6/3 | Morocco | | 593.90 | | | | | | |
| Hon. Dennis Moore | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) | | | | 1,558.90 |
| | 5/30 | 6/1 | Tunisia | | 298.00 | | | | | | |
| | 6/1 | 6/3 | Morocco | | 593.90 | | | | | | |
| Hon. Ralph Regula | 5/25 | 5/27 | Portugal | | 242.00 | | [3] 4,475.91 | | | | 4,717.91 |
| John Shimkus | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) | | | | 1,558.90 |
| | 5/30 | 6/1 | Tunisia | | 298.00 | | | | | | |
| | 6/1 | 6/3 | Morocco | | 593.90 | | | | | | |
| Hon. Thomas Tancredo | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) 4,853.87 | | | | 5,520.87 |
| Hon. Ellen Tauscher | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) 4,754.00 | | | | 5,421.00 |
| Melissa Adamson | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) | | | | 1,558.90 |
| | 5/30 | 6/1 | Tunisia | | 298.00 | | | | | | |
| | 6/1 | 6/3 | Morocco | | 593.90 | | | | | | |
| Kathy Becker | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) | | | | 1,558.90 |
| | 5/30 | 6/1 | Tunisia | | 298.00 | | | | | | |
| | 6/1 | 6/3 | Morocco | | 593.90 | | | | | | |
| Paul Gallis | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) | | | | 1,558.90 |
| | 5/30 | 6/1 | Tunisia | | 298.00 | | | | | | |
| | 6/1 | 6/3 | Morocco | | 593.90 | | | | | | |

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY SPRING MEETING IN MADEIRA, PORTUGAL FOLLOWED BY BILATERAL MEETINGS IN LISBON, PORTUGAL, TUNIS, TUNISIA AND RABAT, MOROCCO BETWEEN MAY 24 AND JUNE 3, 2007—Continued

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem [1] | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] |
| Gene Gurevich | 5/25 | 5/29 | Portugal | | 515.00 | | (3) 5,159.38 | | | | 5,674.38 |
| Marilyn Owen | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) | | | | 1,558.90 |
| | 5/30 | 6/1 | Tunisia | | 298.00 | | | | | | |
| | 6/1 | 6/3 | Morocco | | 593.90 | | | | | | |
| Patrick Stephenson | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) | | | | 1,558.90 |
| | 5/30 | 6/1 | Tunisia | | 298.00 | | | | | | |
| | 6/1 | 6/3 | Morocco | | 593.90 | | | | | | |
| Mark Wellman | 5/25 | 5/30 | Portugal | | 667.00 | | (3) | | | | 1,558.90 |
| | 5/30 | 6/1 | Tunisia | | 298.00 | | | | | | |
| | 6/1 | 6/3 | Morocco | | 593.90 | | | | | | |
| Committee total | | | | | 25,927.50 | | 26,425.85 | | | | 52,353.35 |

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

JOHN S. TANNER, Chairman, July 2, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GREENLAND, GERMANY, UNITED KINGDOM AND BELGIUM BETWEEN MAY 26 AND MAY 31, 2007

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency |
| Hon. Nancy Pelosi | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Hon. Edward Markey | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Hon. Hilda Solis | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Hon. Stephanie Herseth Sandlin | 5/25 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Hon. Earl Blumenauer | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Hon. John Larson | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Hon. Emanuel Cleaver | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Hon. David Hobson | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Hon. Wilson Livingood | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Dr. John F. Eisold | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Dr. Kay King | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Amy Fuestenau | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Lara Levison | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Nadeam Elshami | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| David Moulton | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Dr. Ana Unrh Cohen | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Kenny Kraft | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Phi Nguyen | 5/26 | 5/27 | Greenland | | 763.00 | (3) | 2,788.00 | | | | 3,551.00 |
| Hon. Nancy Pelosi | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| Hon. Edward Markey | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| Hon. Hilda Solis | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| Hon. Stephanie Herseth Sandlin | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| Hon. Earl Blumenauer | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| Hon. John Larson | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| Hon. David Hobson | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| Hon. Wilson Livingood | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| Dr. John F. Eisold | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| Dr. Kay King | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| Amy Fuestenau | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| Lara Levison | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| Nadeam Elshami | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| David Moulton | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| Dr. Ana Unrh Cohen | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| Kenny Kraft | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| Phi Nguyen | 5/27 | 5/29 | Germany | | 932.00 | (3) | | | | | 932.00 |
| Hon. Nancy Pelosi | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Hon. Edward Markey | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Hon. Hilda Solis | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Hon. Stephanie Herseth Sandlin | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Hon. Earl Blumenauer | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Hon. John Larson | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Hon. Emanuel Cleaver | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Hon. David Hobson | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Hon. Wilson Livingood | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Dr. John F. Eisold | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Dr. Kay King | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Amy Fuestenau | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Lara Levison | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Nadeam Elshami | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| David Moulton | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Dr. Ana Unrh Cohen | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Kenny Kraft | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Phi Nguyen | 5/29 | 5/30 | United Kingdom | | 591.00 | (3) | | | | | 591.00 |
| Hon. Nancy Pelosi | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Hon. Edward Markey | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Hon. Hilda Solis | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Hon. Stephanie Herseth Sandlin | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Hon. Earl Blumenauer | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Hon. John Larson | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Hon. Emanuel Cleaver | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Hon. David Hobson | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Hon. Wilson Livingood | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Dr. John F. Eisold | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Dr. Kay King | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Amy Fuestenau | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Lara Levison | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Nadeam Elshami | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| David Moulton | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Dr. Ana Unrh Cohen | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Kenny Kraft | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Phi Nguyen | 5/30 | 5/31 | Belgium | | 409.00 | (3) | | | | | 409.00 |
| Committee total | | | | | | | | | | | 98,694.00 |

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

NANCY PELOSI, Chairman, June 29, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2007

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem [1] | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] |

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

GEORGE MILLER, Chairman, July 9, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2007

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem [1] | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] |
| Amy Carroll | 4/1 | 4/6 | Belgium | | 1,929.88 | | 1,208.30 | | | | 3,138.18 |
| Jean Fruci | 4/1 | 4/6 | Belgium | | 1,929.88 | | 5,463.51 | | | | 7,393.39 |
| Elaine Paulionis | 4/1 | 4/6 | Belgium | | 1,929.88 | | 5,463.51 | | | | 7,393.39 |
| Hon. Bart Gordon | 5/4 | 5/7 | France | | 618.00 | | (3) | | 51,623.55 | | 52,241.55 |
| Hon. Charlie Melancon | 5/4 | 5/7 | France | | 618.00 | | (3) | | | | 618.00 |
| Hon. Phil Gingrey | 5/4 | 5/7 | France | | 618.00 | | (3) | | | | 618.00 |
| Hon. Russ Carnahan | 5/4 | 5/7 | France | | 618.00 | | (3) | | | | 618.00 |
| Hon. Randy Neugebauer | 5/4 | 5/7 | France | | 618.00 | | (3) | | | | 618.00 |
| Hon. Roscoe Bartlett | 5/4 | 5/7 | France | | 618.00 | | (3) | | | | 618.00 |
| Leighann Brown | 5/4 | 5/7 | France | | 618.00 | | (3) | | | | 618.00 |
| Alisa Ferguson | 5/4 | 5/7 | France | | 618.00 | | (3) | | | | 618.00 |
| Bess Caughran | 5/4 | 5/7 | France | | 618.00 | | (3) | | | | 618.00 |
| Alisha Prather | 5/4 | 5/7 | France | | 618.00 | | (3) | | | | 618.00 |
| Elizabeth Stack | 5/4 | 5/7 | France | | 618.00 | | (3) | | | | 618.00 |
| Leslee Gilbert | 5/4 | 5/7 | France | | 618.00 | | (3) | | | | 618.00 |
| Hon. Brian Baird | 5/17 | 5/21 | Jordan | | 68.00 | | 3,060.00 | | | | 3,128.00 |
| Hon. Brian Baird | 5/21 | 5/22 | Iraq | | | | (3) | | | | |
| Lisa Austin | 5/17 | 5/22 | Jordan | | 588.00 | | 3,437.00 | | | | 4,025.53 |
| Ken Monroe | 6/18 | 6/24 | France | | 1,236.00 | | 7,071.24 | | | | 8,307.24 |
| Committee total | | | | | 15,097.64 | | 25,704.09 | | 51,623.55 | | 92,425.28 |

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation

BART GORDON, Chairman, July 9, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2007

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem [1] | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] |

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHARLES B. RANGEL, Chairman, June 11, 2007.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2007

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem [1] | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2] |

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHARLES B. RANGEL, Chairman, July 5, 2007.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3078. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 09-07 informing of an intent to sign a Project Agreement Concerning Emerging Technologies with Australia, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3079. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3080. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-45, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s)of Offer and Acceptance to Morocco for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3081. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-57, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s)of Offer and Acceptance to Iraq for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3082. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-46, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s)of Offer and Acceptance to Israel for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3083. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-

37, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s)of Offer and Acceptance to Israel for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3084. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-24, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s)of Offer and Acceptance to Egypt for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3085. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-49, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s)of Offer and Acceptance to Spain for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3086. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-50, concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s)of Offer and Acceptance to Singapore for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3087. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-43, concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s)of Offer and Acceptance to Israel for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3088. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to the Government of Iceland (Transmittal No. 05-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3089. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the Department's report entitled, ''Report on the Effectiveness of the United Nations to Prevent Sexual Exploitation and Abuse and Trafficking in Persons in UN Peacekeeping Missions,'' pursuant to Public Law 109-164, section 104(e); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3090. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed license for the export of defense articles and services to the Governments of Canada, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, and Kuwait (Transmittal No. DDTC 006-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3091. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of technical data, defense articles and services to the Government of Saudi Arabia (Transmittal No. DDTC 026-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3092. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles and services to the Government of Canada (Transmittal No. DDTC 048-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3093. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3094. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3095. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination and Closing Procedures for Form 8697, Look-Back Interest — received August 14, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3096. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Modification of Notice 2003-81 [Notice 2007-71] received August 14, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3097. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Pharmaceutical Industry Overview Guide — received August 14, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3098. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Food Industry Overview Guide — received August 14, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3099. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Biotech Industry Overview Guide — received August 14, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3100. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Relief Related to Plan Amendment of Definition of Normal Retirement Age [Notice 2007-69] received August 14, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3101. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 26 CFR 601.105: Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2007-55) received August 14, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3102. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Corporate Estimated Tax [TD 9347] (RIN: 1545-AY22) received August 8, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3103. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Section 1274.—Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debit Instruments Issued for Property (Rev. Rul. 2007-57) received August 21, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3104. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Advance Electronic Transmission of Passenger and Crew Member Manifests for Commercial Aircraft and Vessels (RIN: 1651-AA62) received August 14, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

3105. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification that the Department intends to use FY 2007 IMET funds for the Democratic Republic of the Congo, pursuant to Public Law 110-5, section 515; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

3106. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Hospital Conditions of Participation: Laboratory Services [CMS-3014-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AJ29) received August 24, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

3107. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Medicare Integrity Program, Fiscal Intermediary and Carrier Functions, and Conflict of Interest Requirements [CMS-6030-F] (RIN: 0938-AN72) received August 24, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

3108. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicaid Program and State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP); Payment Error Rate Measurement [CMS-6026-F] (RIN: 0938-AN77) received August 31, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

3109. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, CMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare Program, Home Health Prospective Payment System Refinement and Rate Update for Calendar Year 2008 [CMS-1541-FC] (RIN: 0938-AO32) received August 24, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 2992. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve trade programs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 3020. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Microloan program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1908. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform; with an amendment (Rept. 110–314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1011. A bill to designate additional National Forest System lands in the State of Virginia as wilderness or a wilderness study area, to designate the Kimberling Creek Potential Wilderness Area for eventual incorporation in the Kimberling Creek Wilderness, to establish the Seng Mountain and Bear Creek Scenic Areas, to provide for

the development of trail plans for the wilderness areas and scenic areas, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–315 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

## TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1011. Referral to the Committee on Agriculture extended for a period ending not later than October 5, 2007.

H.R. 1400. Referral to the Committees on Ways and Means, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than September 21, 2007.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3470. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 744 West Oglethorpe Highway in Hinesville, Georgia, as the ''John Sidney 'Sid' Flowers Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas):

H.R. 3471. A bill to provide for the award of a military service medal to members of the Armed Forces who were exposed to ionizing radiation as a result of participation in a test of atomic weapons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SPACE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. WEXLER):

H. Res. 629. A resolution extending the condolences and sympathy of the House of Representatives to the Government and the people of Greece for the grave loss of life and vast destruction caused by the devastating fires raging through Greece since June 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BARROW, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. LINDER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H. Res. 630. A resolution congratulating the Warner Robins Little League Baseball Team from Warner Robins, Georgia, on winning the 2007 Little League World Series Championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H. Res. 631. A resolution honoring the sacrifice and courage of the six missing miners and three rescuers who were killed in the Crandall Canyon mine disaster in Utah, and recognizing the rescue crews for their outstanding efforts in the aftermath of the tragedies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. FEENEY introduced a bill (H.R. 3472) for the relief of Richelle Starnes; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 136: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 192: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 211: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 358: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 380: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 543: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 601: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 690: Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 743: Mr. ARCURI and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 760: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 782: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 837: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 882: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 900: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 946: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 969: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 971: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 1014: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
H.R. 1022: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 1046: Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 1064: Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 1069: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1072: Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 1076: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. JINDAL, and Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 1078: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1088: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1108: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1157: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1172: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1188: Mr. JINDAL and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1198: Mr. MARSHALL and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
H.R. 1223: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1225: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1236: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 1237: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
H.R. 1275: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. ORTIZ.
H.R. 1279: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 1293: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1322: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1353: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1395: Ms. FOXX and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1415: Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 1416: Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 1424: Mr. BONNER.
H.R. 1435: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1459: Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 1464: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1474: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SPACE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 1537: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 1539: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1553: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 1560: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 1567: Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1586: Mr. GINGREY, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1609: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. SUTTON, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 1655: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1665: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 1682: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1687: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 1691: Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 1730: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1738: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1748: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 1760: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1783: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1808: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 1813: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1843: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 1845: Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1884: Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CUBIN, and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1932: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1940: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. FOXX, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1957: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 1964: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 1971: Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2015: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. INSLEE, and Ms. HOOLEY.
H.R. 2020: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 2034: Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 2049: Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 2063: Ms. SOLIS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. BEAN, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2073: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2091: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 2095: Mr. HARE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. FARR, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 2108: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2125: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 2138: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 2164: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 2214: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 2221: Mr. SHERMAN and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 2234: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HARE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2262: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 2266: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 2267: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 2295: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2303: Mr. GORDON and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 2329: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 2370: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. JINDAL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. KIRK.
H.R. 2373: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 2380: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, and Mr. GINGREY.
H.R. 2391: Mr. POE.
H.R. 2405: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2411: Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 2412: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 2449: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 2477: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 2490: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 2503: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2511: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 2588: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2599: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 2604: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WYNN, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2606: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2694: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2702: Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. HARE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 2724: Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 2818: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. JINDAL.
H.R. 2820: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2834: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2857: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2859: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 2888: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2895: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WATT, Ms. CARSON, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PASTOR, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. WATSON, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2914: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 2928: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 2934: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 2942: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. EHLERS.
H.R. 3005: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 3008: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 3026: Mr. BARROW, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3029: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 3033: Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 3053: Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 3099: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SHULER, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. BEAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 3132: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. CARSON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 3134: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 3140: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WAMP, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 3146: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 3151: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 3164: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 3168: Mr. MAHONEY of Florida and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 3189: Mr. WATT and Ms. HOOLEY.
H.R. 3195: Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 3204: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3205: Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 3213: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 3214: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 3219: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 3257: Mr. GORDON, Mr. HARE, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. FILNER, Ms. Norton, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3289: Mr. COHEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FARR, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3298: Mr. ARCURI, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. STARK, and Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 3313: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 3322: Mr. COSTA and Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 3326: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 3334: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. COOPER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GORDON, and Mrs. DRAKE.
H.R. 3355: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. Corrine Brown of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. HARE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HILL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 3403: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 3409: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 3414: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H.R. 3418: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 3430: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 3432: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 3438: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 3439: Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 3440: Ms. GIFFORDS.
H.R. 3457: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 3466: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.J. Res. 6: Mr. BOOZMAN and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H. Con. Res. 85: Mr. GORDON, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. ENGEL.
H. Con. Res. 108: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H. Con. Res. 122: Mr. ARCURI, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HARE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. KIND, Ms. CARSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H. Con. Res. 165: Mr. WELLER.
H. Con. Res. 193: Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. BERRY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SHULER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H. Res. 111: Mr. CARNEY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 185: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LINDER, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H. Res. 245: Mr. ISRAEL.
H. Res. 257: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. RAHALL, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H. Res. 335: Mr. HARE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H. Res. 356: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Res. 373: Mr. WOLF.
H. Res. 433: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. JINDAL, and Mr. BARROW.
H. Res. 444: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H. Res. 445: Mr. ROSKAM.
H. Res. 470: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. TERRY.
H. Res. 508: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. CROWLEY.
H. Res. 549: Mrs. DRAKE and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H. Res. 554: Ms. BORDALLO.
H. Res. 557: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Ms. FOXX.
H. Res. 560: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Res. 564: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Res. 572: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. LAMPSON.
H. Res. 575: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Ms. DELAURO.
H. Res. 589: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FARR, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. FILNER.
H. Res. 603: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H. Res. 605: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. ORTIZ.
H. Res. 617: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H. Res. 618: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FARR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. COHEN.